

0

A

450-0162016-002

Addendum 4 to Environmental Impact Report

Addendum Date:	February 22, 2016
Case No.:	2007.0946E
Project Title:	Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II
EIR:	2007.0946E, certified June 3, 2010
Project Sponsor:	CP Development Co., LP
Lead Agency:	Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure
OCII Staff Contact:	Lila Hussain – (415) 749-2431
	lila.hussain@sfgov.org
City Staff Contact:	Joy Navarrete – (415) 575-9040
	joy.navarrete@sfgov.org

REMARKS

The Addendum includes the following attached Exhibits, which provide technical analyses, graphics, and other information supporting the analysis in this Addendum:

	Exhibit A: Tier 1 Project Revisions
Edwin M. Lee MAYOR	Exhibit B: Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions
	Exhibit C: Tower Location Analysis
Tiffany Bohee EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals
	Exhibit E: Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visuals
	Exhibit F: Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter (12/14/15)
Mara Rosales CHAIR	Exhibit G: Fehr & Peers Candlestick Point Parking Letter (1/11/16)
	Exhibit H: OCII Commission Resolution No. 1-2014 (1/7/14)
Miguel Bustos	Exhibit I: Fehr & Peers Harney Way Letter (12/9/15)
Marily Mondejar	Exhibit J: Fehr & Peers Gilman Avenue Letter (8/13/15)
Darshan Singh	Exhibit K: Candlestick Point Tower Analysis from CPSRA
COMMISSIONERS	Exhibit L: Excerpts from CPSRA General Plan and California State Park and Recreation
One S. Van Ness Ave	Commission Approval Resolution 1-2013
5th Floor	Exhibit M: Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Letter (12/21/15)
San Francisco, CA 94103	Exhibit N: Candlestick Point Tower Visual Analysis
01100	Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo
415 749 2400	Exhibit P: Ramboll Environ Air Quality and Climate Change Letter (1/22/16)
www.sfocii.org	Exhibit Q: CP Development Company Excavation Quantities at Candlestick Point Memo
	(1/26/16)
	Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16)

Background

On June 3, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Candlestick Point –

Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project (Project), San Francisco Planning Department File Number 2007.0946E and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency File Number ER06.05.07. On July 14, 2010, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors affirmed the Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR (Motion No. M10-110).

Between June 3, 2010 and August 3, 2010, the Planning Commission, Redevelopment Agency, Board of Supervisors, and other City Boards and Commissions adopted findings of fact, evaluation of mitigation measures and alternatives, a statement of overriding considerations (File No. 100572) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in fulfillment of the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These entities then adopted various resolutions, motions and ordinances related to Project approval and implementation, including but not limited to: (1) General Plan amendments; (2) Planning Code amendments; (3) Zoning Map amendments; (4) Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan amendments; (5) Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan amendments; (6) Interagency Cooperation Agreements; (7) Design for Development documents; (8) Health Code, Public Works Code, Building Code, and Subdivision Code amendments; (9) Disposition and Development Agreement, which included as attachments a Project Phasing Schedule, a Transportation Plan, and an Infrastructure Plan; (10) Real Property Transfer Agreement; (11) Public Trust Exchange Agreement; (12) Park Reconfiguration Agreement; and (13) Tax Increment Allocation Pledge Agreement.

1. Project Summary and Development Status

The Project covers approximately 702 acres along the southeastern waterfront of San Francisco: 281 acres at Candlestick Point (CP) and 421 acres at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS Phase II). The FEIR evaluated several variants of the Project. At the time of Project approval, it was not known whether the 49ers football team would require a new stadium as part of the Project. As a result, the Project as approved authorized several different land use development scenarios:

- 1. the Project with a stadium as described in Chapter II of the FEIR with Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, Utility Variant 4, and Shared Stadium Variant 5;
- 2. the Project without the stadium, with R&D Variant 1, Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, and Utility Variant 4;
- 3. the Project without the stadium, with Housing/R&D Variant 2a, Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, and Utility Variant 4; and
- 4. Sub-alternative 4A, which provides for the preservation of four historic structures in Hunters Point Shipyard, and which could be implemented with either the stadium variants or non-stadium Variants (See Board of Supervisors CEQA Findings pp. 2-4).

Following Project approval, the 49ers relocated to the City of Santa Clara. As a result, the Project Sponsor decided to proceed with Option (3) above which provides for a mix of housing and research

and development at the stadium site (the "Housing/R&D Variant"). If either the R&D Variant or Housing/R&D Variant is implemented, it will be modified by implementation of Candlestick Tower Variant D and the Utilities Variant.

The Project is envisioned to be completed in phases, and calls for the developer to submit major phase applications covering large areas of development that address the conceptual land use proposal for that area, followed by sub-phase applications that provide more development details on specific portions of a major phase. Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR and the approvals listed above, the Project Sponsor sought approval of Major Phase 1 CP in the Candlestick Park area of the Project as well as a Master Streetscape Plan and Signage Plan. The Project Sponsor also sought changes in the previously approved Project Phasing Schedule, and the schedules for implementation of the Transportation Plan (including the Transit Operating Plan of the Infrastructure Plan), and of other public benefits. These changes were analyzed in Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR, published on December 11, 2013 (Addendum 1). The successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII") Commission, approved these Project proposals on January 7, 2014. The approved Major Phase 1 CP encompasses 16 blocks of new development in the Candlestick Park area of the project, including approximately 1,500 new homes and 1.1 million square feet of mixed commercial uses and approximately 50,000 square feet of community facilities. Major Phase 1 CP includes the entirety of the Alice Griffith replacement project and the Candlestick Point retail center destination featuring retail, housing and entertainment uses.

The Project Sponsor has now submitted an application for approval of Sub-Phases 02-03-04 of Major Phase 1 CP ("Sub Phases CP-02-03-04 Application"). The application as proposed requires modifications of the approved Project Candlestick Point Design for Development ("D4D"), and proposed transportation system changes that require modification of the Major Phase 1 CP Approval, including the Schedule of Performance, the Candlestick Point Infrastructure Plan, the Candlestick Point Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Transportation Plan, and mitigation measures TR-MM.16, TR-MM.23.1, which are included in the approved Project MMRP.

This Addendum No. 4 to the FEIR, evaluates the proposed modifications to the Project, which are described in detail below in Section 3.¹

2. Proposed Sub-Phase Application Description, Proposed Project Modifications, Approval Actions

2.1 Sub-Phases 02-03-04

¹ OCII has also prepared two other addenda to the FEIR. Addendum No. 2, published on May 2, 2014, evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the Automatic Waste Collection System described in the FEIR as part of Utility Variant 4. The Project Sponsor is no longer pursing this option. Addendum No. 3 to the FEIR published on September 19, 2014 evaluated the potential environmental impacts of a proposal to demolish Candlestick Park stadium with explosives rather than conventional/mechanical demolition (Addendum 3). This proposal was not pursued by the Project Sponsor and the stadium was demolished using conventional/mechanical means.

Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 would include approximately 1,565 residential units, approximately 635,000 square feet of regional retail at CP Center, approximately 50,000 square feet of community use, approximately 131,000 square feet of neighborhood retail, approximately 75,000 square feet of performance venue use distributed between two locations, approximately 220 hotel rooms, and approximately 134,5000 square feet of office use. A parking garage with approximately 2,700 spaces would be located below the CP Center and along Arelious Walker Drive. Necessary infrastructure, including utilities, transportation improvements, and open space improvements would be included with the development of these sub-phases. [See, Candlestick Point Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application on file at OCII, One South Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94103, c/o Lila Hussain.]

Table 1 below summarizes the land uses approved for Candlestick Point in 2010 and the modifications proposed with the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application.

Table 1: Candlestick Point Land Use – Approved vs. Proposed				
Candlestick Point Land Use	2010 Approved	2015 Proposed		
Housing Units	6,225 units	No change		
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 sf	131,000 sf (125,000 SF + 6,000 SF converted from 15,500 sf office)		
Community Facilities	50,000 sf	50,000 sf (Inclusive of floor space for a Fire Station, Safety Hub, International African Market Place, and CPSRA Welcome Center)		
Office	150,000 sf	134,500 sf (Reduction of 15,500 sf due to conversion to 6,000 SF retail)		
Performance Venue/Arena	10,000 seats 75,000 sf	1200 Seats 42,000 sf Film Arts Center 4400 Seats 33,000 sf Performance Venue		
Hotel	220 Rooms 150,000 sf	No Change		

2.2 Proposed Project Modifications Analyzed in Detail in Addendum

The proposed modifications addressed in this Addendum in detail are described below and in Exhibit A ("Tier 1 Project Revisions"). These modifications require revisions to certain Project documents including the CP D4D, the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), the Transportation Plan, and the Infrastructure Plan. Other modifications that are not discussed in detail in this Addendum are also proposed that require revisions to some of these same documents.

In the case of any modifications not discussed in detail in the Addendum, OCII and the Planning Department have reviewed the changes and determined that no new or more severe environmental impacts would result from the changes because either the changes result in no physical changes to the environment or the nature of any physical changes are minor. Exhibit A summarizes proposed modifications that are discussed in the Addendum; for each modification discussed, Exhibit A identifies the specific elements of the Project documents requiring revisions. Exhibit B ("Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions" and Change Logs) summarizes various modifications to Project documents including updates, refinements, clarifications, and editorial changes that are not discussed in detail in the Addendum. A brief summary of the refinements, clarifications, and editorial changes listed in Exhibit B (Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions) is provided in the Addendum following the description of the modifications discussed in the Addendum in detail.

2.2.1: Tower Relocation: Towers G, J & K

The FEIR Tower Variant 3D included specific tower locations that corresponded with the tower zones identified in the D4D. Figure IV-16a (Vol IX, C&R-2426) in the FEIR shows the location of towers in Variant 3D. The proposed Project modifications would change the location of three towers. (See Exhibit C, Tower Location Analysis).

Tower G, located in CP Center (CP-02), would be moved west from the middle of the block to a location on Arelious Walker Drive near Jamestown Avenue. (See Exhibit C.) Tower G is proposed for relocation because of the practical difficulty of structural integration and construction timing concerns associated with co-locating the tower with the parking garage. The new location would be within CP-02 and outside the 2010 approved tower zone.

Towers J and K would be relocated in CP-04 immediately southeast of the approved locations. (See Exhibit C.) The towers are proposed for relocation because of the proposed increase in the depth of blocks in Sub-Phase CP-04. The approved block depths in CP-04 were established based on the expectation that these blocks would be developed for predominantly retail uses with a rear service alley. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application now proposes to have residential townhomes lining the mid-block break, which means that approved blocks would not have sufficient depth to accommodate these townhomes. The proposed D4D modifications would increase the block depths in CP-04 to accommodate the townhomes. In response, the depth of the blocks immediately to the southeast of CP-04 would be reduced by the same amount and this change would be reflected in the future CP-10 and CP-11 Sub-Phase applications. The reduction in the block depths in CP-10 and

CP-11 would necessitate moving Towers J and K approximately 100 feet southeast of their approved locations. Tower K would remain within a 2010 approved tower zone. Tower J was approved with a fixed location and the proposed modification would establish a new fixed location.

2.2.2: Height Increases

Height Increase within CP Center on Western Corner of Harney Way & Ingerson Avenue Intersection: The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes an increase in the maximum height at CP Center on the corner of West Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet. The proposed height increase would allow for a performance venue (accommodating a Film Arts Center) above a two-story anchor retail space. (See Exhibit D, p. 1 Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals.)

Height Increase for Development Within and Abutting CP Center. The approved height limit for the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue within and adjacent to the CP Center is 65 feet. This height allows for a 20 foot ground floor of retail with four to five floors of residential units above. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application and D4D modifications would increase the maximum height of these buildings to 80 feet, mandate a minimum floor-to-floor height of 20 feet for the ground floor retail, and restrict residential and commercial uses above the ground floor retail to a maximum of five floors. (See Exhibit D, pp. 2-3.)

Height Increase for CP Center at the Corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way: The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application and proposed D4D modifications include an increase in the height of the building located at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet. (See, Exhibit E, Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visuals.)This building would include the 220-room hotel, performance venue space, and office space. The increase in height is intended to ensure consistency in the built form along Harney Way and allow greater flexibility to design the building as an iconic entry statement to CP Center given its important location at the intersection of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The additional height would also allow for a taller floor-to-floor height at ground level, which would provide flexibility for different uses and amenities.

2.2.3: Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

The 2010 approved Project, Variant 2A assumed that Candlestick Point would include 150,000 square feet of office use and 125,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes to increase neighborhood retail use by 6,000 additional square feet, for a total of 131,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use. At the same time, the Project Sponsor proposes to forego development of 15,500 square feet of the 150,000 square feet of office use allowed under the approved Project. The remaining 134,500 square feet of office use would be included in the CP Center on the site with the hotel and performance venue space. (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter, 12/14/15.)

2.2.4: Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage

The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes changes to the number of on-street and offstreet parking spaces, which are discussed in detail in Exhibit G, Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16.

Per Exhibit G and Table 2 below, there is an overall increase of 241 parking spaces within Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04, which is comprised of an overall increase of 510 off-street parking spaces and a reduction of 269 on-street parking spaces.

Table 2: Car Parking Summary - Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04				
Туре	Location	FEIR (2010)	Sub-Phase Application (2016)	Difference (+/-)
Off-Street	CP Center Garage	2,596	2,677	+81
	Other Location	1,141	1,570	+429
	Total	3,737	4,247	+510
On-Street	CP Center Street Network	170	0	-170
	Other Location	260	161	-99
	Total	430	161	-269
	Total Parking	4,167	4,408	+241

In 2010, the maximum supply of off-street parking at CP-02-03-04 was 3,737 spaces, which was based on the maximum floor space entitlements for land uses within the Sub-Phase. The maximum supply was comprised of 2,596 spaces at CP Center, and 1,141 spaces provided on other blocks by other developers. It was assumed that all off-street parking at CP Center would be located within a structured parking garage. Based on the land uses proposed in the CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application, a total of 4,246 total off-street parking spaces would be provided within Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04. This is comprised of 2,677 spaces in the CP Center parking garage and 1,570 spaces provided separately by other developers. This represents a net increase of 510 parking spaces within Sub-Phase CP 02-03-04.

In relation to on-street parking within Sub Phase CP-02-03-04, the FEIR assumed that 430 on-street car parking spaces would be constructed within the Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04 street network. It was identified that 170 of these parking spaces would be located on streets within CP Center (Earl Street, 8th Street and Bill Walsh Street), and 260 spaces located elsewhere within the CP-02-03-04 street network. With the preparation of design development and construction drawings for the street network, the CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application identifies that the maximum amount on-street parking that can be accommodated within the CP-02-03-04 street network is now 161 spaces. This represents a decrease of 269 on-street car parking spaces. The reduction in on-street parking spaces is the result of the need for the street design to provide adequate clearances for emergency vehicles and accommodate essential sidewalk amenities such as fire hydrants, transit stops, transit shelters, and ADA facilities.

The CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application proposes to relocate the 269 displaced on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage. The relocation of the displaced on-street car parking spaces, combined with the land uses proposed within CP Center, will result in an overall increase of 81 parking spaces in the CP Center garage from what was identified in the FEIR. The FEIR did not specify construction details for the CP Center garage – the size of the garage is controlled by the height, bulk, and other development regulations applicable to CP Center. The additional 81 spaces can be accommodated within these development limitations and through refinements being made to the design of the space internal to the garage. Thus, because no garage design was specified in 2010 and because the FEIR assumed full build out of the allowable development program at the CP Center, the additional spaces would not increase in the size of development in the CP Center from that anticipated in 2010.

2.2.5: Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

Under FEIR Mitigation Measure TR-16 as modified pursuant to the Addendum 1 analysis (Addendum 1, p. 15), the Project Sponsor is required to construct certain off-site improvements to Harney Way. The changes identified in Addendum 1 and approved by the OCII Commission by Resolution dated January 7, 2014 are shown in Exhibit H. The Harney Way improvements include an initial configuration and a potential longer-term configuration involving a second phase of improvements. The initial configuration included improvements from Arelious Walker Drive to Thomas Mellon Drive prior to the occupancy permit for CP-02. This initial configuration would maintain the existing two travel lanes in each direction, add two BRT lanes on the north side, add a center median to accommodate left-turn lanes at intersections, add a median between the westbound travel lanes and BRT lands to accommodate a dedicated west bound right turn lane at Executive Park Boulevard East and an eastbound BRT stop just west of Executive Park Boulevard, provide a 12-foot sidewalk on the north side of Harney Way and provide a 13-foot two-way Class I bicycle facility on the south side separated from traffic by a five-foot median. (See, Exhibit I, 12/9/15 Fehr & Peers Harney Way Letter, Figure 1.)

Delays associated with two nearby major transportation projects – the extension of Geneva Avenue and the replacement of the US 101/Harney Way interchange - have delayed the final design of the BRT alignment. Given these delays, it is unlikely that the BRT alignment will be finalized by 2019. Consequently, the improvements anticipated in the initial configuration, which include several BRT related improvements, are affected by this delay. The timing of the second phase of improvements would not be affected by these delays.

The Project Sponsor proposes further modifying the MM TR-16 (which was previously modified in 2014 based on Addendum 1) as follows:

MM TR-16 Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. Prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit for Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, the The Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in figure 5 in the Transportation Study, with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right of way. <u>The portion</u>

between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-A) shall be widened to include a two-way cycle track and two-way BRT lanes, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for Candlestick Sub-Phase CP-02. The remaining portion, between Thomas Mellon Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-B), shall be widened prior to implementation of the planned BRT route which coincides with construction of CP-07 and HP-04 in 2023, as outlined in the transit improvement implementation schedule identified in Addendum 1, based on the alignment recommendations from an ongoing feasibility study conducted by the San Francisco County Transportation Agency.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Candlestick Point Major Phases 2, 3, and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersections on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.

The proposed modification to MM TR-16, and corresponding modification of the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the Infrastructure Plan, and the Transportation Plan would allow the Project Sponsor to limit the construction of the first phase of improvements during Sub-Phase CP-02 to the area of Harney Way between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park Boulevard East, although the sidewalk on Harney Way would be completed all the way to the planned sidewalk and cycle track at Thomas Mellon Drive. When the BRT alignment has been finalized, the Project Sponsor would complete the BRT lanes between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive. Thus, the first phase of improvements would be completed prior to operation of the BRT, and would not delay the start of BRT service. (See Exhibit I, Figure 2.) SFMTA has reviewed this proposed modification and verbally concurred.

2.2.6: Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The approved Major Phase 1 CP Application Schedule of Performance requires the Project Sponsor to construct streetscape improvements on Gilman Avenue concurrently with the development of Sub-Phase CP-02. Gilman Avenue is currently configured to facilitate egress from the former Candlestick Park stadium, with one eastbound lane and two westbound lanes. As required by MM TR-23.1, the streetscape improvements would include two lanes of travel in each direction and on-street parking on both sides of the street. Sidewalks would be narrowed from 15 feet to 12 feet (This configuration is shown in Figure 1(A) in Exhibit J, 8/13/15 Fehr & Peers Gilman Avenue Letter). Mitigation measure MM TR-23.1 also requires one travel lane in each direction to be converted to transit-only for project impacts to transit travel times. (This configuration is shown in Figure 1(B) in Exhibit J).

The proposed configuration would retain 15-foot sidewalks and on-street parking, provide one lane of travel in each direction with a center turn lane, and modify the intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker from all-way-stop-control to signal control. In addition, far-side bus stops with bulb outs would be located on the corridor at Ingalls Street and Griffith Street.

Mitigation measure MM TR-23.1 would be revised as follows and would bring the transit travel times for the 29 Sunset to levels consistent with the mitigated EIR scenario:

MM TR-23.1 <u>Maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset.</u> To address project impacts to the 29-Sunset, prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase I, the Project Applicant in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the following improvements which could reduce Project impacts on transit operations along the Gilman Avenue and Paul Avenue corridor, generally between Arelious Walker Drive and Bayshore Boulevard. The study shall create a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule (as identified below) to maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset.</u>

- For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces.
- For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate onstreet parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces.
- As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 5 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic.
- Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transitonly in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow left-hand lane,

facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno.

- Implement traffic signal priority (TSP), which modifies the timing at signalized intersections to prioritize the movement of transit vehicles, at the intersections of Arelious Walker/Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue/Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue.
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street/Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno/Paul Avenue.
- <u>Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue</u> between Third Street Bayshore Boulevard. The transit land would begin on Gilman Avenue and <u>extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.</u>

A study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the Project mitigation measures was completed (See Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave. Addendum, 08/13/15). The monitoring program would evaluate the current conditions for the 29 Sunset to determine the implementation of the proposed measures above.

2.3. Proposed Minor Modifications of Project Documents Not Analyzed in Detail in Addendum

As noted above, certain Project documents, including the CP D4D, the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the CP Streetscape Master Plan, the Transportation Plan, and the Infrastructure Plan would be modified but are not discussed in detail in this Addendum because they do not raise environmental issues except for a few with respect to transportation. The few transportation-related issues raised by these modifications are discussed in the Transportation section as explained below. A complete list of these minor modifications is included in Exhibit B.

The modifications by and large clarify and clean up documents to reflect past approvals and elaborate on or make minor modifications to previously proposed design details. Briefly summarized, the modifications: (a) clarify design requirements and definitions; (b) update text and figures to reflect Project approvals received since 2010 and the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application; (c) delete references to the stadium option; (d) reorganize text for clarity; (e) amplify design requirements for items such as signage and building massing; (f) add details on design requirements for items such as pedestrian amenities and ground floor heights; (g) revise certain garage entry and curb cut requirements, CP Center internal access, building facades, and timing of certain improvements; (h) update the Streetscape Master Plan for items such as street furniture, paving materials, and landscaping materials; (i) update the Major Phase 1 CP Application to reflect the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application, including an update of the number of affordable housing units from 1025 to 1560; and provide for a portion of performance arts center space to be used for a movie theater.

Generally, these modifications are not further discussed in this Addendum, because OCII and the Planning Department have determined that these Project document modifications would not result in

physical changes sufficient to cause new or more severe significant environmental impacts. A few topics listed in Exhibit B are discussed at the end of the transportation section. These include the proposed garage entry and curb cut modifications, the reduction in performance venue seats as a result of the Film Arts Center proposal for the site at Harney Way and Ingerson, and change in internal circulation at the CP Center (See Section 4.3, Exhibit B Modifications Discussed in Transportation and Circulation Section, for additional discussion related to transportation.)

2.4 Project Approvals

The approvals required to implement the Project modifications addressed in this Addendum and the items listed in Exhibits A and B, include the following:

Table 3: Project Approvals				
	Project Approval	Agency		
1.	D4D Amendments	OCII Commission		
		Planning Commission		
2.	Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04	OCII Executive Director		
3.	Major Phase 1 CP Amendments	OCII Commission		
4.	MMRP Amendments	OCII Commission		
		Planning Commission		
5.	CP Master Streetscape Plan	OCII Commission		
6.	Transportation Plan	SFMTA		
7.	Infrastructure Plan	SFDPW, SFMTA, SFPUC. SFFD		

3. Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 provide that once a lead agency has certified an EIR, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required to support subsequent discretionary approvals of the project unless major revisions are required in the previous EIR due to substantial changes in the project, the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, or as a result of new information, which becomes available and was not known and could not have been known at the time of the EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis for a lead agency's decision not to require a subsequent EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in a previously certified EIR where some changes or additions are necessary in an EIR but none of the conditions calling for a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred. The lead agency's decision to use an addendum must be supported by substantial evidence that the conditions that would trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, are not present.

This Addendum describes the potential environmental effects of the modified Project compared to the impacts identified in the FEIR, and explains why the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental impacts and would not require the adoption of any new or considerably different

mitigation measures or alternatives. Modifications to two previously adopted mitigation measures are proposed and analyzed herein.

4.1 Land Use and Plans

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) no significant construction impacts; (2) LU-1, no significant impact on the physical division of an established community; (3) LU-2, less than significant impact as to conflict with plans, policies, or regulations; (4) LU-3, less than significant impacts on existing land use character; and (4) less than significant cumulative impacts.

Relocation of Towers G, J, and K

The proposed Project modifications include the relocation of Towers G, J, and K. The FEIR land use analysis considered the inclusion of towers at Candlestick Point in determining that the Project would result in less than significant land use and plans impacts. The proposed relocation of three towers would not result in any changes to the Project land uses or introduce a new land use. Because the proposed modified tower locations are within the planned new development area at Candlestick Point (Tower G in CP Center and Towers J and K in CP South) and as shown in Exhibit C, the modified locations would not result in physically dividing an established community. The Project would continue to comply with the General Plan, the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, the San Francisco Sustainability Plan and other applicable plans, policies, and regulations (e.g. noise regulations, regulations adopted to reduce air quality impact, regulations related to geology and hydrology, biological resource regulations, and other environmental regulatory requirements discussed throughout the FEIR) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Thus, relocation of three towers would not affect the Project's consistency with a plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The relocation of the three towers would not change the FEIR's finding that development of Candlestick Point, with the inclusion of towers, would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. The FEIR acknowledged that the Project would alter the land use character at Candlestick Point and result in a substantially different built environment. The FEIR noted that the scale of the proposed development, including the residential towers, which could be as high as 420 feet, would contrast with existing patterns. The FEIR also acknowledged that the Project's open space network would connect with the CP State Recreational Area (CPSRA) and that CPRSA lands would be reconfigured and improved as part of the Project. Towers J and K would be relocated a short distance within the interior of CP South and thus would not change the Project's impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

The relocation of tower G would move this tower closer to CPRSA. (Exhibit C.) Tower G would continue to be part of the CP Center, a dense concentrated area of development within the Project. As shown in Exhibit K, p. 1 (Candlestick Point Tower Analysis from CPSRA), the closest distance from the proposed tower G location to one corner of the CPSRA would be approximately 600 feet. This is an area of CPSRA located at the intersection of Harney Way and Arelious Walker and these

streets separate the proposed tower from the CPSRA. The majority of CPSRA, including the areas along the waterfront, would be a significantly greater distance from the relocated Tower G. (See Exhibit K, p. 1.) The proposed Tower G location previously accommodated the approximately 70,200 seat football stadium, which ranged in height from 70 to 114 feet and was surrounded by paved parking lots. (See Exhibit K, p. 1-4.) The change from the adjacent football stadium to the CP development, with towers, including the relocation of Tower G, would not represent a significant adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

Existing residential development in the Project vicinity includes multi-family housing south of the CP Center along Harney Way and other lower density housing located across Jamestown and farther up the hill from the Project site. Tower G would be moved away from the lower density housing located across Jamestown and somewhat closer to the multi-family, multi-story development along Harney Way. The FEIR Land Use section acknowledged that the Project would alter the character of Candlestick Point and result in a substantially different built environment compared with the existing site and vicinity. (EIR, p. III.B-39.) In particular, the EIR analysis specifically acknowledged that Candlestick Point would include residential towers ranging from 220 feet to 420 feet in height. (EIR, p. III.B-39.) The relocation of tower G within the CP Center would not alter the land use analysis or conclusions in the EIR.

Additionally, the CPSRA General Plan as amended in 2013 acknowledges that the park is located in an intensely urban area surrounded by industrial and residential uses, and, formerly, the stadium. (See Exhibit L, Excerpts from the CPSRA General Plan and Approval Resolution.) The State Park and Recreation Commission Resolution 1-2013 acknowledged that "the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands and other areas with a large mixed use development." (See Exhibit L.) The CPSRA General Plan describes the vision and role of the park as "an urban state park" where its "urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend." (See Exhibit L.) The Plan notes that the "proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a 'green front lawn' for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences." (See Exhibit L.) Thus, the CPSRA includes a vision and plans that accommodate the intense urban development underway at Candlestick Point. Given these factors, the relocation of tower G would not result in a substantial adverse land use impact on the existing character of the vicinity, including the CPSRA.

Therefore, the relocation of towers G, J, and K would not change the land use findings or mitigation measures in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Height Increases

The proposed height increases would not change the Project's approved land uses. The height increases (15 feet-35 feet) for buildings located within the new development area are relatively modest. (See Exhibits D and E.) The increases in height would occur in the CP Center, which will accommodate dense urban development of varying heights. The most significant height increase would be at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson for a building located in the interior of the new development area at a significant intersection. This is a prominent intersection where additional height would be an appropriate urban design feature. The height increases would not affect the existing lower density housing located across Jamestown and up the hill from the Project site because the distance, topography, and other project development would ensure that these height increases would not be noticeable from, or otherwise adversely affect the character of, these existing residential areas. Thus, these proposed height increases would not affect existing land uses, conflict with plans and policies designed to mitigate environmental impacts, or adversely affect the existing land use character of the area surrounding Candlestick Point. Consequently, the height increases would not result in new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

The proposed conversion of 15,500 square feet of office use to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use would maintain the overall mix of uses allowed in Candlestick Point, including residential, office, retail (neighborhood and regional), hotel, and open space/parks. The proposed use conversion would result in a robust neighborhood retail program that would meet the demand for shops and services in the new urban core of Candlestick Point and allow for neighborhood retail to be provided in various locations in the new neighborhoods. The remaining 134,500 square feet of office use would continue to allow appropriate office uses in Candlestick Point to serve residents and commercial uses. This minor change in the use allocation at Candlestick Point would not result in the physical division of an established community, conflict with plans, policies, or regulations designed to mitigate environmental impacts, or adversely affect the existing land use character since both office and neighborhood retail uses were already anticipated to be part of the development. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The proposed Project modifications to the parking and transportation system would not result in any change to the types of land uses in the Project, would not change the density or intensity of the Project uses, and would not change the Project location. Thus, these proposed Project modifications would not change the FEIR's findings with respect to land use and plans impacts. Consequently, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Additionally, given that the proposed Project modifications would have no new or more severe land use impacts, the FEIR land use and plans cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.2 Population, Housing and Employment

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) PH-1, less than significant impacts as the Project would not induce substantial direct population growth during construction; (2) PH-2, less than significant impacts as the Project would not result in indirect population growth during operation; (3) PH-2a, less than significant impacts regarding indirect population growth during operation of Candlestick Point; (4) PH-2b, less than significant impacts regarding indirect population growth during operation of HPS Phase II; (5) PH-3, no impacts regarding the displacement of existing housing units or residents, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (6) PH-3a, no impacts regarding displacement of existing housing units and residents at Candlestick Point, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (7) PH-3b, no impacts regarding displacement of existing housing units and residents at HPS Phase II, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (8) less than significant cumulative population, housing and employment impacts.

Tower Relocations

The relocation of three Project towers would not increase the overall intensity of development of the Project because these towers would accommodate the same amount and type of development contemplated by the FEIR for the towers. Thus, the tower relocation would not increase the FEIR's Project population and employment projections. Additionally, the tower relocations would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

Height Increases

The proposed height increase would change the density range across the whole of Candlestick Point from 20-245 units per acre to 15-285 units per acre. While the density range would change, the total number of housing units at CP would not change and would remain at 6,225 units. Thus, no increase in the FEIR's population and employment projections would occur as a result of this density range change.

The height increases may slightly increase construction activities on the site, but the extent of this increase would be modest - 15 feet, approximately 1-story in most locations, and potentially 35 feet for the Film Arts Center location. In the context of the overall construction activity for the site, these relatively modest increases in potential building height would be unlikely to result in any additional population growth during construction, because any additional construction work would be done by workers already working on the Project. Thus, the height increase would not increase population or employment on the site because of construction activities.

Additionally, the height increase would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

The proposed conversion of 15,500 square feet of office use to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use would reduce the amount of square footage developed on the Project site. Thus, this proposed change would not increase population or employment on the site. Additionally, this proposed change would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The relocation of on-street parking spaces to the garage would not substantially increase the number of spaces in the garage. The FEIR assumed the CP Center garage would accommodate 2,596 spaces (FEIR, Figure III.D-12) and the current plan includes 2,677 spaces. No plans for the garage were available in 2010, but the FEIR assumed full build out of the CP Center. This increase in spaces would be accommodated by the allocation of space within the planned garage and in compliance with the development regulations applicable to CP Center. Thus, this relatively modest increase in spaces would be unlikely to result in any additional population growth during construction, because any additional construction work that might be necessary would be done by workers already working on the Project. Thus, the relocation of parking spaces would not increase population or employment on the site because of construction activities.

The proposed change in the phasing of the Harney Way improvements and the Gilman Avenue configuration revisions would result in some adjustments to previously approved Project elements. Certain Harney Way improvements would be shifted to a later phase and the scope of the Gilman Avenue improvements would be reduced. Thus, these changes would not increase population or employment on the site. Additionally, these proposed transportation changes would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the locations of these improvements do not contain any existing housing units.

Therefore, given that the Project modifications would not result in any significant changes that would implicate the significance criteria for population, employment and housing, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to population, housing and employment impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant or no impact and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR population, housing and employment cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.3 Transportation and Circulation

This discussion evaluates the following proposed Project modifications to determine if they would result in new or more severe significant transportation and circulation environmental impacts: (a) the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail use; (b) the relocation of on-street parking to the CP Center garage; (c) the change in the phasing of Harney Way off-site improvements; and (d) the revisions to the approved configuration of Gilman Avenue. Transportation and circulation are documented in detail in the following exhibits: Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail reference Exhibit F (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15); Relocation of On-Street Parking reference Exhibit G (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16); Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing reference Exhibit I (Fehr & Peers Harney Way Phasing Letter, 12/09/15); and Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements reference Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15). In addition, a memorandum discussing transportation effects of the Performance Venue Revision, including the Film Arts Center, (discussed at the end of this Transportation and Circulation section) is included in Exhibit M (Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Memo, 12/21/15. The FEIR project description refers to a "Performance Venue/Arena" at Candlestick Point. The Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR referred to this land use as an "Arena." In the Sub-Phases Application and in this Addendum, this land use is referred to as Performance Venue and the Film Arts Center is a performance venue use proposed for the building located at the western corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. In this transportation analysis, the land use will be referred to as "Arena/Performance Venue" to reflect the terms used in the FEIR)

The proposed tower relocations and height increases would not result in new significant transportation impacts or an increase in the severity of previously identified transportation impacts, because these modifications would not increase or change the type of development previously approved. Additionally, the tower relocations would occur within areas approved for development and thus would not significantly change expected circulation patterns. Although the height increases may involve additional construction work, the increase is modest in the context of the construction necessary for the Project and would be completed by workers and equipment already anticipated to be on-site and thus no significant additional construction traffic would be expected. Thus, no additional transportation and circulation construction impacts are expected from the relatively modest proposed height increases. Thus, the tower relocations and height increases are not further discussed below.

TR1-1: On-Site and Off-Site Construction Impacts

As described in the EIR, construction of the Project would result in significant and unavoidable transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. The EIR concluded implementation of mitigation measure MM TR-1, which would require the Applicant to develop and implement a construction traffic management plan to reduce the impact of construction activity on transportation facilities, would reduce the impacts caused by construction, but not to a less-than-significant level.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail</u>: The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate less occupied square-footage. Office space would decrease from 150 ksf to 134.5 ksf and local retail would increase from 125 ksf to 131 ksf; thus, the total office and local retail square footage would decrease from 275 ksf to 265.5 ksf, thereby decreasing the amount of construction. The Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in any new significant construction impact because the additional parking spaces will not substantially increase the overall size of development at CP Center. The additional parking spaces would be accommodated by the allocation of space within the planned garage in compliance with the D4D development standards for CP Center.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way construction plan would continue to construct the Harney Way cross-section; however, the construction would be completed in two phases (Phase 1-A and Phase 1-B.) Phase 1-B, Harney Way between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive, shall be constructed prior to implementation of the planned BRT route and would likely coincide with other construction projects in the area. The Construction Traffic Management Program required by MM TR-1 would include specific provisions to manage the potential impacts on Harney Way. The overall amount of construction would remain approximately the same as presented in the EIR; therefore the Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised Gilman Avenue crosssection would decrease the amount of construction activity because the proposal would no longer widen Gilman Avenue. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation and circulation during construction beyond those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required (See Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15.)

Impacts TR-2 through TR-16: Traffic Impacts to Regional and Local Roadway System, Study Intersections, and Freeway Facilities

The EIR evaluated 60 intersections and several freeway facilities throughout the Project site and surrounding area. As described in the EIR, the Project would generate substantial amounts of new vehicular traffic resulting in a number of significant impacts and mitigation measures. Impacts TR-2 through TR-8 and TR-10 through TR-15, which identified several mitigation measures, were considered significant and unavoidable. Impact TR-9 was considered less than significant and TR-16 was considered less than significant with mitigation.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as

identified in the EIR and detailed in Exhibit F. (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the Project revision would not create any new significant traffic impacts because the total trips generated would remain the same or decrease.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional trips generated because under the FEIR analysis the total trips generated are based on land use factors, such as the amount of residential units, retail or office space, etc., not total parking or the location of parking (the analysis assumes that parking is located within the Project site); therefore the Project revision does not result in any new significant traffic impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way phasing plan would continue to provide two lanes of travel in both directions at all times, until monitoring requires construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by MM TR-16. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all times. No additional significant traffic impacts [e.g. changes in LOS] were identified as a result of phasing the initial improvements to Harney Way because the vehicle configuration would remain the same as detailed in Exhibit I (Fehr & Peers Harney Way Phasing Letter, 12/09/15.)

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> The Gilman Avenue revised crosssection would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional impacts to locations away from Gilman Avenue. As indicated in the detailed analysis included in Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised crosssection would result in similar or lower average intersection delay and travel times along Gilman Avenue compared to the original cross-section analyzed in the EIR, and no additional significant impacts would occur on Gilman Avenue, itself.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to traffic circulation beyond those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-17 through TR-30: Impacts to Local and Regional Transit Operations and Capacity

The EIR described the Project's impacts to transit in Impacts TR-17 through TR-30. The EIR identified that with mitigation measures, the Project would provide adequate transit capacity to meet Project demand; therefore, TR-17 through TR-20 were determined to be less than significant. TR-21 through TR-27, which describe impacts to transit travel time, were considered significant and unavoidable because mitigation measures identified would require substantial outreach and design, such that the feasibility of the mitigation measures is uncertain. The EIR also identified TR-28 through TR-30, regional transit routes using nearby freeways. The EIR concluded that TR-28 and TR-30 were significant and unavoidable and TR-29 was less than significant.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> As shown in Exhibit F (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15), the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate fewer

AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project. Therefore, the Project revision would not influence the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant transit impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional transit trips generated, nor would it interfere with projected travel times. In fact, fewer on-street parking spaces may actually reduce the "friction" between transit and vehicles maneuvering into and out of parking spaces on-street. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant transit impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would not affect the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional transit impacts related to transit ridership. The proposed phasing would require that the BRT facilities be constructed in a manner consistent with the alternative BRT alignment determined by the SFCTA and SFMTA prior to operation of the BRT system. MTA is in the process of evaluating the future BRT routes, including the 28 route which is planned to run along Harney Way. At this time, MTA has not completed environmental review or selected a preferred route. Consequently, the potential change in the routes for the BRT is uncertain and too speculative for further analysis. Therefore, transit service would not be affected by the proposed phasing of improvements to Harney Way.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> As described in Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised cross-section would not affect the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional transit impacts identified in TR-17 through TR-22 or TR-24 through TR-30, which relate to transit routes that do not travel on Gilman Avenue. However, the EIR identified proposed MM TR-23, which would widen the Gilman Avenue cross-section between Third Street and Griffith Street. If the revised proposal for Gilman Avenue is adopted, implementing Mitigation MM-TR-23 will be infeasible. Therefore, MM-TR-23 has been revised to include feasible mitigations measures that would result in better transit operations than the original MM-TR-23.

The revised mitigation measure is as follows, with detailed supporting analysis included in Exhibit J.

For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces.²

² To address the project impacts to the 29-Sunset, the DEIR included two mitigation measures, addressing the eastbound and westbound transit operations, and an alternative mitigation measure. Through discussions with City staff the mitigation measures identified were not desirable and removed from the final EIR, such that the alternative became the mitigation measure. The MMRP did not reflect this change; therefore, as part of Addendum 4, the two mitigation measures included in MM TR-23.1 are being removed in addition to the alternate described above.

- For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate on-street parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces.¹
- As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 15 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transitonly lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixedflow traffic.
- Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transit-only in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow lefthand lane, facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno.
- Implement TSP at the intersections of Arelious Walker/Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue/Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street/Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno/Paul Avenue
- Implement peak period-transit dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street/Bayshore Boulevard. The transit lane would begin on Gilman Avenue and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.

As explained in Exhibit J of the Appendix, the revised MM TR-23 would offer a better level of improvement to transit travel times compared to the original MM TR-23, and therefore, no additional significant impacts to transit are anticipated as a result of the proposed change to the Gilman Avenue cross-section.

Consequently, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transit beyond those identified in the EIR nor would it cause a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required with exception to MM TR-23, which would require a revised mitigation measure. The revised mitigation measure would result in better transit operations than the original mitigation measure identified in the EIR.

Impacts TR-31 and TR-32: Bicycle Circulation

The EIR described impacts to bicycle circulation in Impacts TR-31 and TR-32. The EIR concluded that TR-31 would result in a beneficial impact or no impact because the Project would construct bicycle facilities to serve the additional demand. TR-32 was identified as significant and unavoidable because the feasibility to implement MM TR-32 is uncertain.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The amount of office space converted to neighborhood retail was based on generating the same or fewer peak hour trips, as such, the conversion would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project analyzed in the EIR (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the Project revision would not increase the Project's travel demand and associated conflicts between auto traffic and bicycles such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant bicycle impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional bicycle or vehicle trips generated because the total bicycle trips generated are based on land use factors, such as the amount of residential units, retail or office space, etc., not total parking or the location of parking. Further, the reduction in on-street parking supply may actually reduce the potential conflicts between bicycles and vehicles maneuvering into and out of on-street parking spaces, and from drivers opening their doors into bicycles on adjacent streets; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant bicycle impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The phased approach would include the full two-way cycletrack on the south side of Harney Way for the extent of the project's responsibility for improvements to Harney Way, between Arelious Walker Drive and Thomas Mellon Drive, as part of the very first phase. Therefore, the phasing will have no effect to bicycle conditions compared to what was described in the EIR and prior addenda.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: Neither the originally proposed configuration nor the revised configuration proposed dedicated bicycle facilities on Gilman Avenue. Both proposals continue to designate Gilman Avenue as a Class III facility. The provision of a single lane in each direction compared to two, as originally planned, may actually serve to calm traffic and reduce conflicts between cars and bicycles. Further, the revised cross-section actually widens the outside lane (that would accommodate the majority of bicyclists) from 11-feet to 12-feet, allowing more room for autos and bicycles. Therefore, since the revisions do not propose changes to the designation of bicycle routes nor to any physical infrastructure dedicated for bicycles, nor do they increase the potential for conflicts between bicycles and vehicles, the proposed changes will not result in any new significant bicycle impacts compared to those identified in the EIR. See Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15) for additional details. The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to bicycle circulation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-33 and TR-34: Pedestrian Circulation

The EIR described impacts to pedestrian circulation in Impacts TR-33 and TR-34. The EIR concluded that TR-33 would result in a beneficial impact or no impact because the Project would construct pedestrian facilities to serve the additional demand. TR-34 was identified as less than significant because the Project traffic would not substantially affect pedestrian circulation in the area.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The amount of office space converted to neighborhood retail was based on generating the same or fewer peak hour trips. As such, the conversion would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project. Therefore, the Project revision would not influence the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional pedestrian trips generated, but may change the pedestrian path of travel, as more pedestrians would travel between their destinations and the parking structure constructed as part of the candlestick retail center (Sub-Phase CP-02). However, the parking structure will be designed to meet existing design standards, which include provisions for pedestrian paths of travel. The final designs will be reviewed by the City as part of the issuance of construction permits to ensure that design standards are met; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would widen the sidewalk from 8 to 12 feet between Arelious Walker and Executive Park Boulevard East. However, the sidewalk between Executive Park Boulevard and Thomas Mellon Drive would not be widened until the construction of the BRT lanes, prior to the operation of the BRT route. In the interim, the existing 8' sidewalk would remain along this section. Though the widening of a portion of the northern sidewalk would not occur for several years after opening of the Candlestick Point retail center, the retail center is not expected to generate a substantial number of new pedestrian trips along Harney Way and the existing facilities are expected to be adequate in the interim period. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised cross-section would keep the existing sidewalk width, instead of decreasing as originally proposed. The revised Project will result in improved pedestrian conditions compared to the originally proposed EIR cross-section which decreased the sidewalk widths by 3'. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to pedestrian circulation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-35 and TR-36: Parking

The EIR identified Impacts TR-35 and TR-36, which determined that the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces compared to its projected demand. Table III.D-21 of the FEIR shows that total parking demand in the Candlestick Hunters Point Shipyard Project site is approximately 21,200 parking spaces and the maximum parking supply is approximately 18,900 parking spaces, a shortfall of approximately 2,300 spaces. Although the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces and would remove some existing on-street parking spaces, the Project's impacts to parking conditions would be less than significant. Exhibit G (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16) details the current total parking proposed in CP Center and Figure III.D-12 of the FEIR shows the total parking supply in the Project Site. Total demand is expected to remain approximately the same, as described in Table III.D-20 of the FEIR.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of some office space to neighborhood retail would decrease the office parking supply and increase the retail supply in CP Center, as shown in Exhibit G. (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16.) The conversion would decrease the total office and local retail parking supply; however the revised Project's parking supply would remain within the range of parking spaces identified in the EIR (See Figure III.D-12 in the FEIR.)

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street to off-street parking does not affect the overall site total because parking would be relocated on-site; thus would not change the total supply Additionally, the EIR provided a range of parking provided within the Project site, and the total supply with the proposed relocation falls within the range. Therefore, the relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional significant parking impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would not impact parking because there is no on-street parking on Harney Way under existing conditions and none of the proposed configurations for Harney Way would provide parking. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on parking.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The proposed changes will not affect parking supply or demand within the proposed project nor along Gilman Avenue because the revised cross-section continues to provide on-street parking. See Figure 1, Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15). Therefore, the changes do not result in any new significant impacts to parking conditions.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts associated with parking supply and demand beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact TR-37: Loading

The EIR identified Impact TR-37 and determined that the Project would provide adequate loading supply and therefore concluded that impacts related to loading would be less than significant, and that no mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the EIR states that if the loading demand

is not met on site and could not be accommodated within on-street loading zones, trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets while loading and unloading goods, which would result in disruptions and impacts to traffic and transit operations, as well as bicycles and pedestrians. However, because any effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not result in a significant impact.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail / Relocation of On-Street Parking:</u> Both the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail and the relocation of on-street parking will have small effects on loading. However, an analysis of loading demand shows that these effects will be less than significant because the change in daily and peak hour truck loading demand would be minimal and will likely be met on-site. Table 2 in Exhibit R (Fehr & Peers Loading Letter, 2/18/16), shows that the daily truck trip generation would decrease by 32 truck trips and increase the peak hour loading space demand by 2 spaces compared to the Project Proposal. The slight increase will likely be accommodated by off-street loading spaces on-site; however, if the loading demand is not met on-site and could not be accommodate by on-street loading zones, the additional trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets. As stated in the EIR, because the effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not be significant. Therefore, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: There are currently no loading facilities on Harney Way, and none of the proposals would add loading. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on loading in the area.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised cross-section does not change the overall loading supply or demand. Thus, implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation associated with loading beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-38 through TR-50: Stadium Impacts

The revised Project does not include construction of a new stadium. Furthermore, the existing stadium at Candlestick Point has already been demolished and the 49ers games are played elsewhere. Game day impacts for the revised Project are not applicable.

Impact TR-51 through TR-55: Arena/Performance Venue Impacts

The EIR included summarized impacts related to the operation of an Arena/Performance Venue in TR-51 through TR-55. The EIR identified that with mitigation measures, TR-51 (related to traffic) and TR-52 (related to transit) would remain significant and unavoidable. TR-53 through TR-55, which

summarized bicycle, pedestrian, and parking impacts, respectively, related to the operation of the Arena/Performance Venue were considered less than significant.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would not affect the operation of the proposed Arena nor would the conversion generate additional trips to impact arena traffic operations (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the revised Project does not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking would not affect the operation of the Arena because the relocation of on-street parking would not change the total parking provided on-site. Therefore, the revised Project does not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena/Performance Venue.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way phasing plan would continue to provide two lanes of travel in both directions at all times, until monitoring requires construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by MM TR-16. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all time, thereby will not result in additional impacts to Arena/Performance Venue operations.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The Gilman Avenue revised crosssection would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional significant impacts associated with the Arena/Performance Venue. As indicated in the detailed analysis, the revised cross-section would result in similar or better intersection delay and travel times.

The revised Project would reduce the capacity of the event space (Arena); therefore, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation associated with the event space and will likely lessen the severity of significant impacts identified in the EIR. (See Exhibit B Modifications discussed below for additional details.)

Impact TR-56: Air Traffic Impacts

The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air traffic. The revised Project would contain the same overall land uses and general development form and would not change the EIR's conclusion regarding air traffic. The revised Project would not create any new significant impacts with respect to air traffic and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Impact TR-57: Hazards due to Design Features

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would be designed in accordance with City standards, and would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction. As a result the Project's impacts to hazards would be less than significant. The revised Project would be

designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to design features have been identified.

Impact TR-58: Emergency Access

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would adequately facilitate emergency access and be designed to City standards, which include provisions that address emergency vehicles.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The office to retail conversion would not affect the transportation infrastructure such that it would impact emergency vehicle access. Additionally, the revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking would not affect the transportation infrastructure such that it would impact emergency vehicle access. In fact, fewer on-street parking spaces may actually reduce the "friction" between emergency vehicles and vehicles maneuvering into and out of parking spaces on-street. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would maintain the same number of traffic lanes as proposed in the EIR. Therefore, there would be no additional significant impact to emergency vehicle access with the proposed phasing.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> The revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. As indicated in the detailed analysis (Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised cross-section would result in similar or better intersection delay and travel times. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

The revised Project would not change the overall Project's transportation infrastructure. Additionally, the revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

Exhibit B Modifications Discussed in Transportation and Circulation Section

As noted in Section 3.3, Proposed Project Modifications Analyzed in Addendum, minor modifications that are not discussed in detail in this Addendum are also proposed and set out in Exhibit B. Planning and OCII have determined that these minor modifications either do not result in physical changes or result in such minor physical changes that they will not have different environmental effects from the effects analyzed in the FEIR. However, as explained in Section 3.3 Proposed Minor Modifications of Project Documents Not Analyzed in Detail in Addendum, a few of the minor

modifications could affect transportation or circulation impacts and those are discussed in this subsection. These include the proposed garage entry and curb cut modifications, the reduction in performance venue seats as a result of the Film Arts Center proposal for the site at Harney Way and Ingerson, and change in internal circulation at the CP Center.

<u>Parking Garage Entry and Curb Cut Widths:</u> The revised curb-cut widths would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional impacts related to trip generation. The increased curb-width would extend the pedestrian crossing length; however, the garage entries will be designed to meet existing design standards and will comply with City regulations, which include adequate pedestrian treatments to facilitate pedestrian crossings with driveway ingress and egress. The final designs will be reviewed by the City as part of the issuance of construction permits to ensure that design standards are met; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant impacts.

<u>Arena/ Performance Venue Conversion</u>: The Arena/ Performance Venue Conversion, including the Film Arts Center proposed at one performance venue location would not result in a substantial change in the Project's travel demand without an Arena Event as described in the EIR and would substantially decrease the number of PM peak hour trips with an Arena Event, as shown in Table 2 of Exhibit M (Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Memo, 12/21/15.) With the Film Arts Center and a Performance Venue event (at the second location in CP Center for Performance Venue space), the revised Project would generate 678 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. The Film Arts Center trip distribution and mode split is likely to behave similarly to retail uses and the second Performance Venue is likely to behave similarly to the originally assumed Arena; therefore, the mode splits and geographic distribution originally forecasted in the EIR are applicable.

The proposed land use revisions would likely result in localized changes to traffic volumes, because the change in traffic generation is relatively small compared to the project, and the relatively small increases would disperse relatively quickly farther away from the project. Thus, the revised Project will not create any new significant impacts compared to those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially worsen the severity of those significant impacts that were identified in the EIR. Therefore, the results and conclusions from the EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project. A detailed study, included in Exhibit M, sets out these conclusions in detail. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable, as previously identified, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

CP Center Internal Circulation Changes: Internal circulation related to vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian travel to CP Center, such as garage driveway locations and circulation with CP Center, was not evaluated in detail in the EIR; however, the proposed designs are not inconsistent with FEIR assumptions and will be designed in accordance with applicable design standards. Although some driveways and curb cuts will be wider under the proposed D4D amendments, these wider widths will allow adequate access to certain garages for large loading vehicles and accommodate the large volume of vehicles anticipated at the CP Center garage. The enhancement of adequate access to the garages would reduce back-ups on local streets and double-parking by service and delivery vehicles. These benefits will reduce pedestrian and bike conflicts and enhance vehicle circulation

functioning. Additionally, appropriate design features to ensure pedestrian and bike safety (such as pavement treatments, signage, car alert signals, staffing at garage entrances) will be required by the D4D during detailed design review. Internal circulation modifications such as removing certain street extensions into CP Center will enhance pedestrian and bike access by reducing the potential for conflicts with vehicle traffic. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not adversely affect circulation assumptions or impacts identified in the FEIR.

4.4 Aesthetics

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impact: (1) AE-1, less-thansignificant construction impacts on a scenic vista or scenic resource; (2) AE-2, less-than-significant construction impacts on visual character or quality with implementation of mitigation; (3) AE-3, construction impacts on light or glare that could obstruct day or night views; (4) AE-4, less-thansignificant Project impacts on scenic vistas; (5) AE-5, less-than-significant Project impacts on scenic resources; (6) AE-6, less-than-significant Project impacts on visual character; (7) AE-7, less-thansignificant Project impacts on light and glare with implementation of mitigation; or (8) less-thansignificant cumulative impacts.

Tower Relocations

Impact AE-4: Effects on Scenic Vistas. The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on scenic vistas and acknowledged that long-range views of the site would include the Project towers. Visual simulations for the proposed tower relocations are attached as Exhibit N, Candlestick Point Tower Visual Analysis.

Tower G would move closer to open space areas south and east of Harney Way in the CPSRA, and would appear more prominent from this corner of the park. From some vantage points to the east, Tower G would be visible in front of Bayview Hill. Nonetheless, much of the Bayview Hill would still remain in view, particularly towards the northeast. The visibility of Tower G from the north would be reduced under the proposed location. From the south, the towers would appear in slightly different locations than in 2010 but would otherwise be similar in appearance. Thus, long-range views of the site would not be significantly affected by the relocation of Tower G.

Towers J & K would move marginally closer to the CPSRA, by approximately 100 feet and within the interior of a developed neighborhood. Given that the relocation would be modest, this modification would not be detectable in long-range views of the site and would not result in new or more severe impacts.

Under the proposed tower relocations, views of the site would continue to be of an urban development with towers and mid-rise buildings. Given that this visual context was established under the 2010 Project approval, the proposed tower relocations would continue to be consistent with the expectations of those viewing the development from the adjoining open space network and beyond. The new tower locations would not restrict views of the Bay and important landforms would still be visible from different vantage points without significant loss of prominence. Therefore, the tower

relocations would not result in new significant scenic view impacts or increases in the severity of significant scenic view impacts previously acknowledged in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact AE-5: Effect on Scenic Resources: Scenic resources at or near Candlestick Point include the CPSRA, Bayview Hill, Yosemite Slough, and the shoreline. In 2010, the FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on scenic resources. The FEIR analysis focused on the change in the existing character of the site - from a stadium, parking lots, degraded urban areas – to a new, well-designed urban development, including towers, with integrated public parks, improvements to the CPSRA, and shoreline improvements.

As shown on the visual simulations in Exhibit N, the overall appearance of the tower relocations would be substantially similar to the Project and the other variants considered in the FEIR. The visual context of the site and associated scenic resources would continue to be of an urban development with towers and mid-rise buildings surrounded by an enhanced network of parks along the Bay shoreline. The new tower locations would not introduce new land uses or types of structures that were not previously considered and analyzed, and would not detract from long- or mid-range views compared to the 2010 approval. Other than a more prominent view of Tower G from one corner of the CPSRA located near the Harney Way and Arelious Walker intersection, the towers would appear similar to the 2010 locations. Thus, with the tower relocation, the impact would remain less than significant and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact AE-6 Effect on Visual Character: The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The FEIR acknowledged that the towers would be visible from various vantage points. As shown in Exhibit N, pp. 13-16, Tower G would no longer be visible in the view from Mariner Village towards Candlestick Point. It would appear more prominent from the corner of CPSRA at the intersection of Harney Way and Arelious Walker open space looking north away from the water and towards the development at CP Center. As shown in the FEIR, Tower G was clearly visible from the CPSRA. The new location of tower G is closer to the CPSRA and thus appears larger and more prominent from this vantage point in CPSRA than the approved location. Although Tower G would be more prominent from this location in CPSRA and would change the view from the 2010 plan, the overall character of the view north from this corner of CPSRA would continue to be of the dense CP Center. Additionally, the visual quality of this area of the Project site would be improved over the previous massive stadium surrounded by unpaved parking lots and little or no landscaping. The State Park and Recreation Commission has acknowledged in its 2013 CPSRA General Plan that the park is located in an urban area planned for a large mixed use development. As noted above in the "Land Use and Plans" the 2013 General Plan embraces this urban setting of the park, which will be a "green front lawn" for the new development. Thus, this new location would not result in a new significant impact on the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact. No new mitigation measures would be required.

The proposed relocation of the towers would not change the analysis or conclusions in the FEIR with respect to Aesthetic impacts. The Project would continue to replace degraded urban areas, vacant

parcels, expanses of asphalt and dirt and outdated developments with a new, well-designed urban development including towers, parks. transportation facilities, and walkable mixed-use neighborhoods. The Project would continue to improve the visual quality of the site and provide new areas of open space, improvements to the CPSRA, and other amenities. Urban design guidelines would ensure high quality development and appropriate height transitions within the new development and between existing communities and new development. The towers would be required to comply with the D4D design guidelines, including bulk requirements. Proposed floor plates for the towers would not increase. Thus, with the proposed relocation of the towers, the impacts on visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would remain less than significant and no new mitigation measures will be required.

Impact AE-7 Effect of Light and Glare: The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not result in significant light and glare impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures MM AE-7a1 through MM AE-7a3. Because towers were included in the 2010 Project approvals and because the relocation would not increase the overall amount of development on the Project site, the proposed tower relocations would not introduce any new sources of light or glare in Candlestick Point, or increase the severity of approved sources of light or glare. Mitigation measures MM AE-7a1 through MM AE-7a3 would continue to apply to all development on the site, and would mitigate the potential for light and glare impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, under the proposed relocation of the towers, impacts on light and glare would remain less than significant. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Height Increases

As shown in Exhibits D and E, the increase in height for the Film Arts Center at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson from 85 feet to 120 feet, the increase in the height of the building at Harney Way and Arelious Walker from 65 feet to 80 feet, and the increase in height for the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson from 65 feet to 80 feet would be relatively minor in the context of a dense urban setting with multi-story buildings of varying heights, including several towers. These buildings would be largely internalized within the Candlestick Point project area and therefore would not result in new significant impacts to the scenic resources. These height modifications would not be noticeable in long-range views of the site, nor restrict any views of the Bay. Additionally, these buildings would be subject to mitigation measures MM AE-7a1-7a3, which would mitigate the potential for light and glare impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, these proposed height increases would not result in new significant aesthetic impacts or an increase in the severity of significant impacts identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

The conversion would slightly reduce overall development because 15,500 square feet of office use would be replaced with 6,000 square feet of retail use. This conversion would not create new significant aesthetic impacts or significantly increase the impacts identified in the FEIR. The office to retail conversion would be accommodated in areas already planned for development and considered in the FEIR aesthetic analysis. Therefore, this land use conversion would not result in new

significant aesthetic impacts or an increase in the severity of significant impacts identified in the FEIR and no new mitigation measures would be required.

<u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

The proposed parking and transportation system modifications would not result in changes in the location of the Project or add new elements requiring the construction of additional Project structures. The relocation of parking spaces may result in a potential modest increase in the size of the CP Center garage, which would be unlikely to be noticeable in the dense urban context of the overall CP Center structure's height or bulk as identified in the FEIR, or create any new sources of light and glare other than those considered in the FEIR. Thus, these proposed modifications would not create new significant aesthetic impacts or significantly increase the impacts identified in the FEIR.

Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would result in no new significant aesthetic impacts and no more severe significant aesthetic impacts than identified in the FEIR and no new mitigation measures would be required. The FEIR aesthetic cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.5 Shadows

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts : (1) SH-1a, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (2) SH-1b, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (3) SH-1b, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space.

Tower Relocation/Height Increases

Exhibit O (IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo) includes the shadow studies showing the December 21st (worst case) shadow impacts from Candlestick Point development with the proposed tower relocations and height increases. The analysis has been prepared to identify shadow impacts from the relocated towers on Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park (located outside the Project boundary) and the CPSRA, Bayview Gardens/Wedge Destination Park (BGWDP), Mini-Wedge Community Park (MWCP) and the Jamestown Hillside Community Park (JHCP) The provisions of Planning Code

³ The FEIR found that the Project under Tower Variants C and D, would have a significant and unavoidable shadow impact on Gilman Park (FEIR, Comments and Responses, p. 2445). Exhibit O shows that Towers G, J, and K would not contribute to this impact. Other shadow impacts of the towers were found to have a less than significant impact because they would not have an adverse effect on the use of open space (Impact SH-1a).

Section 295, commonly referred to Proposition K, apply only to Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park and do not apply to CPSRA, BGWDP, MWCP, and JHCP. The shadow impacts were measured at three times during the day on winter solstice (10 a.m., 12 p.m., and 3 p.m.), which is consistent with the shadow analysis in the FEIR. These times were chosen to reflect the worst-case scenario, because shadows cast on the winter solstice are the longest of any time of the year due to the low angle of the sun, and therefore represent the greatest potential impact. The shadows in the FEIR layout and the layout for the analysis in Exhibit O were generated in Google Sketchup. The topography within the model is based on a survey of lands surrounding the site at 5 foot contour intervals, and the proposed topography within the Project site at 1 foot contour intervals. The shadow studies in Exhibit O show the 2010 shadow and 2016 shadows in different colors. Neither the tower relocations nor the increased building heights add new shadows to Bayview Hill Park or Gilman Park at any of the times studied.

At 10:00 a.m., the relocated Tower G would cast a minor increase in shadow (approximately 3%) on the JHCP open space area across Arelious Walker Drive and this small area of shadow would be gone by noon. The shadow would not have an adverse impact on the use of this area, because it is a relatively narrow strip of extremely steep land between two streets which does not contain any park amenities such as benches or play areas for children and is generally not usable due to the steep grade. Thus, the additional shade would not likely affect its use. At 10:00 a.m. the relocated Tower J would result in a minor increase in shadowing on the BGWDP. These increases in shadow would be minor and would not be a significant impact under the FEIR shadow significance criteria.

At 12:00 p.m., the relocated Tower G would not shadow any park or open space. At 12:00 p.m the relocated Tower J would add two slivers of shade to the BGWDP, similar to the shadow pattern already shown in the FEIR in Figure III-F-4 and approved under the 2010 Project approvals. Furthermore, the shadow from Tower J would shift away from the proposed Bus Rapid Transit station location (improving solar access to this high-activity zone) to a less activated portion of the park east of Ingerson. Tower J would also add a small amount of shadow to the MWCP. Tower K and the midrise building along Harney Way (Block 8a) would result in an increase of shadowing to the BGWDP of approximately 15-18 feet for one block length of approximately 200 feet. These slivers of shade would be unlikely to significantly affect use of the Project's wedge parks and would not be a significant impact under the FEIR shadow significance criteria.

At 3 p.m., the relocated Tower G would not add additional shadow on any park or open space. The relocated Tower J would add a small increase in shadow on CPSRA. The additional shadow would add approximately 10,000 square feet (.02 ac) of additional shadow to the shadow already cast at this location, which would represent approximately .02% of the total CPSRA area. The Project buildings approved in 2010 would already cast modest shadow impacts on CPSRA, generally in the late afternoon and evening. This small amount of additional shadow added to a shadow pattern that would occur under the approved development would be unlikely to adversely affect use of CPSRA. The small amount of additional shadow at this time of day would not be noticeable to most park users and significant areas of the park not in shadow at this time would be available to park users. Tower J would also add a minor increase in shadow to MWCP, which, when combined with the shadows expected in 2010, would shade the entirety of MWCP at this time. MWCP is part of the Project and

thus this increase in shading is not a Project impact on the existing environment. Additionally, this small wedge park, located between Project buildings, would be substantially in shadow at this time of the year and day from other Project buildings as acknowledged in the EIR (EIR, p. III.F-10.). The EIR found that that the orientation of the narrow wedge parks with respect to the path of the sun and the close proximity to Project buildings along the parks' southwestern boundaries combine to make these wedge parks most susceptible to new shade. (EIR, p. III.F-26.) The EIR acknowledged that the heights, layouts, and orientations of the Project buildings would result in variable levels of shading throughout the day on Project neighborhood parks, but public use of the proposed parks would not be adversely affected by these shade conditions. (EIR, p. III.F-26.) The new shadow would be consistent with the type of shadow impacts expected in the new highly urban development Project and would not result in a new significant shadow impact.

The shadow analyses prepared for the relocated towers and building height increase show that these proposed Project modifications would not result in a new significant impact or an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact. No new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR shadow cumulative impact conclusions would remain the same.

Conversion of /Office Use to Retail Use

The office to retail conversion would not create any new or more severe significant shadow impacts because this modification adjusts square footage but does not involve a change in building location or a height increase. This modification would reduce the overall amount of development and thus would not result in new or more severe shadow impacts.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The relocation of parking spaces would not result in new shadow impacts because these spaces will be relocated to the approved CP Center garage and would not involve a height increase for that structure. The transportation system modifications would not create new or more severe significant shadow impacts because these modifications propose horizontal construction and do not involve the construction of tall structures.

Therefore, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to shadow impacts. Additionally, the modifications would not affect the FEIR shadow cumulative impact conclusions and this impact would continue to be less than significant.

4.6 Wind

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) W-1a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measure W-1a, as implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, with mitigation, would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (2) W-1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation

measures, as implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (3) W-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; and (4) less than significant cumulative wind impacts.

Tower Relocations

Under the proposed tower relocations development would continue to occur on areas of the Project site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The FEIR wind analysis assumed multiple towers at Candlestick Point. Implementation of mitigation measure W-1a, designed to address wind impacts and adopted as part of the 2010 Project approvals, would be unchanged by the tower relocations. Mitigation MM W-1a requires a wind analysis to be undertaken at schematic design stage for high-rise buildings with a maximum height over 100 feet. The wind analysis will assess the potential impacts of the building and make design recommendations to minimize those impacts. Therefore, the proposed tower relocations would not result in in a new significant wind impact or a substantial increase in a previously identified significant wind impact. The wind impacts associated with the towers would remain less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Height Increases

The proposed height increase for the buildings at the western corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue and along Harney Way and Ingerson within and adjacent to the CP Center would be limited to 80 feet. The proposed height increase for the performance venue/film arts center location at the corner of West Harney Way and Ingerson would be up to 120 feet. Buildings approximately 100 feet in height or higher have the potential to create wind impacts. The proposed Project modifications would allow the height of one building – the performance venue at CP Center – to exceed 100 feet in height. The other proposed height increases would be below 100 feet. The FEIR assumed that some Project buildings would exceed 100 feet in height and mitigation measure W-1a was adopted as part of the Project approvals to address wind impacts from these buildings. This mitigation measure would be implemented during the design review process for individual buildings and would ensure that potential adverse wind impacts would be mitigated. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to wind and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

This proposed Project modification involves an adjustment to the allocation of square footage for certain Project land uses, would not require the construction of additional structures, and would not change the height of Project buildings. Thus, this proposed modification would not result in new or increased wind impacts.
<u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

The proposed Harney Way and Gilman Avenue modifications primarily involve horizontal construction and would not include construction of tall structures that could result in wind impacts. Consequently, these transportation system modifications would not change the Project's effects related to wind. The proposed relocation of on-street spaces to the CP Center garage would not increase the height of the garage which is subject to a 65-foot height limit and thus would not create significant wind impacts.

All development in the Project must comply with the wind mitigation measures, which have been designed by the City to ensure no significant wind impacts will result from tall buildings. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to wind impacts. Additionally, the FEIR wind cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.7 Air Quality

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) AQ-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emission of criteria pollutants; (2) AQ-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emissions of diesel particulate matter; (3) AQ-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emissions of toxic air contaminants; (4) AQ-4, significant and unavoidable impacts from mass emissions of criteria pollutants during project operations; (5) AQ-5, less than significant impact from carbon monoxide emissions due to motor vehicle trips during project operation; (6) AQ-6, less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures from emissions of toxic air contaminants due to operation of research and development uses; (7) AQ-7, less than significant impact from vehicle emissions of PM_{2.5} during project operation; (8) AQ-8, less than significant impacts from odors during project operations; (9) AQ-9 less than significant related to conformity with regional air quality plan objectives; and (10) less than significant cumulative impacts, except for the project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts from emissions of toxic air contaminants and PM_{2.5}.

Ramboll Environ reviewed the prosed Project modifications for consistency with the FEIR air quality findings and the discussion below reflects their analysis and conclusions. (See, Exhibit P, 1/22/16 Ramboll Environ letter.)

Tower Relocations

Although the three towers would be relocated, the proposed relocations would not result in any change in the overall location of the Project or the amount of development evaluated in the FEIR. Because the tower relocation would not change the overall land use square footage of the Project, this modification would not alter the analysis of criteria air pollutant emissions (CAP) in the FEIR. This modification would have a negligible effect on the FEIR health risk assessment (HRA) performed for construction emissions because the towers would be relocated within the same sub-phases as analyzed in the FEIR. The HRA analysis in the FEIR assumed construction emission would be

distributed throughout the sub-phase, thus relocation of towers within the respective sub-phases would not change the analysis.

Height Increases

The proposed height increases would change the massing of the affected buildings, but would not change the floor area or the overall land use square footage of the Project. Although certain Project modifications such as the height increases may slightly increase construction activity, other modifications may slightly decrease construction activities. In any event, the overall amount of development and number of residential units at CP would be consistent with that analyzed in the FEIR such that no significant increase in construction activities would be expected from the Project modifications. Consequently, this modification would not alter the analysis of CAP in the FEIR, because the models used in the FEIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage. This modification would have a negligible effect on the FEIR health risk assessment (HRA) performed for construction emissions, because total construction emissions would be unchanged from the FEIR assumptions.

Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

This analysis evaluates the proposed conversion of office floor space to local-serving retail floor space. The analysis is structured to determine the necessary reduction in the amount of office square footage that would be required to allow a 6,000-square-foot increase in neighborhood retail without increasing any of the Project criteria air pollutant (CAP) evaluated in the FEIR.

To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail without increasing the total Project operational criteria pollutant emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated 2030 criteria pollutant emissions associated with the proposed 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail using California Emission Estimator Model version 2013.2.2 (CalEEMod®).⁴ The proposed neighborhood retail is modeled as "Strip Mall", which is consistent with the land use category used for the local-serving (neighborhood) retail in the FEIR. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air Resources Board (ARB)'s EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default that was based on EMFAC2011. EMFAC2014 incorporates new vehicle emissions standards and rules and regulations (e.g., Advanced Clean Cars and Truck & Bus Rule).

The Project criteria pollutant emissions presented in the FEIR were modeled using URBEMIS 2007 version 9.2.4 for year 2030.⁵ The minimum square footage of the approved office floor space entitlement that would be converted and its associated CAP emissions were scaled from the previous calculation presented in Appendix H1 of the FEIR by matching the worst case pollutant (i.e., NOx) of

⁴ CalEEMod® is a statewide program designed to calculate both criteria and GHG emissions from development projects in California. It was developed in collaboration with California air districts led by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and is currently supported by several lead agencies for use in quantifying the emissions associated with development projects undergoing environmental review.

⁵ URBEMIS was the land use emissions inventory model recommended used for the EIR. It was widely used before the development of CalEEMod®.

the local-serving retail emissions discussed above. The emission comparison is summarized in Exhibit P, Table 1. As presented in Table 1, adding 6,000 square feet neighborhood retail development to the Project without increasing the emissions of any criteria pollutant previously estimated in the FEIR would require a removal of at least 10,300 square feet of office. The proposed Project modification would remove 15, 500 square feet of office space.

The proposed neighborhood retail development is designed to offer the community retail services (e.g., dry clean, barbershop, grocery and other businesses) within walking distance. The mobile source emissions in this analysis were evaluated using CalEEMod® default trip rates based on ITE Trip Generation, which does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the transit-oriented nature of the development plan. (See Exhibit P, Table 1.) Therefore, the estimated emissions for the proposed neighborhood retail uses are conservative. If a detailed site specific trip generation rate were available, it would be likely that less office space would need to be replaced due to lower emissions from mobile sources.

The construction emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated based on the Project construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed neighborhood retail would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the operational criteria pollutant comparison discussed above, the equivalent neighborhood retail would be smaller in size than the office space to be removed. Therefore, converting office into local-serving retail would not generate increased criteria pollutant emissions, cancer risks, noncancer chronic hazard index (HI), or acute HI associated with the construction activities presented in the EIR.

Relocation of On-street Parking Spaces to CP Center Garage

The proposed relocation of certain on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garages is expected to have a negligible effect on construction activity, because the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage will not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. Consequently, there would be no change in the overall CAP emissions from that evaluated in the FEIR. This proposed modification would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions would not increase from the estimates in the FEIR.

Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

The proposed modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This proposed modification would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would spread the same amount of work over a longer time. Because this proposed modification only divides the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there is no change in the overall CAP emissions. This proposed modification would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions would not increase from the estimates in the FEIR.

Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

This modification will result in less construction. The original cross-section proposed to widen Gilman Avenue to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle. The curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. This revision reflects a reduction in construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway), thus the construction activity would be reduced from the FEIR assumptions. As such, there would be no increase in overall CAP and GHG emissions. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are reduced from the FEIR assumptions.

Consequently, the Project modifications would not affect air quality-related impact analyses. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to air quality impacts. All Project impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR air quality cumulative impact conclusions would be unchanged.

4.8 Noise and Vibration

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts:

(1) NO-1a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at Candlestick Point on increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction), they would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (2) NO-1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at HPS Phase II on increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would be temporary, they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (3) NO-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction activities associated with the Project on increased noise levels for both offsite and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction); they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (4) NO-2a, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at Candlestick Point by creating excessive ground-borne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels. Although the Project's construction vibration impacts would be temporary, would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction activities that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code, vibration levels would still be significant; (5) NO-2b, significant and

unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from rock removal activities in the Alice Griffith and Jamestown districts resulting in vibration levels that exceed the FTA threshold of 80 VdB or could cause damage to structures from vibration caused by the fracturing of bedrock for excavation; (6) NO-2c, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction at HPS Phase II that would create excessive ground-borne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels is complete; (7) NO-2, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities associated with the Project that would create excessive ground-borne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels is complete; (8) NO-3, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities associated with the Project that would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels; (9) NO-4, less than significant impacts with implementation of the Project, including the use of mechanical equipment or the delivery of goods, on exposure to noise-sensitive land uses on or off site to noise levels that exceed the standards established by the City; (10) NO-5, less than significant impacts from the Project regarding the generation or exposure of persons on or off site to excessive ground-borne vibration; (11) NO-6, significant and unavoidable impacts with operation of the Project as it would generate increased local traffic volumes that could cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in existing residential areas along the major Project site access routes; (12) NO-7, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on noise during football games and concerts at the proposed stadium resulting in temporary increases in ambient noise levels that could adversely affect surrounding residents for the duration of a game or concert; (13) NO-8, less than significant impacts from Project exposure of residents and visitors to excessive noise levels from flights from San Francisco International Airport such that the noise would be disruptive or cause annoyance; and (14) less than significant cumulative noise and vibration impacts.

Tower Relocations/Height Increases/Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

These proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the overall nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The proposed height increases might result in a slightly greater amount of construction activity, but these modest increases would not result in significant increases in noise impacts associated with the construction activities and would be within the scope of noise impacts expected for the overall Project. While the location of the three towers would change, the number of towers would remain the same and the towers would be located within the area analyzed for construction noise impacts in the FEIR. The office to retail land use conversion would reduce the overall amount of development because 6,000 square feet of retail space would be substituted for 15,500 square feet of office space. This reduction in development would offset any minor increase in construction activity related to the proposed height increase. Thus, no new noise construction impacts would be expected as a result of these proposed Project modifications.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The change in phasing of Harney Way improvements would change the construction timing of the planned improvements, but would not increase construction noise impacts assumed in the FEIR analysis. Revisions to Gilman Avenue would modify the street configuration but would not increase the scope of construction and thus construction noise impacts would not increase. The relocation of the on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage would increase the number of spaces assumed in the garage. The Project Sponsor has stated it is likely that these spaces would be accommodated through space allocation within the same garage footprint that could be assumed for the garage. Thus, the overall amount of construction noise would not be expected to significantly increase. Moreover, the reduction in the amount of office space at CP would offset the potential for other slight increases in construction impacts such as those associated with the increased heights. Consequently, no additional construction impacts would be expected.

The FEIR assumed that sensitive residential receptors in and outside the Project area would be exposed to construction-related noise and vibration impacts and operational traffic noise impacts. Under the FEIR, this was identified as significant and unavoidable, and the Project approvals included adoption of all identified feasible mitigation measures to reduce these noise- and vibration-related impacts. This impact will remain the same under the proposed Project modifications. The proposed Project modifications would result in similar sensitive residential receptor exposure to construction and operational noise and vibration impacts and would not alter these assumptions or conclusions.

Therefore, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to noise and vibration impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable with mitigation, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR noise and vibration cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.9 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) CP-1a, less than significant impacts on the significance of an historical resource during construction at Candlestick Point; (2) CP-1b, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, due to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource at HPS Phase II; (3) CP-1, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, due to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource at the combined Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II (Project); (4) CP-2a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American, Chinese fishing camp, and maritime-related archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources, with construction at HPS Phase II; (6) CP-2, less than significant impacts, with

implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources with construction at Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II combined (7) CP-3a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resources during construction at Candlestick Point; (8) CP-3b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resources during construction at HPS Phase II; (9) CP-3c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements activities, including in-water activities; (10) CP-3d, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during pile driving associated with construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements (11) CP-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during construction activities associated with the Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II Project; and (4) less than significant cumulative archaeological and paleontological impacts and significant and unavoidable cumulative historical resource impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in any changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increase would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space, which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (EIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90.) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in additional excavation or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. Consequently, there would be no changes to the Project's effects related to cultural and paleontological resources. The mitigation measures have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's cultural and paleontological resources impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or significant and unavoidable with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR cultural and paleontological resources cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant for archeological and paleontological impacts and significant and unavoidable for historical resource impacts.

4.10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) HZ-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to known contaminants during construction activities; (2) HZ-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to previously unidentified contaminants during construction; (3) HZ-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from off-site transport and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater during construction; (4) HZ-4, less than significant impacts from installation of underground utilities; (5) HZ-5, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from installation of foundation support piles; (6) HZ-6, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from soil handling, stockpiling, and transport within the project site boundaries during construction; (7) HZ-7, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from contaminated surface runoff from construction sites; (8) HZ-8, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous material releases that have not been fully remediated (9) HZ-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials in conjunction with limited remediation activities during construction of the Yosemite Slough Bridge; (10) HZ-10, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials during construction of shoreline improvements; (11) HZ-11, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials while constructing infrastructure on Navy-owned property; (12) HZ-12, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from remediation activities conducted in conjunction with development activities at HPS Phase II early transfer parcels; (13) HZ-13, less than significant impacts from exposures to hazardous materials contamination during construction of off-site roadway improvements; (14) HZ-14, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure of ecological receptors to hazardous materials from construction activities; (15) HZ-15, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to naturally occurring asbestos from construction activities; (16) HZ-16, less than significant impacts from exposure to hazardous materials in buildings and structures; (17) HZ-17, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure of workers to hazardous materials during construction; (18) HZ-18, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities with potential to generate hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile of a school; (19) HZ-19, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from release of contaminants from historic uses or fill; (20) HZ-20, less than significant impacts from routine use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction; (21) HZ-21, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from routine maintenance of properties; (22) HZ-22, less than significant impacts from routine use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials during Project operation; (23) HZ-23, less than significant impacts from exposure to hazardous materials caused by upset or accident conditions; (24) HZ-24, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from hazardous air emissions associated with R&D uses within one-quarter mile of a school; (25) HZ-25, no impacts from safety hazards from conflicts with airport land use plans; (26) HZ-26, no impact from safety hazards from proximity to private air strips; (27) HZ-27, less than significant impact from fire hazards or conflicts with emergency response and

evacuation plans; and (28) less than significant cumulative impacts from hazards and hazardous materials.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space, which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation and operational activities would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (EIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in additional excavation or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. Additionally, none of these modifications would involve new or increased use of hazardous materials. Consequently, there would be no changes to the Project's effects related to hazards and hazardous materials. The mitigation measures have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's hazards and hazardous materials impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR hazards or hazardous materials cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.11 Geology and Soils

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) GE-1, 1a, 1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures from construction on soil erosion; (2) GE-2, 2a, 2b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on settlement from dewatering activities; (3) GE-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on destabilization of bedrock from rock removal activities; (4) GE-4, 4a, 4b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced groundshaking; (5) GE-5, 5a, 5b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced ground failure; (6) GE-6, 6a, 6b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced landslides; (7) GE-7, 7a, 7b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to shoreline instability; (8) GE-8, 8a, 8b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to landslides; (9) GE-9, 9a, 9b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to

damage from settlement; (10) GE-10, 10a, 10b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to expansive soils; (11) GE-11, 11a, 11b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to corrosive soils; (12) GE-12, no impact from surface fault rupture; (13) GE-13, no impact from the use of soils incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems; (14) GE-14, no impact from the destruction of unique geologic features; and (15) less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, to cumulative geology and soils impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation and grading would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (FEIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in grading or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. (See, Exhibit Q, CP Development Co. Excavation Quantities Memo.) Consequently, there would be no changes to the Project's effects related to geology and soils. The mitigation measures and regulatory requirements summarized in the FEIR have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's geology and soils impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR geology and soils cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

4.12 Hydrology and Water Quality

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) HY-1, 1a, 1b, 1c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction regarding compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements; (2) HY-2, less than significant impacts from construction on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge; (3) HY-3, less than significant impacts from construction on erosion and siltation; (4) HY-4, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on flooding; (5) HY-5, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on storm sewer system capacity; (6) HY-6, 6a, 6b, 6c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on storm sewer system capacity; (6) HY-6, 6a, 6b, 6c, less than significant impacts of the Yosemite Slough Bridge, from project operations regarding compliance with water quality standards

and waste discharge requirements; (7) HY-7, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on water quality; (8) HY-8, no impact from project operations on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge; (9) HY-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on erosion or siltation effects; (10) HY-10, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on flooding from surface runoff; (11) HY-11, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on storm sewer system capacity; (12) HY-12, 12a, 12b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, related to placing housing in a flood hazard area; (13) HY-13, 13a, 13b, 13c, less than significant impacts at Candlestick and the Yosemite Slough Bridge and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, at HPS Phase II related to placing structures within a flood hazard zone; (14) HY-14, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, regarding other flood risks; (15) HY-15, less than significant impacts related to seiche, tsunami, and mudflows; (16) less than significant cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project. the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space which would reduce the overall construction. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The Project modifications would not involve significant additional grading, construction, other land alteration impacts, or new operational activities that were not anticipated in the FEIR, because these modifications involve relocation of certain approved Project components, modest height increases for approved building sites, and changes in the timing and configuration of off-site roadway improvements. The FEIR assumed that excavation, construction, and operational activities would occur across the entire development area of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Additionally the FEIR mitigation measures and compliance with the regulatory requirements for water guality, runoff control, and stormwater management will continue to ensure that Project impacts are mitigated in accordance with the FEIR analysis and Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not result in new significant conclusions. impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR hydrology and water quality cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.13 Biological Resources

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) BI-1, no construction impact on regional conservation plans; (2) BI-2, less than significant impacts from construction on common species and habitat; (3) BI-3a and 3b, no construction impact on sensitive plants; (4) BI-4a, 4b, 4c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures,

from construction on waters of the United States and navigable waters; (5) BI-5a, 5b, no construction impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on eelgrass beds; (6) BI-6a, 6b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on sensitive bird species; (7) BI-7a, 7b. less than significant impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on foraging habitat for raptors; (8) BI-8a, 8b, less than significant impacts from construction on the western red bat; (9) BI-9a, 9b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on marine mammals and fish; (10) BI-10a, 10b, 10c, less than significant impacts from construction on mollusks; (11) BI-11a, 11b, 11c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on special-status fish species; (12) BI-12a, 12b, 12c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on essential fish habitat; (13) BI-13a, 13b, less than significant impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impact, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on wildlife movement; (14) BI-14a, 14b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on local plans and policies; (15) BI-15a, 15b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on contaminated soils or sediments; (16) BI-16a, 16b, less than significant impacts from project operations on sensitive birds and animals; (17) BI-17a, 17b, no impact from project operations on nesting American peregrine falcons; (18) BI-18a, 18b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II, from project operations on sensitive aquatic species, mollusks, and designated essential fish habitat; (19) BI-19a, 19b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II, from project operations on contaminated sediments; (20) BI-20a, 20b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on the movement of bird species; (21) BI-21a, 21b, less than significant, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on local plans and policies; (22) BI-22, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on specialstatus and/or legally protected species; (23) BI-23, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on sensitive habitats; (24) BI-24, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on wetlands and jurisdictional waters; (25) BI-25, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on fish or wildlife movement; (26) BI-26, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on local plans and policies; and (27) less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, to cumulative biological resource impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall location of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, or the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Even with the proposed Project modifications, development (construction and operational activities) would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. In

particular, the proposed tower relocations would shift the towers to sites previously identified for development. Thus, the new locations were fully considered in the analysis, conclusions and mitigation measures in the FEIR. The revised location for Tower G would be in a location previously occupied by the stadium. The stadium has been demolished and the site is devoid of vegetation. (See Exhibit K, p. 5.) Thus, there are no biological resources on this site. Consequently, the proposed tower relocations and other proposed Project modifications would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified biological resource impacts. Additionally the FEIR mitigation measures and compliance with the regulatory requirements designed to protect and mitigate for impacts to biological resources will continue to ensure that Project impacts are mitigated in accordance with the FEIR analysis and conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR biological resource cumulative impact conclusions would not change.

4.14 Public Services

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) PS-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on police protection; (2) PS-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on police protection; (3) PS-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on fire protection and emergency medical services; (4) PS-4, less than significant impacts from project operations on fire protection and emergency medical services; (5) PS-5, no impact from construction on schools; (6) PS-6, less than significant impacts from project operations on library services; (8) PS-8, less than significant impacts from project operations on library services; and (9) less than significant cumulative impacts, except for the project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts on police services.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although certain Project modification such as the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, other modifications may slightly reduce construction activities. In any event, the overall amount of development and number of residential units at CP would be consistent with that analyzed in the FEIR such that no significant increase in construction activities would be expected from the Project modifications. Additionally, the minor increases in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Consequently, there would be no increase in the demand for public services. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter the FEIR's findings with respect to public service impacts. Project impacts would be required. Additionally,

the FEIR public service cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant except for the Project's contribution of significant impacts on police services.

4.15 Recreation

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) RE-1, less than significant impacts as construction of the parks, recreational uses, and open space proposed by the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts beyond those analyzed and disclosed in the EIR; (2) RE-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities that would cause the substantial physical deterioration of the facilities to occur or to be accelerated, nor would it result in the need for, new or physically altered park or recreational facilities; (3) RE-3, less than significant impacts, as implementation of the Project would decrease the size of Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) but would not, overall, adversely affect the recreational opportunities offered by that park, nor would it substantially adversely affect windsurfing opportunities at the Project site; and (4) less than significant cumulative recreation impacts.

Tower Relocations

The FEIR and 2010 Project approvals included the towers proposed for relocation, thus the towers are not a new Project element. The proposed tower relocations would occur in areas planned for development and would not affect the location, amount, use, or type of park and open space approved within the Project. Additionally, the proposed tower relocations would not affect plans for the reconfiguration and improvement of the CPSRA and would not affect use of the park. The CPSRA General Plan as amended in 2013 acknowledges that the park is located in an intensely urban area surrounded by industrial and residential uses, and, formerly, the stadium. (See Exhibit L.) The State Park and Recreation Commission Resolution 1-2013 acknowledged that "the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands and other areas with a large mixed use development." (See Exhibit L.) The CPSRA General Plan describes the vision and role of the park as "an urban state park" where its "urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend." (See Exhibit L.) The Plan notes that the "proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a 'green front lawn' for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences." (See Exhibit L.) Thus, the State Park and Recreation Department, in establishing goals and objectives for the park, has recognized that the park must be designed to function with the development. As such, the new surrounding development would be compatible with

its recreational goals for the park. The tower relocations will change the location of three towers but not the overall planned development and the development and park would remain compatible.

Towers J and K would be relocated within Candlestick Point South. (Exhibit C.) These towers would move approximately 100 feet closer to the CPSRA, but this relatively modest change would not be noticeable in the context of the larger development. Intervening development with lower heights in Candlestick Point South would continue to separate the towers from the CPSRA. Thus, the modest relocation of these towers would not adversely affect use of the CPSRA.

As shown on Exhibit K, p.1, Tower G would be a minimum of 600 feet from the closest point to one corner of CPSRA in the area known as the "Last Port" which parallels Harney Way. The relocated Tower G would be approximately 1,860 feet from the area of the park known as "Wind Meadow" and 1,682 feet from the area known as the Last Rubble." (Exhibit K, p.1). Given these distances from the CPSRA, the dense urban context that would be created by the approved Project, the intervening streets (Harney Way and Arelious Walker), landscaping and other development (CP south) between this tower and the park, the relocation of Tower G would not interfere with use of CPSRA. Tower G would be part of the large, dense CP Center and would fit within the urban context approved for development adjacent to the CPSRA. Moreover, Tower G would be located on a site formerly occupied by the football stadium, which was a dominant feature near the CPSRA and visible from many areas in the CPSRA. (Exhibit K, pp.1-4.) Scenic views from the park to the water would not be affected by the relocated Tower G, which would be located behind the viewer. Thus, the proposed location of Tower G would not contribute to the deterioration or degradation of the CPSRA or reduce it recreational opportunities.

Height Increases

The proposed modifications to allow modest height increases at CP Center would not result in any changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, or the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The proposed height increases are modest and would be limited to the CP Center so that no height increases are proposed near the CPSRA. No changes to the Project's park and open space system are proposed. These proposed changes would not affect the use of the CPSRA or any of its improvements.

<u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

These proposed modifications would have not affect recreation areas and do not implicate the FEIR recreation significance criteria.

Consequently, the relocated towers would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts related to recreation. No new

mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, with the relocated towers, the FEIR recreation cumulative impact conclusions would not change.

4.16 Utilities

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) UT-1, less than significant impacts regarding the need for new or expanded water entitlements and resources; (2) UT-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding the need for construction of new or expanded water treatment or conveyance facilities; (3) UT-3, 3a, 3b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding the need for expansion of off-site wastewater conveyance facilities; (4) UT-4, less than significant impacts regarding the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board; (5) UT-5, 5a, 5b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding construction-related solid waste generation; (6) UT-6, 6a, 6b, less than significant impacts regarding disposal of construction-related hazardous waste; (7) UT-7, 7a, 7b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding operational solid waste generation; (8) UT-8, 8a, 8b, less than significant impacts regarding disposal of operational generated hazardous waste; (9) UT-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding compliance with solid waste regulations; (10) UT-10, less than significant impacts regarding dry utility infrastructure and service capacity; (11) less than significant cumulative utility impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the net reduction in office space which would reduce overall construction. Additionally, the minor increases in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Consequently, there would be either minor or no increase in the demand for utility services from construction or operational activities. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not alter the FEIR's findings with respect to utility service impacts. Project impacts would be required. Additionally, the FEIR utility cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.17 Energy

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) ME-1, less than significant impact from energy use during construction; (2) ME-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of electricity in a wasteful manner for the operation of buildings constructed under the Project; (3) ME-3, less than significant

impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of natural gas in a wasteful manner for the operation of buildings constructed under the Project; (4) ME-4 less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of energy in a wasteful manner for vehicle trips associated with the Project; and (5) less than significant cumulative impacts related to energy use during project construction and operation.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the net reduction in office space which would reduce overall construction. Additionally, any potential minor increases in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Although some of these changes may slightly increase energy use and some may slightly decrease energy use, on balance Project energy use would be substantially as estimated in the FEIR because the proposed Project modifications are not the type or scale of modifications that would substantially affect energy use. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change the FEIR's findings with respect to energy impacts. All Project energy impacts would be required. Additionally, the FEIR energy cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.18 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) GC-1, less than significant impact, as the Project would not result in a substantial contribution to global climate change by increasing GHG emissions in a manner that conflicts with the state goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020 (e.g., a substantial contribution to global climate change) or conflict with the San Francisco's Climate Action Plan by impeding implementation of the local GHG reduction goals established by the San Francisco 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance; (2) less than significant cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed Project modifications for consistency with the FEIR air quality findings and the discussion below reflects their analysis and conclusions. (See Exhibit P.)

Tower Relocations

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed tower relocations and determined that the relocation of three towers would not affect the analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the FEIR because the overall square footage of the Project would not be increased.

Height Increases

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed increase in maximum building height for three locations in CP Center and determined that this modification would not affect the analysis of GHG emissions in the FEIR because, while the massing of the buildings would increase, the overall square footage of the Project would not be increased. Because the models used in the FEIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage; there would not be a material difference in the way the emissions are estimated. Therefore, this Project revision would not change the analysis in the FEIR.

Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

Ramboll Environ evaluated whether this conversion of office use to neighborhood retail use would increase the GHG emissions findings in the FEIR. To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail without increasing the total Project operational GHG emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated the 2020 GHG emissions associated with proposed 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail using CalEEMod®. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air ARB's EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default as discussed in the Air Quality section above. In addition, the GHG emissions associated with energy incorporate the 2013 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24) and Pacific Gas and Electric's 2020 carbon intensity factor.

The Project GHG emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated for year 2020. In the analysis for this Addendum, Ramboll Environ determined the minimum square footage of the previously approved office land use that would require removal from the Project to ensure that the proposed increase in neighborhood retail would not increase Project GHG emissions. The land use GHG emissions for this analysis are calculated using the same methodology presented in F E I R Appendix S (Climate Change Technical Report). As presented in Exhibit P, Table 2, adding 6,000 square feet local-serving retail development to the Project without increasing the GHG emissions previously estimated in the FEIR would require a removal of at least 9,200 square feet of previously approved office land use. The CalEEMod® default trip rates does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the nature of the development plan. Therefore, the estimated GHG emissions for the proposed local-serving retail are conservative. Since the office use would be reduced by 15,500 square feet, no increase in GHG emissions above the emissions estimated in the FEIR would occur with this modification.

The construction emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated based on the Project specific construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed neighborhood retail would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the GHG emission comparison discussed above, the equivalent local-serving retail would be smaller in size than the office space proposed for removal/conversion. Therefore, converting office space to neighborhood-retail space would not generate increased GHG emissions associated with the construction activities analysis presented in the EIR.

Relocation of On-Street Parking Spaces to CP Center Garage

The proposed relocation of certain on-street parking to the CP Center garage is expected to have negligible effect on construction activity, because the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage either would not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. Consequently, there would be no change in the overall GHG emissions from that evaluated in the EIR.

Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

This proposed modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This proposed modification would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would spread the same amount of work spread over a longer time. Because this proposed modification only divides the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there would be no change to the GHG emissions.

Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The original cross-section proposed to widen the Gilman to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle – the curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. This modification reflects a reduction in construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway) that was analyzed in the FEIR. Consequently, there would be no increase in the overall GHG emissions from this proposed modification.

Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and no new mitigation measures would be required. The impacts would remain less than significant, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR greenhouse gas emissions cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

5. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, OCII concludes that the analysis and conclusions reached in the FEIR certified on June 3, 2010 remain valid, and that no supplemental environmental review is required for the proposed modifications to the Project. The modified Project would neither cause new significant impacts nor result in the substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the Project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the modified project would contribute considerably, and no new information has been put forward which shows that the modified Project would cause significant environmental impacts. Consequently, the Project changes do not require major revision of the FEIR, and the project sponsors may implement the proposed modifications without additional CEQA review,

consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21166 and California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15164. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond this Addendum.

Date of Determination:

2

0

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to state and local requirements.

Tiffany Bohee Executive Director Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Executive Summary Amendments to Design-for-Development

HEARING DATE: MARCH 3, 2016

February 25, 2016		
2015-013111CWP		
Candlestick Point		
Candlestick Point Activity Node Special Use District		
4884/024, 028-036, 039; 4886/09; 4917/001-003, 4918/ 001-008, 021-025,		
4934/002, 003; 4935/001-003; 4956/003-014; 4960/ 027; 4977/008; 4983/001;		
4984/ 001, 002; 4991/276; 5000/002-024; 5005/001-005; 5023/008, 010,		
5025/028, 011; 5027/015; 5076/008, 010, 011; 8803/001, 8804/001, 8811/001,		
8812/001		
Kofi Bonner		
Lennar Urban		
1 Sansome, Suite 3200		
San Francisco, CA 94104		
Mat Snyder – (415) 575-6891		
Mathew.snyder@sfgov.org		

Recommendation: Approval

APPROVAL BEING SOUGHT

The Project Sponsor proposes to amend the Design for Development for the Candlestick Point portion of the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Project (Project). The Planning Commission is required to approve all amendments to the Design for Development per both the Commission's initial action approving the D4D (Planning Commission Motion No. 18104) and per the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan (Section 4.3).

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Full Project

The full Candlestick Point / Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Plan ("CP HPS II Plan") is to completely redevelop Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard from the underutilized sites that they are currently into a series of mixed-use, high-density, and amenity-rich neighborhoods. While Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard were planned together, they have separate schedules for implementation. The CP HPS II Plan is within two active Redevelopment Project Areas and is therefore implemented by the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII") and not by the Planning Department. The table below compares the land use program between the 2010 approval and the current proposal:

Table 1: Candlestick Point Land Use - Approved vs. Proposed					
Candlestick Point Land Use	2010 Approved	2016 Proposed			
Housing Units	6,225 units	No change			
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 sf	131,000 sf (125,000 SF + 6,000 SF converted from 15,500 sf office)			
Community Facilities	50,000 sf	50,000 sf (Inclusive of floor space for a Fire Station, Safety Hub, International African Market Place, and CPSRA Welcome Center)			
Office	150,000 sf	134,500 sf (Reduction of 15,500 sf due to conversion to 6,000 SF retail)			
Performance Venue/Arena	10,000 seats 75,000 sf	1,200 Seats 42,000 sf Film Arts Center 4,400 Seats 33,000 sf Performance Venue			
Hotel	220 Rooms 150,000 sf	No Change			

Design-for-Development

The Candlestick Point Design-for-Development ("D4D") acts as the Planning Code for the Candlestick Point project. While the CP HPS II Project is generally implemented by OCII, amendments to the D4D require approval by the Planning Commission ("Commission").

The D4D provides development controls that will create a mixed-use, mid-to-high density urban environment characterized by well-proportioned urban streets and parks and aligning buildings. For the entire master development, the D4D provides controls for street and block layout; building height, bulk and massing; setbacks and street activation; open space, building type, modulation, parking, loading, and signage among other topics. The D4D generally restricts buildings to low-rise (up to 65 feet) and mid-rise (up to 85-feet), but allows for up to 12 towers (buildings above 105-feet tall) at specific locations. Further height restrictions are provided for specific contexts, such as where buildings align the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area ("CPSRA"), narrow alleys, and existing neighborhoods.

The D4D originally included controls for three possible build-out scenarios (Project variants) with a focus on the scenario that included the construction of a stadium at Hunters Point Shipyard. The D4D includes specific provisions for five neighborhoods, "Alice Griffith", "Candlestick North", "Candlestick South", "Candlestick Center" and "Jamestown". Of the five neighborhoods, four are being developed under the

DDA by Lennar Urban. The fifth neighborhood, "Jamestown", would be developed separately. It should be noted that the D4D does not provide specific controls for actual land use; land use controls are provided in the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and other implementing documents.

Proposed Project Amendments

The Project Sponsor is now proposing to amend the Project, which will require amending several implementing documents, including the D4D. The Project Sponsor describes the proposed Project changes in three tiers of amendments. Tier One includes substantive changes; Tier Two includes refinements and clarifications to the implementing documents; Tier Three includes editorial changes to the D4D that reflect the elimination of the stadium from the proposal and moving provisions for the Jamestown neighborhood to a stand-alone chapter, among other topics. Attached to the Draft Motion as Exhibits A and B are detailed lists of proposed Project changes and how the changes will need to be reflected in the different implementing documents. Of these changes to the proposed documents, the D4D needs Planning Commission approval. Below is a summarized list of Project changes are also listed separately for informational purposes.

Tier One changes (denoted in the attached D4D with yellow highlights) to the D4D include:

- Relocation of three of the twelve tower locations;
- Height increases from 85 to 120 feet for the "landmark" building (proposed Film Arts Center) at the Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue;
- Height increases for buildings along Harney Way between Arelious Walker Drive and Ingerson Avenue, and along Ingerson Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet; and
- Relocation of 269 parking spaces originally proposed for the street to the parking garage.

Tier One changes to the Project that do not require changes to the D4D include:

- Inclusion of an additional 6,000 square feet of local serving retail and the elimination of 15,500 square feet of office;
- Revision of Harney Way off-site phasing; and
- Revision of the design of the off-site portion of Gilman Avenue, maintaining current sidewalk widths and eliminating a travel lane, among other aspects.

Tier Two changes (denoted in the attached D4D with blue highlights) to the D4D include:

- Additional signage provisions;
- Clarifications on height limits for building podiums;
- Greater ground floor height requirements (from 12 to 15 feet) for non-residential uses;
- Relocation and change in requirements for garage entries and curb cut widths;
- Reconfiguration of CP Center internal circulation and access;
- New guidelines and standards for the newly proposed pedestrian and vehicular entry plaza to CP Center off of Arelious Walker Drive;
- Refinement to blank façade provisions recognizing situations where floor plates are below grade;
- Removal of parking space dimension requirements;

- Addition of parking ratio maximums for grocery stores and cinemas consistent with the Planning Code;
- Provisions that recognize the newly proposed hotel location at Harney Way and Arelious Walker;
- New requirements for minimum width of pedestrian paths within the mid-block breaks;
- Additional guidelines that encourage outdoor seating at key locations within the Alice Griffith neighborhoods;
- Adjustment of required setbacks at Alice Griffith from 10 feet to 9 feet for properties fronting Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue, and G Street;
- Adjustment of boundary and block depth for blocks facing Harney Way on the south side; and
- New provisions that clarify boundaries of height zones.

Tier 2 changes to the Project that do not require changes to the D4D include:

- Phasing of the construction of Wedge Park, and timing and grading for Jamestown Avenue Improvements;
- Adjustments to the streetscape plan including elimination of bulb-outs to accommodate Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and Fire requirements; and
- Inclusion of two performance venues, one at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, the "Landmark" building site; and another integrated into the hotel location at Harney Way and Arelious Walker Drive.

<u>Tier Three changes (denoted as grey highlights) to the D4D include:</u>

- Removal of all references to the stadium;
- Relocation of standards and guidelines for the Jamestown neighborhood to its own Chapter (Chapter 7);
- Clarifications throughout that provide consistent interpretations of certain standards, update graphics, images, tables, and text to reflect the latest proposal.

BACKGROUND

Previous Actions

On June 3, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency Commission Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Project ("Project") with the following actions:

- By Planning Commission Motion 18096 Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") and by Planning Commission Motion 18097 Adoption of California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA") Findings. The certification of the FEIR was confirmed by the Board of Supervisors on July 14, 2010;
- 2. Adoption of General Plan amendments, which among other elements, created a new Sub-Area Plan for Candlestick Point, and a new Area Plan for Hunters Point Shipyard;
- 3. Adoption of Planning Code amendments; (3) Zoning Map amendments;

- 4. Adoption of Redevelopment Plan amendments for both the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan and the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan;
- 5. Approval of a Cooperation Agreement between the Redevelopment Agency and the Planning Department; and
- 6. Adoption of separate Design for Development documents for Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard.

Other aspects of the project that were approved at the same time, but for which the Planning Commission was not an approving body, include the following: (1) Interagency Cooperation Agreements ("ICA") for interagency review of horizontal (infrastructure) improvements; (2) Health Code, Public Works Code, Building Code, and Subdivision Code amendments; (3) Disposition and Development Agreement ("DDA"), which included (among other documents) as attachments a Project Phasing Plan, a Transportation Plan, and an Infrastructure Plan; (4) Real Property Transfer Agreement; (5) Public Trust Exchange Agreement; (6) Park Reconfiguration Agreement; and (7) Tax Increment Allocation Pledge Agreement.

Phasing Plan

The Project Phasing Plan (an attachment to the DDA), divides the sites into Major Phases (four major phases for Candlestick) and Sub-phases within the Major Phases. In addition to including the Project Phasing Plan, the DDA also establishes a Schedule of Performance in which the Project Sponsor is required to submit applications for Major Phase and Sub-Phase approval, and deliver infrastructure and community benefits. Given the complexity of the project, the DDA also includes provisions by which the Project Phasing Plan can be amended.

Subsequent Approvals

So far, the Project Sponsor has received approvals from the OCII Commission for the first Major Phase at Candlestick Point, and the first Sub-Phase within that major phase. The major phase (identified as Major Phase I) consists of the "Candlestick Center" neighborhood, or the central retail center, and portions of the "Candlestick South" and "Candlestick North" neighborhoods, which are immediately across the street from Candlestick Center; and a portion of the Alice Griffith neighborhood. The first Sub-Phase approval included four blocks of the Alice Griffith Public Housing Replacement Project, which includes 325 affordable housing units (of which, 209 are replacement Housing Authority units), ("Sub-Phase CP-01"). Sub-Phase CP-01 was approved by OCII's Executive Director in March 2014. Its first buildings are expected to be completed by fall of 2016.

Along with the approval of the First Major Phase, the following actions were also taken: (1) amendments to the Project Phasing Plan including the schedule of transportation improvements; (2) approval of a Master Streetscape Plan, (3) approval of Master Signage Plan; and (4) issuance of an Addendum (Addendum 1) to the FEIR.

Approvals Currently Being Sought

The Project Sponsor is currently seeking approval of three additional Sub-Phases within Major Phase 1, which generally include Candlestick Center ("Sub-Phase CP-02"), the portion of Candlestick South that is immediately across Harney Way from Candlestick Center ("Sub-Phase CP-03") and the portion of Candlestick North that is immediately across Ingerson Avenue from Candlestick Center ("Sub-Phase CP-04", collectively, "Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04"). At the same time, the Project Sponsor is seeking approval for schematic design for portions of Sub-Phase CP-02. These Sub-Phases include 635,000 square feet of regional retail, 131,000 square feet of local-serving retail, 150,000 square feet of hotel space, 134,500 square feet of office use, and up to 75,000 square feet of entertainment uses. The Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04

Application also includes up to 1,565 units of housing, including 290 stand-alone affordable units and up to 129 inclusionary units.

In conjunction with these applications, the Project Sponsor is now proposing changes to the Project that would require amendments to the initial Major Phase approval, the Streetscape Master Plan, and the D4D.

SURROUNDING PROPERTIES AND NEIGHBORHOOD

The Project site is located along the City's southeastern waterfront. The site is east of Executive Park, with the Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood to the north, the Hunters Point Shipyard to the northeast, and adjacent to the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area along the Bay frontage generally to the east.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

The OCII staff, in consultation with the Planning Department, has prepared Addendum 4 to the Project EIR, which OCII staff issued on **Date**. Addendum 4 evaluates the proposed Project changes in the applications for Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04, including the D4D changes. Addendum 4 reflects the changes in the D4D and address all aspects of the proposed changes listed in Exhibits A and B of the Draft Motion.

In Addendum 4, OCII staff has determined that the proposed Project modifications will not cause new significant impacts not identified in the EIR, will not increase the severity of significant impacts identified in the EIR, and will not require new mitigation measures to reduce significant impacts. Addendum 4 among other considerations, identifies and discusses recommended modifications to two previously adopted transportation-related mitigation measures: 1) Mitigation Measures TR-16, which provides for improvements to Harney Way, and 2) TR-23.1, which provides mitigation to maintain headways for the 29-Sunset transit line. Addendum 4 concludes that the proposed modifications to the mitigation measures would not result in new or more severe impacts. Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the modifications to Mitigation Measures TR-16 and TR-23.1 as set forth in Addendum 4. Other than as described in the Addendum 4, no Project changes have occurred , and no changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the proposed Project that will cause significant environmental impacts to which the Project will contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the Project will cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond the Addendum.

HEARING NOTIFICATION

Hearing notification outside of posting of the Commission's Agenda is not required.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Staff of OCII presented the proposed Project changes to the Planning and Development Subcommittee of the Hunters Point Shipyard Citizens Advisory Committee ("CAC") on May 14, 2015 and September 10, 2015; and to the full CAC on September 14, 2015. The proposed Project changes received unanimous support.

ISSUES AND OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

Below is a discussion and analysis of the D4D Amendments.

Substantive Changes (Tier One)

Heights

The developer proposes to increase the height limits for the mixed-use buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, and the "landmark structure" which is intended to be developed as a Film Arts Center.

Mixed-use Building Heights (Item 2 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

The 2010 D4D prescribed a height limit of 65 feet for the mixed-use buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. The developer proposes to increase this height limit to 80 feet, mandate a minimum floor-to-floor height for the ground floor retail to 20 feet, and limit development to five residential stories above the ground floor retail space.

Staff believes this height increase will have the following significant benefits on the Candlestick Center neighborhood:

- An increased height limit will ensure 20 foot high retail spaces at the ground floor along Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way can be accommodated. A 65 foot height limit results in retail spaces that are only 15 feet high. Given the importance and scale of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, requiring 20 foot tall retail is appropriate.
- An increased height limit will allow for more architectural variety in the neighborhood. An 80 foot height limit gives architects the space they need to differentiate the design of the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. This architectural differentiation is more difficult to achieve under a 65 foot height limit as architects must design for a viable program within a smaller building envelope.
- An increased height limit will create a strong streetwall for Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue at Candlestick's core. An 80 foot height limit on Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue will help to create a strong statement that will anchor future development at Candlestick Point.

Landmark Structure Height (Item 3 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

The developer proposes an increase in the permitted height for an anchor landmark structure (currently proposed as a Film Arts Center) from 85 feet to 120 feet. Staff believes the increased height at this location will create a strong corner presence for the most critical intersection at Candlestick Point: Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue.

Tower Locations

The Final EIR Tower Variant 3D included specific locations within the tower zones identified in the D4D. Section 4.2.1, Table 4.1, and Figure 4.3 of the D4D provides the allowed tower locations. Modifications to three towers locations are proposed for Tower J, Tower K, and Tower G.

Tower J and Tower K (Item 1 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

Towers J and K are located within the Candlestick South neighborhood (D4D Section 5.4) They are proposed as parts of Sub-Phases CP-11 and CP-10, respectively. With the proposed Project amendments, the two towers move approximately 100 feet south-east, immediately adjacent to the approved locations. Tower K remains within the approved allowable high rise location zone. These changes result from the proposed increase in the depth of the blocks in Sub-Phase CP-04.

The approved Sub-Phase CP-04 block depths are substantially less than other blocks at Candlestick Point as they were originally expected to accommodate predominantly retail development with a service alley (the mid-block break) along the back of these blocks. The current development plan proposes townhomes lining the mid-block break and thus proposes to increase the block boundaries to accommodate the proposed land use program. This will increase the variety of housing types in Candlestick Center and increase the efficient use of land on these blocks. The increase in the depth of these blocks within SubPhase CP-04 results in an equivalent reduction in the depth of the blocks immediately behind them, thereby shifting the location of Towers J and K. Both Towers would move approximately 100 feet to the southeast from their current approved location. Tower K would continue to be located within an approved tower zone.

Tower G (Item 1 of the Tier 1 Revision List)

Tower G, as approved in 2010, was located in the middle of Candlestick Center (Sub-Phase CP-02). However, this location conflicts with the proposed new layout for CP Retail Center. The Project Sponsor has stated that the tower cannot be structurally integrated with the CP Retail Center garage as it will be constructed on a separate timeline.

The Developer worked with staff at OCII, Planning, and California State Parks to achieve a shift in the tower location that met the goals of the above mentioned agencies. The D4D now includes additional provisions to assure that care is taken to integrate the tower into the whole neighborhood. A pedestrian plaza and mews has been added to the designs to provide meaningful connectivity between the tower facing Jamestown and the internal circulation.

Other Changes of Note (Tiers 2 and 3)

In addition to the significant changes to the D4D discussed above, the following changes are proposed:

CP Retail Center Reconfiguration (Items 4, 5, 6 on the Tier 2 Revisions List)

CP Retail Center is now proposed with internal circulation that features three north-south routes through the site that connect to the adjacent street network and have limited vehicular access. The illustrative example in the original D4D featured continuation of Earl Street and 8th Street through the site and featured an east-west route that connected through to Arelious Walker Drive (Bill Walsh Street). Along with the garage structure along Arelious Walker Drive, the current proposal now features a below grade parking structure for almost the full footprint of the CP Retail Center. While vehicular ingress and egress is still concentrated along Arelious Walker Drive, a new ingress and egress is now proposed for Ingerson Avenue and an egress-only is proposed for Harney Way.

Parking (Items 10 and 11, on the Tier 2 Revisions List)

Parking provisions now allow for the addition of 269 parking spaces to the CP Retail Center parking garage that had previously been proposed in the street network. Previously, parking was proposed on the internal streets in CP Retail Center; these streets are now designed with pedestrian emphasis and limited vehicular access. ADA, stormwater, and other utility requirements has reduced the number of on-street parking that can be provided on other, neighboring streets as well. The D4D parking standards now enable these previously planned parking spaces to be provided within the parking structure. Maximum parking ratios for cinemas and grocery stores that are consistent with the Planning Code have also been added. Consistent with the Planning Code, required dimensions for parking spaces has been eliminated. Allowance for parking entries have been minimally increased from 24 feet to 27 feet where such entries would serve both vehicular ingress and egress and loading.

Staff believes that these changes to the parking standards and access still meet the spirit of the original design to emphasize pedestrian, bicycle and transit access over vehicular access and is consistent with the General Plan. Other than along Arelious Walker Drive, where an adjacent above grade parking structure has always been proposed, parking will be completely below grade and/or wrapped with active uses. While additional parking ingress and egress are now proposed, additional standards and guidelines are proposed to make sure that they do not unduly degrade pedestrian safety and comfort and that the urban

streetwall and activation at the ground level is maintained. The net results of the changes to the parking provisions do not create an amount of parking greater than what would have otherwise been permitted by the Planning Code (Planning Code Section 151.1 – Parking Maximums). The additional width for combined vehicular ingress / egress and loading is consistent with the Planning Code. Other than the CP Center parking facility, parking entries are still limited to one per development.

BASIS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- The increase in height within and surrounding CP Retail Center would allow greater flexibility for tenants, allow greater architectural variety and differentiation in the design of buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, create a strong streetwall to anchor development at Candlestick Point, and allow the developer to use modular construction.
- The increase in height for the hotel will provide amenity space, facilitate an active ground floor use, and be consistent with the height increase for the adjacent buildings.
- The increase in height for the "Landmark Building" will create a strong corner presence for the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue, and facilitate a viable space for a critical anchor tenant at this high profile intersection.
- The relocation of Towers J and K will keep the towers within the approved tower zone and be consistent with the revised block depths to accommodate the development plan for townhomes to line the mid-block break.
- The relocation of Tower G will be accompanied by additional provisions to make sure it is well integrated into the CP Center neighborhood.
- The new signage provisions will ensure a well-designed signage program that will contribute to the high quality character of the new neighborhood.
- The minor D4D changes will ensure the D4D reflects current conditions and provides consistent, clear guidance for future development.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

Attachments:

Draft Motion

Exhibit A - List of Substantive Changes

Exhibit B – List of Refinements, Clarifications, and Editorial Changes

Addendum 4 to the FEIR

Detailed Log of D4D Changes

Proposed Amended D4D

Attachment Checklist

 \mathbb{N}

Executive Summary

Project sponsor submittal

Draft Motion

Revised D4D

Environmental Determination IX

Log of Changes

Planner's Initials

KG: I:\Citywide\Community Planning\Southeast BVHP\Candlestick HP Lennar\Post Approval Review\CP D4D Revissions \ CP D4D - Ex Summary.doc

Exhibits above marked with an "X" are included in this packet



0

450-0162016-002

Addendum 4 to Environmental Impact Report

Addendum Date:	February 22, 2016
Case No.:	2007.0946E
Project Title:	Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II
EIR:	2007.0946E, certified June 3, 2010
Project Sponsor:	CP Development Co., LP
Lead Agency:	Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure
OCII Staff Contact:	Lila Hussain – (415) 749-2431
	lila.hussain@sfgov.org
City Staff Contact:	Joy Navarrete - (415) 575-9040
	joy.navarrete@sfgov.org

REMARKS

The Addendum includes the following attached Exhibits, which provide technical analyses, graphics, and other information supporting the analysis in this Addendum:

		Exhibit A: Tier 1 Project Revisions
	Edwin M. Lee	Exhibit B: Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions
	MAYOR	Exhibit C: Tower Location Analysis
	Tiffany Roboo	Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals
	EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	Exhibit E: Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visuals
		Exhibit F: Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter (12/14/15)
	Mara Rosales	Exhibit G: Fehr & Peers Candlestick Point Parking Letter (1/11/16)
	CHAIR	Exhibit H: OCII Commission Resolution No. 1-2014 (1/7/14)
	Miguel Bustos	Exhibit I: Fehr & Peers Harney Way Letter (12/9/15)
	Marily Mondejar	Exhibit J: Fehr & Peers Gilman Avenue Letter (8/13/15)
	Darshan Singh	Exhibit K: Candlestick Point Tower Analysis from CPSRA
	COMMISSIONERS	Exhibit L: Excerpts from CPSRA General Plan and California State Park and Recreation
0	One S. Van Ness Ave	Commission Approval Resolution 1-2013
1	5th Floor	Exhibit M: Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Letter (12/21/15)
	San Francisco, CA 94103	Exhibit N: Candlestick Point Tower Visual Analysis
		Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo
1	415 749 2400	Exhibit P: Ramboll Environ Air Quality and Climate Change Letter (1/22/16)
A	www.sfocii.org	Exhibit Q: CP Development Company Excavation Quantities at Candlestick Point Memo
		(1/26/16)
		Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16)

Background

On June 3, 2010, the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Redevelopment Agency Commission certified the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the Candlestick Point –

Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project (Project), San Francisco Planning Department File Number 2007.0946E and San Francisco Redevelopment Agency File Number ER06.05.07. On July 14, 2010, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors affirmed the Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR (Motion No. M10-110).

Between June 3, 2010 and August 3, 2010, the Planning Commission, Redevelopment Agency, Board of Supervisors, and other City Boards and Commissions adopted findings of fact, evaluation of mitigation measures and alternatives, a statement of overriding considerations (File No. 100572) and a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) in fulfillment of the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). These entities then adopted various resolutions, motions and ordinances related to Project approval and implementation, including but not limited to: (1) General Plan amendments; (2) Planning Code amendments; (3) Zoning Map amendments; (4) Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan amendments; (5) Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan amendments; (6) Interagency Cooperation Agreements; (7) Design for Development documents; (8) Health Code, Public Works Code, Building Code, and Subdivision Code amendments; (9) Disposition and Development Agreement, which included as attachments a Project Phasing Schedule, a Transportation Plan, and an Infrastructure Plan; (10) Real Property Transfer Agreement; (11) Public Trust Exchange Agreement; (12) Park Reconfiguration Agreement; and (13) Tax Increment Allocation Pledge Agreement.

1. Project Summary and Development Status

The Project covers approximately 702 acres along the southeastern waterfront of San Francisco: 281 acres at Candlestick Point (CP) and 421 acres at Hunters Point Shipyard (HPS Phase II). The FEIR evaluated several variants of the Project. At the time of Project approval, it was not known whether the 49ers football team would require a new stadium as part of the Project. As a result, the Project as approved authorized several different land use development scenarios:

- 1. the Project with a stadium as described in Chapter II of the FEIR with Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, Utility Variant 4, and Shared Stadium Variant 5;
- 2. the Project without the stadium, with R&D Variant 1, Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, and Utility Variant 4;
- 3. the Project without the stadium, with Housing/R&D Variant 2a, Candlestick Tower Variant 3D, and Utility Variant 4; and
- 4. Sub-alternative 4A, which provides for the preservation of four historic structures in Hunters Point Shipyard, and which could be implemented with either the stadium variants or non-stadium Variants (See Board of Supervisors CEQA Findings pp. 2-4).

Following Project approval, the 49ers relocated to the City of Santa Clara. As a result, the Project Sponsor decided to proceed with Option (3) above which provides for a mix of housing and research

and development at the stadium site (the "Housing/R&D Variant"). If either the R&D Variant or Housing/R&D Variant is implemented, it will be modified by implementation of Candlestick Tower Variant D and the Utilities Variant.

The Project is envisioned to be completed in phases, and calls for the developer to submit major phase applications covering large areas of development that address the conceptual land use proposal for that area, followed by sub-phase applications that provide more development details on specific portions of a major phase. Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR and the approvals listed above, the Project Sponsor sought approval of Major Phase 1 CP in the Candlestick Park area of the Project as well as a Master Streetscape Plan and Signage Plan. The Project Sponsor also sought changes in the previously approved Project Phasing Schedule, and the schedules for implementation of the Transportation Plan (including the Transit Operating Plan of the Infrastructure Plan), and of other public benefits. These changes were analyzed in Addendum No. 1 to the FEIR, published on December 11, 2013 (Addendum 1). The successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII") Commission, approved these Project proposals on January 7, 2014. The approved Major Phase 1 CP encompasses 16 blocks of new development in the Candlestick Park area of the project, including approximately 1,500 new homes and 1.1 million square feet of mixed commercial uses and approximately 50,000 square feet of community facilities. Major Phase 1 CP includes the entirety of the Alice Griffith replacement project and the Candlestick Point retail center destination featuring retail, housing and entertainment uses.

The Project Sponsor has now submitted an application for approval of Sub-Phases 02-03-04 of Major Phase 1 CP ("Sub Phases CP-02-03-04 Application"). The application as proposed requires modifications of the approved Project Candlestick Point Design for Development ("D4D"), and proposed transportation system changes that require modification of the Major Phase 1 CP Approval, including the Schedule of Performance, the Candlestick Point Infrastructure Plan, the Candlestick Point Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Transportation Plan, and mitigation measures TR-MM.16, TR-MM.23.1, which are included in the approved Project MMRP.

This Addendum No. 4 to the FEIR, evaluates the proposed modifications to the Project, which are described in detail below in Section 3.¹

2. Proposed Sub-Phase Application Description, Proposed Project Modifications, Approval Actions

2.1 Sub-Phases 02-03-04

¹ OCII has also prepared two other addenda to the FEIR. Addendum No. 2, published on May 2, 2014, evaluated the potential environmental impacts of the Automatic Waste Collection System described in the FEIR as part of Utility Variant 4. The Project Sponsor is no longer pursing this option. Addendum No. 3 to the FEIR published on September 19, 2014 evaluated the potential environmental impacts of a proposal to demolish Candlestick Park stadium with explosives rather than conventional/mechanical demolition (Addendum 3). This proposal was not pursued by the Project Sponsor and the stadium was demolished using conventional/mechanical means.

Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 would include approximately 1,565 residential units, approximately 635,000 square feet of regional retail at CP Center, approximately 50,000 square feet of community use, approximately 131,000 square feet of neighborhood retail, approximately 75,000 square feet of performance venue use distributed between two locations, approximately 220 hotel rooms, and approximately 134,5000 square feet of office use. A parking garage with approximately 2,700 spaces would be located below the CP Center and along Arelious Walker Drive. Necessary infrastructure, including utilities, transportation improvements, and open space improvements would be included with the development of these sub-phases. [See, Candlestick Point Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application on file at OCII, One South Van Ness, San Francisco, CA 94103, c/o Lila Hussain.]

Table 1 below summarizes the land uses approved for Candlestick Point in 2010 and the modifications proposed with the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application.

Table 1: Candlestick Point Land Use – Approved vs. Proposed					
Candlestick Point Land Use	2010 Approved	2015 Proposed			
Housing Units	6,225 units	No change			
Neighborhood Retail	125,000 sf	131,000 sf (125,000 SF + 6,000 SF converted from 15,500 sf office)			
Community Facilities	50,000 sf	50,000 sf (Inclusive of floor space for a Fire Station, Safety Hub, International African Market Place, and CPSRA Welcome Center)			
Office	150,000 sf	134,500 sf (Reduction of 15,500 sf due to conversion to 6,000 SF retail)			
Performance Venue/Arena	10,000 seats 75,000 sf	1200 Seats 42,000 sf Film Arts Center 4400 Seats 33,000 sf Performance Venue			
Hotel	220 Rooms 150,000 sf	No Change			

2.2 Proposed Project Modifications Analyzed in Detail in Addendum

The proposed modifications addressed in this Addendum in detail are described below and in Exhibit A ("Tier 1 Project Revisions"). These modifications require revisions to certain Project documents including the CP D4D, the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP), the Transportation Plan, and the Infrastructure Plan. Other modifications that are not discussed in detail in this Addendum are also proposed that require revisions to some of these same documents.

In the case of any modifications not discussed in detail in the Addendum, OCII and the Planning Department have reviewed the changes and determined that no new or more severe environmental impacts would result from the changes because either the changes result in no physical changes to the environment or the nature of any physical changes are minor. Exhibit A summarizes proposed modifications that are discussed in the Addendum; for each modification discussed, Exhibit A identifies the specific elements of the Project documents requiring revisions. Exhibit B ("Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions" and Change Logs) summarizes various modifications to Project documents including updates, refinements, clarifications, and editorial changes that are not discussed in detail in the Addendum. A brief summary of the refinements, clarifications, and editorial changes listed in Exhibit B (Tier 2 and 3 Project Revisions) is provided in the Addendum following the description of the modifications discussed in the Addendum in detail.

2.2.1: Tower Relocation: Towers G, J & K

The FEIR Tower Variant 3D included specific tower locations that corresponded with the tower zones identified in the D4D. Figure IV-16a (Vol IX, C&R-2426) in the FEIR shows the location of towers in Variant 3D. The proposed Project modifications would change the location of three towers. (See Exhibit C, Tower Location Analysis).

Tower G, located in CP Center (CP-02), would be moved west from the middle of the block to a location on Arelious Walker Drive near Jamestown Avenue. (See Exhibit C.) Tower G is proposed for relocation because of the practical difficulty of structural integration and construction timing concerns associated with co-locating the tower with the parking garage. The new location would be within CP-02 and outside the 2010 approved tower zone.

Towers J and K would be relocated in CP-04 immediately southeast of the approved locations. (See Exhibit C.) The towers are proposed for relocation because of the proposed increase in the depth of blocks in Sub-Phase CP-04. The approved block depths in CP-04 were established based on the expectation that these blocks would be developed for predominantly retail uses with a rear service alley. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application now proposes to have residential townhomes lining the mid-block break, which means that approved blocks would not have sufficient depth to accommodate these townhomes. The proposed D4D modifications would increase the block depths in CP-04 to accommodate the townhomes. In response, the depth of the blocks immediately to the southeast of CP-04 would be reduced by the same amount and this change would be reflected in the future CP-10 and CP-11 Sub-Phase applications. The reduction in the block depths in CP-10 and

CP-11 would necessitate moving Towers J and K approximately 100 feet southeast of their approved locations. Tower K would remain within a 2010 approved tower zone. Tower J was approved with a fixed location and the proposed modification would establish a new fixed location.

2.2.2: Height Increases

Height Increase within CP Center on Western Corner of Harney Way & Ingerson Avenue Intersection: The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes an increase in the maximum height at CP Center on the corner of West Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet. The proposed height increase would allow for a performance venue (accommodating a Film Arts Center) above a two-story anchor retail space. (See Exhibit D, p. 1 Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals.)

Height Increase for Development Within and Abutting CP Center. The approved height limit for the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue within and adjacent to the CP Center is 65 feet. This height allows for a 20 foot ground floor of retail with four to five floors of residential units above. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application and D4D modifications would increase the maximum height of these buildings to 80 feet, mandate a minimum floor-to-floor height of 20 feet for the ground floor retail, and restrict residential and commercial uses above the ground floor retail to a maximum of five floors. (See Exhibit D, pp. 2-3.)

Height Increase for CP Center at the Corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application and proposed D4D modifications include an increase in the height of the building located at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet. (See, Exhibit E, Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visuals.)This building would include the 220-room hotel, performance venue space, and office space. The increase in height is intended to ensure consistency in the built form along Harney Way and allow greater flexibility to design the building as an iconic entry statement to CP Center given its important location at the intersection of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The additional height would also allow for a taller floor-to-floor height at ground level, which would provide flexibility for different uses and amenities.

2.2.3: Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

The 2010 approved Project, Variant 2A assumed that Candlestick Point would include 150,000 square feet of office use and 125,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use. The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes to increase neighborhood retail use by 6,000 additional square feet, for a total of 131,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use. At the same time, the Project Sponsor proposes to forego development of 15,500 square feet of the 150,000 square feet of office use allowed under the approved Project. The remaining 134,500 square feet of office use would be included in the CP Center on the site with the hotel and performance venue space. (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter, 12/14/15.)
2.2.4: Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage

The Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application proposes changes to the number of on-street and offstreet parking spaces, which are discussed in detail in Exhibit G, Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16.

Per Exhibit G and Table 2 below, there is an overall increase of 241 parking spaces within Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04, which is comprised of an overall increase of 510 off-street parking spaces and a reduction of 269 on-street parking spaces.

Table 2: Car Parking Summary - Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04				
Туре	Location	FEIR (2010)	Sub-Phase Application (2016)	Difference (+/-)
Off-Street	CP Center Garage	2,596	2,677	+81
	Other Location	1,141	1,570	+429
	Total	3,737	4,247	+510
On-Street	CP Center Street Network	170	0	-170
	Other Location	260	161	-99
	Total	430	161	-269
Total Parking		4,167	4,408	+241

In 2010, the maximum supply of off-street parking at CP-02-03-04 was 3,737 spaces, which was based on the maximum floor space entitlements for land uses within the Sub-Phase. The maximum supply was comprised of 2,596 spaces at CP Center, and 1,141 spaces provided on other blocks by other developers. It was assumed that all off-street parking at CP Center would be located within a structured parking garage. Based on the land uses proposed in the CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application, a total of 4,246 total off-street parking spaces would be provided within Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04. This is comprised of 2,677 spaces in the CP Center parking garage and 1,570 spaces provided separately by other developers. This represents a net increase of 510 parking spaces within Sub-Phase CP 02-03-04.

In relation to on-street parking within Sub Phase CP-02-03-04, the FEIR assumed that 430 on-street car parking spaces would be constructed within the Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04 street network. It was identified that 170 of these parking spaces would be located on streets within CP Center (Earl Street, 8th Street and Bill Walsh Street), and 260 spaces located elsewhere within the CP-02-03-04 street network. With the preparation of design development and construction drawings for the street network, the CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application identifies that the maximum amount on-street parking that can be accommodated within the CP-02-03-04 street network is now 161 spaces. This represents a decrease of 269 on-street car parking spaces. The reduction in on-street parking spaces is the result of the need for the street design to provide adequate clearances for emergency vehicles and accommodate essential sidewalk amenities such as fire hydrants, transit stops, transit shelters, and ADA facilities.

The CP-02-03-04 Sub-Phase Application proposes to relocate the 269 displaced on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage. The relocation of the displaced on-street car parking spaces, combined with the land uses proposed within CP Center, will result in an overall increase of 81 parking spaces in the CP Center garage from what was identified in the FEIR. The FEIR did not specify construction details for the CP Center garage – the size of the garage is controlled by the height, bulk, and other development regulations applicable to CP Center. The additional 81 spaces can be accommodated within these development limitations and through refinements being made to the design of the space internal to the garage. Thus, because no garage design was specified in 2010 and because the FEIR assumed full build out of the allowable development program at the CP Center, the additional spaces would not increase in the size of development in the CP Center from that anticipated in 2010.

2.2.5: Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

Under FEIR Mitigation Measure TR-16 as modified pursuant to the Addendum 1 analysis (Addendum 1, p. 15), the Project Sponsor is required to construct certain off-site improvements to Harney Way. The changes identified in Addendum 1 and approved by the OCII Commission by Resolution dated January 7, 2014 are shown in Exhibit H. The Harney Way improvements include an initial configuration and a potential longer-term configuration involving a second phase of improvements. The initial configuration included improvements from Arelious Walker Drive to Thomas Mellon Drive prior to the occupancy permit for CP-02. This initial configuration would maintain the existing two travel lanes in each direction, add two BRT lanes on the north side, add a center median to accommodate left-turn lanes at intersections, add a median between the westbound travel lanes and BRT lands to accommodate a dedicated west bound right turn lane at Executive Park Boulevard East and an eastbound BRT stop just west of Executive Park Boulevard, provide a 12-foot sidewalk on the north side of Harney Way and provide a 13-foot two-way Class I bicycle facility on the south side separated from traffic by a five-foot median. (See, Exhibit I, 12/9/15 Fehr & Peers Harney Way Letter, Figure 1.)

Delays associated with two nearby major transportation projects – the extension of Geneva Avenue and the replacement of the US 101/Harney Way interchange - have delayed the final design of the BRT alignment. Given these delays, it is unlikely that the BRT alignment will be finalized by 2019. Consequently, the improvements anticipated in the initial configuration, which include several BRT related improvements, are affected by this delay. The timing of the second phase of improvements would not be affected by these delays.

The Project Sponsor proposes further modifying the MM TR-16 (which was previously modified in 2014 based on Addendum 1) as follows:

MM TR-16 Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study. Prior to the issuance of the occupancy permit for Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, the The Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in figure 5 in the Transportation Study, with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right of way. <u>The portion</u>

between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-A) shall be widened to include a two-way cycle track and two-way BRT lanes, prior to issuance of an occupancy permit for Candlestick Sub-Phase CP-02. The remaining portion, between Thomas Mellon Drive and Executive Park East (Phase 1-B), shall be widened prior to implementation of the planned BRT route which coincides with construction of CP-07 and HP-04 in 2023, as outlined in the transit improvement implementation schedule identified in Addendum 1, based on the alignment recommendations from an ongoing feasibility study conducted by the San Francisco County Transportation Agency.

Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Candlestick Point Major Phases 2, 3, and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersections on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.

The proposed modification to MM TR-16, and corresponding modification of the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the Infrastructure Plan, and the Transportation Plan would allow the Project Sponsor to limit the construction of the first phase of improvements during Sub-Phase CP-02 to the area of Harney Way between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park Boulevard East, although the sidewalk on Harney Way would be completed all the way to the planned sidewalk and cycle track at Thomas Mellon Drive. When the BRT alignment has been finalized, the Project Sponsor would complete the BRT lanes between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive. Thus, the first phase of improvements would be completed prior to operation of the BRT, and would not delay the start of BRT service. (See Exhibit I, Figure 2.) SFMTA has reviewed this proposed modification and verbally concurred.

2.2.6: Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The approved Major Phase 1 CP Application Schedule of Performance requires the Project Sponsor to construct streetscape improvements on Gilman Avenue concurrently with the development of Sub-Phase CP-02. Gilman Avenue is currently configured to facilitate egress from the former Candlestick Park stadium, with one eastbound lane and two westbound lanes. As required by MM TR-23.1, the streetscape improvements would include two lanes of travel in each direction and on-street parking on both sides of the street. Sidewalks would be narrowed from 15 feet to 12 feet (This configuration is shown in Figure 1(A) in Exhibit J, 8/13/15 Fehr & Peers Gilman Avenue Letter). Mitigation measure MM TR-23.1 also requires one travel lane in each direction to be converted to transit-only for project impacts to transit travel times. (This configuration is shown in Figure 1(B) in Exhibit J).

The proposed configuration would retain 15-foot sidewalks and on-street parking, provide one lane of travel in each direction with a center turn lane, and modify the intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker from all-way-stop-control to signal control. In addition, far-side bus stops with bulb outs would be located on the corridor at Ingalls Street and Griffith Street.

Mitigation measure MM TR-23.1 would be revised as follows and would bring the transit travel times for the 29 Sunset to levels consistent with the mitigated EIR scenario:

MM TR-23.1 <u>Maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset.</u> To address project impacts to the 29-Sunset, prior to issuance of a grading permit for Phase I, the Project Applicant in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the following improvements which could reduce Project impacts on transit operations along the Gilman Avenue and Paul Avenue corridor, generally between Arelious Walker Drive and Bayshore Boulevard. The study shall create a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule (as identified below) to maintain the proposed headways of the 29-Sunset.</u>

- For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces.
- For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate onstreet parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces.
- As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 5 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic.
- Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transitonly in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow left-hand lane,

facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno.

- <u>Implement traffic signal priority (TSP)</u>, which modifies the timing at signalized intersections to prioritize the movement of transit vehicles, at the intersections of Arelious Walker/Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue/Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue.
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street/Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno/Paul Avenue.
- <u>Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue</u> <u>between Third Street Bayshore Boulevard. The transit land would begin on Gilman Avenue and</u> <u>extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.</u>

A study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the Project mitigation measures was completed (See Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave. Addendum, 08/13/15). The monitoring program would evaluate the current conditions for the 29 Sunset to determine the implementation of the proposed measures above.

2.3. Proposed Minor Modifications of Project Documents Not Analyzed in Detail in Addendum

As noted above, certain Project documents, including the CP D4D, the Major Phase 1 CP Application, the CP Streetscape Master Plan, the Transportation Plan, and the Infrastructure Plan would be modified but are not discussed in detail in this Addendum because they do not raise environmental issues except for a few with respect to transportation. The few transportation-related issues raised by these modifications are discussed in the Transportation section as explained below. A complete list of these minor modifications is included in Exhibit B.

The modifications by and large clarify and clean up documents to reflect past approvals and elaborate on or make minor modifications to previously proposed design details. Briefly summarized, the modifications: (a) clarify design requirements and definitions; (b) update text and figures to reflect Project approvals received since 2010 and the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application; (c) delete references to the stadium option; (d) reorganize text for clarity; (e) amplify design requirements for items such as signage and building massing; (f) add details on design requirements for items such as pedestrian amenities and ground floor heights; (g) revise certain garage entry and curb cut requirements, CP Center internal access, building facades, and timing of certain improvements; (h) update the Streetscape Master Plan for items such as street furniture, paving materials, and landscaping materials; (i) update the Major Phase 1 CP Application to reflect the Sub-Phases CP-02-03-04 Application, including an update of the number of affordable housing units from 1025 to 1560; and provide for a portion of performance arts center space to be used for a movie theater.

Generally, these modifications are not further discussed in this Addendum, because OCII and the Planning Department have determined that these Project document modifications would not result in

physical changes sufficient to cause new or more severe significant environmental impacts. A few topics listed in Exhibit B are discussed at the end of the transportation section. These include the proposed garage entry and curb cut modifications, the reduction in performance venue seats as a result of the Film Arts Center proposal for the site at Harney Way and Ingerson, and change in internal circulation at the CP Center (See Section 4.3, Exhibit B Modifications Discussed in Transportation and Circulation Section, for additional discussion related to transportation.)

2.4 Project Approvals

The approvals required to implement the Project modifications addressed in this Addendum and the items listed in Exhibits A and B, include the following:

Table 3: Project Approvals				
	Project Approval	Agency		
1.	D4D Amendments	OCII Commission		
		Planning Commission		
2.	Sub-Phase CP-02-03-04	OCII Executive Director		
3.	Major Phase 1 CP Amendments	OCII Commission		
4.	MMRP Amendments	OCII Commission		
		Planning Commission		
5.	CP Master Streetscape Plan	OCII Commission		
6.	Transportation Plan	SFMTA		
7.	Infrastructure Plan	SFDPW, SFMTA, SFPUC. SFFD		

3. Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15162 provide that once a lead agency has certified an EIR, no subsequent or supplemental EIR is required to support subsequent discretionary approvals of the project unless major revisions are required in the previous EIR due to substantial changes in the project, the circumstances under which the project is undertaken, or as a result of new information, which becomes available and was not known and could not have been known at the time of the EIR. CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis for a lead agency's decision not to require a subsequent EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in a previously certified EIR where some changes or additions are necessary in an EIR but none of the conditions calling for a subsequent or supplemental EIR have occurred. The lead agency's decision to use an addendum must be supported by substantial evidence that the conditions that would trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, are not present.

This Addendum describes the potential environmental effects of the modified Project compared to the impacts identified in the FEIR, and explains why the proposed modifications would not result in any new significant environmental impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified environmental impacts and would not require the adoption of any new or considerably different

mitigation measures or alternatives. Modifications to two previously adopted mitigation measures are proposed and analyzed herein.

4.1 Land Use and Plans

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) no significant construction impacts; (2) LU-1, no significant impact on the physical division of an established community; (3) LU-2, less than significant impact as to conflict with plans, policies, or regulations; (4) LU-3, less than significant impacts on existing land use character; and (4) less than significant cumulative impacts.

Relocation of Towers G, J, and K

The proposed Project modifications include the relocation of Towers G, J, and K. The FEIR land use analysis considered the inclusion of towers at Candlestick Point in determining that the Project would result in less than significant land use and plans impacts. The proposed relocation of three towers would not result in any changes to the Project land uses or introduce a new land use. Because the proposed modified tower locations are within the planned new development area at Candlestick Point (Tower G in CP Center and Towers J and K in CP South) and as shown in Exhibit C, the modified locations would not result in physically dividing an established community. The Project would continue to comply with the General Plan, the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan, the San Francisco Sustainability Plan and other applicable plans, policies, and regulations (e.g. noise regulations, regulations adopted to reduce air quality impact, regulations related to geology and hydrology, biological resource regulations, and other environmental regulatory requirements discussed throughout the FEIR) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. Thus, relocation of three towers would not affect the Project's consistency with a plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

The relocation of the three towers would not change the FEIR's finding that development of Candlestick Point, with the inclusion of towers, would not have a substantial adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity. The FEIR acknowledged that the Project would alter the land use character at Candlestick Point and result in a substantially different built environment. The FEIR noted that the scale of the proposed development, including the residential towers, which could be as high as 420 feet, would contrast with existing patterns. The FEIR also acknowledged that the Project's open space network would connect with the CP State Recreational Area (CPSRA) and that CPRSA lands would be reconfigured and improved as part of the Project. Towers J and K would be relocated a short distance within the interior of CP South and thus would not change the Project's impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

The relocation of tower G would move this tower closer to CPRSA. (Exhibit C.) Tower G would continue to be part of the CP Center, a dense concentrated area of development within the Project. As shown in Exhibit K, p. 1 (Candlestick Point Tower Analysis from CPSRA), the closest distance from the proposed tower G location to one corner of the CPSRA would be approximately 600 feet. This is an area of CPSRA located at the intersection of Harney Way and Arelious Walker and these

streets separate the proposed tower from the CPSRA. The majority of CPSRA, including the areas along the waterfront, would be a significantly greater distance from the relocated Tower G. (See Exhibit K, p. 1.) The proposed Tower G location previously accommodated the approximately 70,200 seat football stadium, which ranged in height from 70 to 114 feet and was surrounded by paved parking lots. (See Exhibit K, p. 1-4.) The change from the adjacent football stadium to the CP development, with towers, including the relocation of Tower G, would not represent a significant adverse impact on the existing character of the vicinity.

Existing residential development in the Project vicinity includes multi-family housing south of the CP Center along Harney Way and other lower density housing located across Jamestown and farther up the hill from the Project site. Tower G would be moved away from the lower density housing located across Jamestown and somewhat closer to the multi-family, multi-story development along Harney Way. The FEIR Land Use section acknowledged that the Project would alter the character of Candlestick Point and result in a substantially different built environment compared with the existing site and vicinity. (EIR, p. III.B-39.) In particular, the EIR analysis specifically acknowledged that Candlestick Point would include residential towers ranging from 220 feet to 420 feet in height. (EIR, p. III.B-39.) The relocation of tower G within the CP Center would not alter the land use analysis or conclusions in the EIR.

Additionally, the CPSRA General Plan as amended in 2013 acknowledges that the park is located in an intensely urban area surrounded by industrial and residential uses, and, formerly, the stadium. (See Exhibit L, Excerpts from the CPSRA General Plan and Approval Resolution.) The State Park and Recreation Commission Resolution 1-2013 acknowledged that "the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands and other areas with a large mixed use development." (See Exhibit L.) The CPSRA General Plan describes the vision and role of the park as "an urban state park" where its "urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend." (See Exhibit L.) The Plan notes that the "proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a 'green front lawn' for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences." (See Exhibit L.) Thus, the CPSRA includes a vision and plans that accommodate the intense urban development underway at Candlestick Point. Given these factors, the relocation of tower G would not result in a substantial adverse land use impact on the existing character of the vicinity, including the CPSRA.

Therefore, the relocation of towers G, J, and K would not change the land use findings or mitigation measures in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Height Increases

The proposed height increases would not change the Project's approved land uses. The height increases (15 feet-35 feet) for buildings located within the new development area are relatively modest. (See Exhibits D and E.) The increases in height would occur in the CP Center, which will accommodate dense urban development of varying heights. The most significant height increase would be at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson for a building located in the interior of the new development area at a significant intersection. This is a prominent intersection where additional height would be an appropriate urban design feature. The height increases would not affect the existing lower density housing located across Jamestown and up the hill from the Project site because the distance, topography, and other project development would ensure that these height increases would not be noticeable from, or otherwise adversely affect the character of, these existing residential areas. Thus, these proposed height increases would not affect existing land uses, conflict with plans and policies designed to mitigate environmental impacts, or adversely affect the existing land use character of the area surrounding Candlestick Point. Consequently, the height increases would not result in new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

The proposed conversion of 15,500 square feet of office use to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use would maintain the overall mix of uses allowed in Candlestick Point, including residential, office, retail (neighborhood and regional), hotel, and open space/parks. The proposed use conversion would result in a robust neighborhood retail program that would meet the demand for shops and services in the new urban core of Candlestick Point and allow for neighborhood retail to be provided in various locations in the new neighborhoods. The remaining 134,500 square feet of office use would continue to allow appropriate office uses in Candlestick Point to serve residents and commercial uses. This minor change in the use allocation at Candlestick Point would not result in the physical division of an established community, conflict with plans, policies, or regulations designed to mitigate environmental impacts, or adversely affect the existing land use character since both office and neighborhood retail uses were already anticipated to be part of the development. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The proposed Project modifications to the parking and transportation system would not result in any change to the types of land uses in the Project, would not change the density or intensity of the Project uses, and would not change the Project location. Thus, these proposed Project modifications would not change the FEIR's findings with respect to land use and plans impacts. Consequently, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to land use and plans and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Additionally, given that the proposed Project modifications would have no new or more severe land use impacts, the FEIR land use and plans cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.2 Population, Housing and Employment

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) PH-1, less than significant impacts as the Project would not induce substantial direct population growth during construction; (2) PH-2, less than significant impacts as the Project would not result in indirect population growth during operation; (3) PH-2a, less than significant impacts regarding indirect population growth during operation of Candlestick Point; (4) PH-2b, less than significant impacts regarding indirect population growth during operation of HPS Phase II; (5) PH-3, no impacts regarding the displacement of existing housing units or residents, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (6) PH-3a, no impacts regarding displacement of existing housing units and residents at Candlestick Point, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (7) PH-3b, no impacts regarding displacement of existing housing units and residents at HPS Phase II, necessitating the construction of new units elsewhere; (8) less than significant cumulative population, housing and employment impacts.

Tower Relocations

The relocation of three Project towers would not increase the overall intensity of development of the Project because these towers would accommodate the same amount and type of development contemplated by the FEIR for the towers. Thus, the tower relocation would not increase the FEIR's Project population and employment projections. Additionally, the tower relocations would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

Height Increases

The proposed height increase would change the density range across the whole of Candlestick Point from 20-245 units per acre to 15-285 units per acre. While the density range would change, the total number of housing units at CP would not change and would remain at 6,225 units. Thus, no increase in the FEIR's population and employment projections would occur as a result of this density range change.

The height increases may slightly increase construction activities on the site, but the extent of this increase would be modest - 15 feet, approximately 1-story in most locations, and potentially 35 feet for the Film Arts Center location. In the context of the overall construction activity for the site, these relatively modest increases in potential building height would be unlikely to result in any additional population growth during construction, because any additional construction work would be done by workers already working on the Project. Thus, the height increase would not increase population or employment on the site because of construction activities.

Additionally, the height increase would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

The proposed conversion of 15,500 square feet of office use to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail use would reduce the amount of square footage developed on the Project site. Thus, this proposed change would not increase population or employment on the site. Additionally, this proposed change would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the existing CP Center and CP South sites do not contain any existing housing units.

<u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

The relocation of on-street parking spaces to the garage would not substantially increase the number of spaces in the garage. The FEIR assumed the CP Center garage would accommodate 2,596 spaces (FEIR, Figure III.D-12) and the current plan includes 2,677 spaces. No plans for the garage were available in 2010, but the FEIR assumed full build out of the CP Center. This increase in spaces would be accommodated by the allocation of space within the planned garage and in compliance with the development regulations applicable to CP Center. Thus, this relatively modest increase in spaces would be unlikely to result in any additional population growth during construction, because any additional construction work that might be necessary would be done by workers already working on the Project. Thus, the relocation of parking spaces would not increase population or employment on the site because of construction activities.

The proposed change in the phasing of the Harney Way improvements and the Gilman Avenue configuration revisions would result in some adjustments to previously approved Project elements. Certain Harney Way improvements would be shifted to a later phase and the scope of the Gilman Avenue improvements would be reduced. Thus, these changes would not increase population or employment on the site. Additionally, these proposed transportation changes would not displace any existing housing units or residents, because the locations of these improvements do not contain any existing housing units.

Therefore, given that the Project modifications would not result in any significant changes that would implicate the significance criteria for population, employment and housing, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to population, housing and employment impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant or no impact and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR population, housing and employment cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.3 Transportation and Circulation

This discussion evaluates the following proposed Project modifications to determine if they would result in new or more severe significant transportation and circulation environmental impacts: (a) the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail use; (b) the relocation of on-street parking to the CP Center garage; (c) the change in the phasing of Harney Way off-site improvements; and (d) the revisions to the approved configuration of Gilman Avenue. Transportation and circulation are documented in detail in the following exhibits: Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail reference Exhibit F (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15); Relocation of On-Street Parking reference Exhibit G (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16); Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing reference Exhibit I (Fehr & Peers Harney Way Phasing Letter, 12/09/15); and Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements reference Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15). In addition, a memorandum discussing transportation effects of the Performance Venue Revision, including the Film Arts Center, (discussed at the end of this Transportation and Circulation section) is included in Exhibit M (Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Memo, 12/21/15. The FEIR project description refers to a "Performance Venue/Arena" at Candlestick Point. The Transportation and Circulation section of the EIR referred to this land use as an "Arena." In the Sub-Phases Application and in this Addendum, this land use is referred to as Performance Venue and the Film Arts Center is a performance venue use proposed for the building located at the western corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue. In this transportation analysis, the land use will be referred to as "Arena/Performance Venue" to reflect the terms used in the FEIR)

The proposed tower relocations and height increases would not result in new significant transportation impacts or an increase in the severity of previously identified transportation impacts, because these modifications would not increase or change the type of development previously approved. Additionally, the tower relocations would occur within areas approved for development and thus would not significantly change expected circulation patterns. Although the height increases may involve additional construction work, the increase is modest in the context of the construction necessary for the Project and would be completed by workers and equipment already anticipated to be on-site and thus no significant additional construction traffic would be expected. Thus, no additional transportation and circulation construction impacts are expected from the relatively modest proposed height increases. Thus, the tower relocations and height increases are not further discussed below.

TR1-1: On-Site and Off-Site Construction Impacts

As described in the EIR, construction of the Project would result in significant and unavoidable transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. The EIR concluded implementation of mitigation measure MM TR-1, which would require the Applicant to develop and implement a construction traffic management plan to reduce the impact of construction activity on transportation facilities, would reduce the impacts caused by construction, but not to a less-than-significant level.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate less occupied square-footage. Office space would decrease from 150 ksf to 134.5 ksf and local retail would increase from 125 ksf to 131 ksf; thus, the total office and local retail square footage would decrease from 275 ksf to 265.5 ksf, thereby decreasing the amount of construction. The Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in any new significant construction impact because the additional parking spaces will not substantially increase the overall size of development at CP Center. The additional parking spaces would be accommodated by the allocation of space within the planned garage in compliance with the D4D development standards for CP Center.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way construction plan would continue to construct the Harney Way cross-section; however, the construction would be completed in two phases (Phase 1-A and Phase 1-B.) Phase 1-B, Harney Way between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive, shall be constructed prior to implementation of the planned BRT route and would likely coincide with other construction projects in the area. The Construction Traffic Management Program required by MM TR-1 would include specific provisions to manage the potential impacts on Harney Way. The overall amount of construction would remain approximately the same as presented in the EIR; therefore the Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised Gilman Avenue crosssection would decrease the amount of construction activity because the proposal would no longer widen Gilman Avenue. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant construction impacts.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation and circulation during construction beyond those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required (See Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15.)

Impacts TR-2 through TR-16: Traffic Impacts to Regional and Local Roadway System, Study Intersections, and Freeway Facilities

The EIR evaluated 60 intersections and several freeway facilities throughout the Project site and surrounding area. As described in the EIR, the Project would generate substantial amounts of new vehicular traffic resulting in a number of significant impacts and mitigation measures. Impacts TR-2 through TR-8 and TR-10 through TR-15, which identified several mitigation measures, were considered significant and unavoidable. Impact TR-9 was considered less than significant and TR-16 was considered less than significant with mitigation.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as

identified in the EIR and detailed in Exhibit F. (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the Project revision would not create any new significant traffic impacts because the total trips generated would remain the same or decrease.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional trips generated because under the FEIR analysis the total trips generated are based on land use factors, such as the amount of residential units, retail or office space, etc., not total parking or the location of parking (the analysis assumes that parking is located within the Project site); therefore the Project revision does not result in any new significant traffic impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way phasing plan would continue to provide two lanes of travel in both directions at all times, until monitoring requires construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by MM TR-16. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all times. No additional significant traffic impacts [e.g. changes in LOS] were identified as a result of phasing the initial improvements to Harney Way because the vehicle configuration would remain the same as detailed in Exhibit I (Fehr & Peers Harney Way Phasing Letter, 12/09/15.)

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> The Gilman Avenue revised crosssection would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional impacts to locations away from Gilman Avenue. As indicated in the detailed analysis included in Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised crosssection would result in similar or lower average intersection delay and travel times along Gilman Avenue compared to the original cross-section analyzed in the EIR, and no additional significant impacts would occur on Gilman Avenue, itself.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to traffic circulation beyond those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially increase in the severity of a significant impact identified in the EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-17 through TR-30: Impacts to Local and Regional Transit Operations and Capacity

The EIR described the Project's impacts to transit in Impacts TR-17 through TR-30. The EIR identified that with mitigation measures, the Project would provide adequate transit capacity to meet Project demand; therefore, TR-17 through TR-20 were determined to be less than significant. TR-21 through TR-27, which describe impacts to transit travel time, were considered significant and unavoidable because mitigation measures identified would require substantial outreach and design, such that the feasibility of the mitigation measures is uncertain. The EIR also identified TR-28 through TR-30, regional transit routes using nearby freeways. The EIR concluded that TR-28 and TR-30 were significant and unavoidable and TR-29 was less than significant.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> As shown in Exhibit F (Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15), the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would generate fewer

AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project. Therefore, the Project revision would not influence the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant transit impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional transit trips generated, nor would it interfere with projected travel times. In fact, fewer on-street parking spaces may actually reduce the "friction" between transit and vehicles maneuvering into and out of parking spaces on-street. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant transit impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would not affect the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional transit impacts related to transit ridership. The proposed phasing would require that the BRT facilities be constructed in a manner consistent with the alternative BRT alignment determined by the SFCTA and SFMTA prior to operation of the BRT system. MTA is in the process of evaluating the future BRT routes, including the 28 route which is planned to run along Harney Way. At this time, MTA has not completed environmental review or selected a preferred route. Consequently, the potential change in the routes for the BRT is uncertain and too speculative for further analysis. Therefore, transit service would not be affected by the proposed phasing of improvements to Harney Way.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> As described in Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised cross-section would not affect the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional transit impacts identified in TR-17 through TR-22 or TR-24 through TR-30, which relate to transit routes that do not travel on Gilman Avenue. However, the EIR identified proposed MM TR-23, which would widen the Gilman Avenue cross-section between Third Street and Griffith Street. If the revised proposal for Gilman Avenue is adopted, implementing Mitigation MM-TR-23 will be infeasible. Therefore, MM-TR-23 has been revised to include feasible mitigations measures that would result in better transit operations than the original MM-TR-23.

The revised mitigation measure is as follows, with detailed supporting analysis included in Exhibit J.

For the five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, prohibit on-street parking on westbound Gilman Avenue during the AM and PM peak periods to provide for three westbound travel lanes. During the peak periods convert one of the three westbound travel lanes to transit-only. During off-peak periods, parking would be allowed, and buses would travel in one of the two mixed-flow lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 90 parking spaces.²

² To address the project impacts to the 29-Sunset, the DEIR included two mitigation measures, addressing the eastbound and westbound transit operations, and an alternative mitigation measure. Through discussions with City staff the mitigation measures identified were not desirable and removed from the final EIR, such that the alternative became the mitigation measure. The MMRP did not reflect this change; therefore, as part of Addendum 4, the two mitigation measures included in MM TR-23.1 are being removed in addition to the alternate described above.

- For the same five-block segment of Gilman Avenue between Arelious Walker Drive and Third Street, restripe the eastbound direction to provide two travel lanes, one of which would accommodate on-street parking and one of which would be a mixed-flow travel lane. During the AM and PM peak periods, prohibit on-street parking in the eastbound direction, and operate one of the two eastbound lanes as transit-only lanes. The peak period transit lanes would impact 80 parking spaces.¹
- As an alternative to the two bulleted measures above, narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 15 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transitonly lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixedflow traffic.
- Prohibit on-street parking on the north side of Paul Avenue, between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard to create two westbound through lanes. Convert one westbound through lane to transit-only in the AM and PM peak periods. The peak period transit-only lane would impact 40 parking spaces. At the intersection of Paul Avenue and Bayshore Avenue, provide transit signal priority treatment (i.e., queue jump) to allow transit vehicles to maneuver into the mixed flow lefthand lane, facilitating a left-turn movement immediately west of Bayshore Boulevard from westbound Paul Avenue to southbound San Bruno.
- Implement TSP at the intersections of Arelious Walker/Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue/Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard/Paul Avenue
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street/Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno/Paul Avenue
- Implement peak period-transit dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street/Bayshore Boulevard. The transit lane would begin on Gilman Avenue and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.

As explained in Exhibit J of the Appendix, the revised MM TR-23 would offer a better level of improvement to transit travel times compared to the original MM TR-23, and therefore, no additional significant impacts to transit are anticipated as a result of the proposed change to the Gilman Avenue cross-section.

Consequently, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transit beyond those identified in the EIR nor would it cause a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required with exception to MM TR-23, which would require a revised mitigation measure. The revised mitigation measure would result in better transit operations than the original mitigation measure identified in the EIR.

Impacts TR-31 and TR-32: Bicycle Circulation

The EIR described impacts to bicycle circulation in Impacts TR-31 and TR-32. The EIR concluded that TR-31 would result in a beneficial impact or no impact because the Project would construct bicycle facilities to serve the additional demand. TR-32 was identified as significant and unavoidable because the feasibility to implement MM TR-32 is uncertain.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The amount of office space converted to neighborhood retail was based on generating the same or fewer peak hour trips, as such, the conversion would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project analyzed in the EIR (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the Project revision would not increase the Project's travel demand and associated conflicts between auto traffic and bicycles such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant bicycle impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional bicycle or vehicle trips generated because the total bicycle trips generated are based on land use factors, such as the amount of residential units, retail or office space, etc., not total parking or the location of parking. Further, the reduction in on-street parking supply may actually reduce the potential conflicts between bicycles and vehicles maneuvering into and out of on-street parking spaces, and from drivers opening their doors into bicycles on adjacent streets; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant bicycle impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The phased approach would include the full two-way cycletrack on the south side of Harney Way for the extent of the project's responsibility for improvements to Harney Way, between Arelious Walker Drive and Thomas Mellon Drive, as part of the very first phase. Therefore, the phasing will have no effect to bicycle conditions compared to what was described in the EIR and prior addenda.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: Neither the originally proposed configuration nor the revised configuration proposed dedicated bicycle facilities on Gilman Avenue. Both proposals continue to designate Gilman Avenue as a Class III facility. The provision of a single lane in each direction compared to two, as originally planned, may actually serve to calm traffic and reduce conflicts between cars and bicycles. Further, the revised cross-section actually widens the outside lane (that would accommodate the majority of bicyclists) from 11-feet to 12-feet, allowing more room for autos and bicycles. Therefore, since the revisions do not propose changes to the designation of bicycle routes nor to any physical infrastructure dedicated for bicycles, nor do they increase the potential for conflicts between bicycles and vehicles, the proposed changes will not result in any new significant bicycle impacts compared to those identified in the EIR. See Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15) for additional details. The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to bicycle circulation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-33 and TR-34: Pedestrian Circulation

The EIR described impacts to pedestrian circulation in Impacts TR-33 and TR-34. The EIR concluded that TR-33 would result in a beneficial impact or no impact because the Project would construct pedestrian facilities to serve the additional demand. TR-34 was identified as less than significant because the Project traffic would not substantially affect pedestrian circulation in the area.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The amount of office space converted to neighborhood retail was based on generating the same or fewer peak hour trips. As such, the conversion would generate fewer AM peak hour trips and the same number of PM peak hour trips as the Project. Therefore, the Project revision would not influence the Project's travel demand, such that the revised Project would not cause additional significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional pedestrian trips generated, but may change the pedestrian path of travel, as more pedestrians would travel between their destinations and the parking structure constructed as part of the candlestick retail center (Sub-Phase CP-02). However, the parking structure will be designed to meet existing design standards, which include provisions for pedestrian paths of travel. The final designs will be reviewed by the City as part of the issuance of construction permits to ensure that design standards are met; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would widen the sidewalk from 8 to 12 feet between Arelious Walker and Executive Park Boulevard East. However, the sidewalk between Executive Park Boulevard and Thomas Mellon Drive would not be widened until the construction of the BRT lanes, prior to the operation of the BRT route. In the interim, the existing 8' sidewalk would remain along this section. Though the widening of a portion of the northern sidewalk would not occur for several years after opening of the Candlestick Point retail center, the retail center is not expected to generate a substantial number of new pedestrian trips along Harney Way and the existing facilities are expected to be adequate in the interim period. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised cross-section would keep the existing sidewalk width, instead of decreasing as originally proposed. The revised Project will result in improved pedestrian conditions compared to the originally proposed EIR cross-section which decreased the sidewalk widths by 3'. Therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant pedestrian impacts.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to pedestrian circulation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-35 and TR-36: Parking

The EIR identified Impacts TR-35 and TR-36, which determined that the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces compared to its projected demand. Table III.D-21 of the FEIR shows that total parking demand in the Candlestick Hunters Point Shipyard Project site is approximately 21,200 parking spaces and the maximum parking supply is approximately 18,900 parking spaces, a shortfall of approximately 2,300 spaces. Although the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces and would remove some existing on-street parking spaces, the Project's impacts to parking conditions would be less than significant. Exhibit G (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16) details the current total parking proposed in CP Center and Figure III.D-12 of the FEIR shows the total parking supply in the Project Site. Total demand is expected to remain approximately the same, as described in Table III.D-20 of the FEIR.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The conversion of some office space to neighborhood retail would decrease the office parking supply and increase the retail supply in CP Center, as shown in Exhibit G. (Fehr & Peers CP Parking Memo, 1/11/16.) The conversion would decrease the total office and local retail parking supply; however the revised Project's parking supply would remain within the range of parking spaces identified in the EIR (See Figure III.D-12 in the FEIR.)

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street to off-street parking does not affect the overall site total because parking would be relocated on-site; thus would not change the total supply Additionally, the EIR provided a range of parking provided within the Project site, and the total supply with the proposed relocation falls within the range. Therefore, the relocation of on-street parking does not result in additional significant parking impacts.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would not impact parking because there is no on-street parking on Harney Way under existing conditions and none of the proposed configurations for Harney Way would provide parking. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on parking.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The proposed changes will not affect parking supply or demand within the proposed project nor along Gilman Avenue because the revised cross-section continues to provide on-street parking. See Figure 1, Exhibit J (Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15). Therefore, the changes do not result in any new significant impacts to parking conditions.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts associated with parking supply and demand beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact TR-37: Loading

The EIR identified Impact TR-37 and determined that the Project would provide adequate loading supply and therefore concluded that impacts related to loading would be less than significant, and that no mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the EIR states that if the loading demand

is not met on site and could not be accommodated within on-street loading zones, trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets while loading and unloading goods, which would result in disruptions and impacts to traffic and transit operations, as well as bicycles and pedestrians. However, because any effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not result in a significant impact.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail / Relocation of On-Street Parking:</u> Both the conversion of office space to neighborhood retail and the relocation of on-street parking will have small effects on loading. However, an analysis of loading demand shows that these effects will be less than significant because the change in daily and peak hour truck loading demand would be minimal and will likely be met on-site. Table 2 in Exhibit R (Fehr & Peers Loading Letter, 2/18/16), shows that the daily truck trip generation would decrease by 32 truck trips and increase the peak hour loading space demand by 2 spaces compared to the Project Proposal. The slight increase will likely be accommodated by off-street loading spaces on-site; however, if the loading demand is not met on-site and could not be accommodate by on-street loading zones, the additional trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets. As stated in the EIR, because the effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not be significant. Therefore, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: There are currently no loading facilities on Harney Way, and none of the proposals would add loading. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on loading in the area.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The revised cross-section does not change the overall loading supply or demand. Thus, implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading.

The revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation associated with loading beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-38 through TR-50: Stadium Impacts

The revised Project does not include construction of a new stadium. Furthermore, the existing stadium at Candlestick Point has already been demolished and the 49ers games are played elsewhere. Game day impacts for the revised Project are not applicable.

Impact TR-51 through TR-55: Arena/Performance Venue Impacts

The EIR included summarized impacts related to the operation of an Arena/Performance Venue in TR-51 through TR-55. The EIR identified that with mitigation measures, TR-51 (related to traffic) and TR-52 (related to transit) would remain significant and unavoidable. TR-53 through TR-55, which

summarized bicycle, pedestrian, and parking impacts, respectively, related to the operation of the Arena/Performance Venue were considered less than significant.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail</u>: The conversion of office space to neighborhood retail would not affect the operation of the proposed Arena nor would the conversion generate additional trips to impact arena traffic operations (See Exhibit F, Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Memo, 12/14/15.) Therefore, the revised Project does not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking would not affect the operation of the Arena because the relocation of on-street parking would not change the total parking provided on-site. Therefore, the revised Project does not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena/Performance Venue.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The revised Harney Way phasing plan would continue to provide two lanes of travel in both directions at all times, until monitoring requires construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by MM TR-16. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all time, thereby will not result in additional impacts to Arena/Performance Venue operations.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revise Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements</u>: The Gilman Avenue revised crosssection would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional significant impacts associated with the Arena/Performance Venue. As indicated in the detailed analysis, the revised cross-section would result in similar or better intersection delay and travel times.

The revised Project would reduce the capacity of the event space (Arena); therefore, the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts to transportation associated with the event space and will likely lessen the severity of significant impacts identified in the EIR. (See Exhibit B Modifications discussed below for additional details.)

Impact TR-56: Air Traffic Impacts

The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air traffic. The revised Project would contain the same overall land uses and general development form and would not change the EIR's conclusion regarding air traffic. The revised Project would not create any new significant impacts with respect to air traffic and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Impact TR-57: Hazards due to Design Features

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would be designed in accordance with City standards, and would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction. As a result the Project's impacts to hazards would be less than significant. The revised Project would be

designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to design features have been identified.

Impact TR-58: Emergency Access

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would adequately facilitate emergency access and be designed to City standards, which include provisions that address emergency vehicles.

<u>Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail:</u> The office to retail conversion would not affect the transportation infrastructure such that it would impact emergency vehicle access. Additionally, the revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

<u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u>: The relocation of on-street parking would not affect the transportation infrastructure such that it would impact emergency vehicle access. In fact, fewer on-street parking spaces may actually reduce the "friction" between emergency vehicles and vehicles maneuvering into and out of parking spaces on-street. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

<u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing</u>: The proposed phasing would maintain the same number of traffic lanes as proposed in the EIR. Therefore, there would be no additional significant impact to emergency vehicle access with the proposed phasing.

<u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross-Section Off-Site Improvements:</u> The revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. As indicated in the detailed analysis (Exhibit J, Fehr & Peers Gilman Ave Addendum, 08/13/15), the revised cross-section would result in similar or better intersection delay and travel times. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

The revised Project would not change the overall Project's transportation infrastructure. Additionally, the revised Project would be designed in accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified.

Exhibit B Modifications Discussed in Transportation and Circulation Section

As noted in Section 3.3, Proposed Project Modifications Analyzed in Addendum, minor modifications that are not discussed in detail in this Addendum are also proposed and set out in Exhibit B. Planning and OCII have determined that these minor modifications either do not result in physical changes or result in such minor physical changes that they will not have different environmental effects from the effects analyzed in the FEIR. However, as explained in Section 3.3 Proposed Minor Modifications of Project Documents Not Analyzed in Detail in Addendum, a few of the minor

modifications could affect transportation or circulation impacts and those are discussed in this subsection. These include the proposed garage entry and curb cut modifications, the reduction in performance venue seats as a result of the Film Arts Center proposal for the site at Harney Way and Ingerson, and change in internal circulation at the CP Center.

<u>Parking Garage Entry and Curb Cut Widths:</u> The revised curb-cut widths would not influence the Project's travel demand; therefore, the Project revision would not result in additional impacts related to trip generation. The increased curb-width would extend the pedestrian crossing length; however, the garage entries will be designed to meet existing design standards and will comply with City regulations, which include adequate pedestrian treatments to facilitate pedestrian crossings with driveway ingress and egress. The final designs will be reviewed by the City as part of the issuance of construction permits to ensure that design standards are met; therefore, the Project revision does not result in any new significant impacts.

<u>Arena/ Performance Venue Conversion</u>: The Arena/ Performance Venue Conversion, including the Film Arts Center proposed at one performance venue location would not result in a substantial change in the Project's travel demand without an Arena Event as described in the EIR and would substantially decrease the number of PM peak hour trips with an Arena Event, as shown in Table 2 of Exhibit M (Fehr & Peers Arena Conversion Memo, 12/21/15.) With the Film Arts Center and a Performance Venue event (at the second location in CP Center for Performance Venue space), the revised Project would generate 678 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. The Film Arts Center trip distribution and mode split is likely to behave similarly to retail uses and the second Performance Venue is likely to behave similarly to the originally assumed Arena; therefore, the mode splits and geographic distribution originally forecasted in the EIR are applicable.

The proposed land use revisions would likely result in localized changes to traffic volumes, because the change in traffic generation is relatively small compared to the project, and the relatively small increases would disperse relatively quickly farther away from the project. Thus, the revised Project will not create any new significant impacts compared to those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially worsen the severity of those significant impacts that were identified in the EIR. Therefore, the results and conclusions from the EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project. A detailed study, included in Exhibit M, sets out these conclusions in detail. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable, as previously identified, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

CP Center Internal Circulation Changes: Internal circulation related to vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian travel to CP Center, such as garage driveway locations and circulation with CP Center, was not evaluated in detail in the EIR; however, the proposed designs are not inconsistent with FEIR assumptions and will be designed in accordance with applicable design standards. Although some driveways and curb cuts will be wider under the proposed D4D amendments, these wider widths will allow adequate access to certain garages for large loading vehicles and accommodate the large volume of vehicles anticipated at the CP Center garage. The enhancement of adequate access to the garages would reduce back-ups on local streets and double-parking by service and delivery vehicles. These benefits will reduce pedestrian and bike conflicts and enhance vehicle circulation

functioning. Additionally, appropriate design features to ensure pedestrian and bike safety (such as pavement treatments, signage, car alert signals, staffing at garage entrances) will be required by the D4D during detailed design review. Internal circulation modifications such as removing certain street extensions into CP Center will enhance pedestrian and bike access by reducing the potential for conflicts with vehicle traffic. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not adversely affect circulation assumptions or impacts identified in the FEIR.

4.4 Aesthetics

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impact: (1) AE-1, less-thansignificant construction impacts on a scenic vista or scenic resource; (2) AE-2, less-than-significant construction impacts on visual character or quality with implementation of mitigation; (3) AE-3, construction impacts on light or glare that could obstruct day or night views; (4) AE-4, less-thansignificant Project impacts on scenic vistas; (5) AE-5, less-than-significant Project impacts on scenic resources; (6) AE-6, less-than-significant Project impacts on visual character; (7) AE-7, less-thansignificant Project impacts on light and glare with implementation of mitigation; or (8) less-thansignificant cumulative impacts.

Tower Relocations

Impact AE-4: Effects on Scenic Vistas. The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on scenic vistas and acknowledged that long-range views of the site would include the Project towers. Visual simulations for the proposed tower relocations are attached as Exhibit N, Candlestick Point Tower Visual Analysis.

Tower G would move closer to open space areas south and east of Harney Way in the CPSRA, and would appear more prominent from this corner of the park. From some vantage points to the east, Tower G would be visible in front of Bayview Hill. Nonetheless, much of the Bayview Hill would still remain in view, particularly towards the northeast. The visibility of Tower G from the north would be reduced under the proposed location. From the south, the towers would appear in slightly different locations than in 2010 but would otherwise be similar in appearance. Thus, long-range views of the site would not be significantly affected by the relocation of Tower G.

Towers J & K would move marginally closer to the CPSRA, by approximately 100 feet and within the interior of a developed neighborhood. Given that the relocation would be modest, this modification would not be detectable in long-range views of the site and would not result in new or more severe impacts.

Under the proposed tower relocations, views of the site would continue to be of an urban development with towers and mid-rise buildings. Given that this visual context was established under the 2010 Project approval, the proposed tower relocations would continue to be consistent with the expectations of those viewing the development from the adjoining open space network and beyond. The new tower locations would not restrict views of the Bay and important landforms would still be visible from different vantage points without significant loss of prominence. Therefore, the tower

relocations would not result in new significant scenic view impacts or increases in the severity of significant scenic view impacts previously acknowledged in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact AE-5: Effect on Scenic Resources: Scenic resources at or near Candlestick Point include the CPSRA, Bayview Hill, Yosemite Slough, and the shoreline. In 2010, the FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on scenic resources. The FEIR analysis focused on the change in the existing character of the site - from a stadium, parking lots, degraded urban areas – to a new, well-designed urban development, including towers, with integrated public parks, improvements to the CPSRA, and shoreline improvements.

As shown on the visual simulations in Exhibit N, the overall appearance of the tower relocations would be substantially similar to the Project and the other variants considered in the FEIR. The visual context of the site and associated scenic resources would continue to be of an urban development with towers and mid-rise buildings surrounded by an enhanced network of parks along the Bay shoreline. The new tower locations would not introduce new land uses or types of structures that were not previously considered and analyzed, and would not detract from long- or mid-range views compared to the 2010 approval. Other than a more prominent view of Tower G from one corner of the CPSRA located near the Harney Way and Arelious Walker intersection, the towers would appear similar to the 2010 locations. Thus, with the tower relocation, the impact would remain less than significant and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact AE-6 Effect on Visual Character: The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not have a significant effect on the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings. The FEIR acknowledged that the towers would be visible from various vantage points. As shown in Exhibit N, pp. 13-16, Tower G would no longer be visible in the view from Mariner Village towards Candlestick Point. It would appear more prominent from the corner of CPSRA at the intersection of Harney Way and Arelious Walker open space looking north away from the water and towards the development at CP Center. As shown in the FEIR, Tower G was clearly visible from the CPSRA. The new location of tower G is closer to the CPSRA and thus appears larger and more prominent from this vantage point in CPSRA than the approved location. Although Tower G would be more prominent from this location in CPSRA and would change the view from the 2010 plan, the overall character of the view north from this corner of CPSRA would continue to be of the dense CP Center. Additionally, the visual quality of this area of the Project site would be improved over the previous massive stadium surrounded by unpaved parking lots and little or no landscaping. The State Park and Recreation Commission has acknowledged in its 2013 CPSRA General Plan that the park is located in an urban area planned for a large mixed use development. As noted above in the "Land Use and Plans" the 2013 General Plan embraces this urban setting of the park, which will be a "green front lawn" for the new development. Thus, this new location would not result in a new significant impact on the visual character or quality of the site or its surroundings, or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact. No new mitigation measures would be required.

The proposed relocation of the towers would not change the analysis or conclusions in the FEIR with respect to Aesthetic impacts. The Project would continue to replace degraded urban areas, vacant

parcels, expanses of asphalt and dirt and outdated developments with a new, well-designed urban development including towers, parks, transportation facilities, and walkable mixed-use neighborhoods. The Project would continue to improve the visual quality of the site and provide new areas of open space, improvements to the CPSRA, and other amenities. Urban design guidelines would ensure high quality development and appropriate height transitions within the new development and between existing communities and new development. The towers would be required to comply with the D4D design guidelines, including bulk requirements. Proposed floor plates for the towers would not increase. Thus, with the proposed relocation of the towers, the impacts on visual character and quality of the site and its surroundings would remain less than significant and no new mitigation measures will be required.

Impact AE-7 Effect of Light and Glare: The FEIR found that the Project, including Tower Variant D, would not result in significant light and glare impacts with the implementation of mitigation measures MM AE-7a1 through MM AE-7a3. Because towers were included in the 2010 Project approvals and because the relocation would not increase the overall amount of development on the Project site, the proposed tower relocations would not introduce any new sources of light or glare in Candlestick Point, or increase the severity of approved sources of light or glare. Mitigation measures MM AE-7a1 through MM AE-7a3 would continue to apply to all development on the site, and would mitigate the potential for light and glare impacts to a less than significant level. Thus, under the proposed relocation of the towers, impacts on light and glare would remain less than significant. No new mitigation measures would be required.

Height Increases

As shown in Exhibits D and E, the increase in height for the Film Arts Center at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson from 85 feet to 120 feet, the increase in the height of the building at Harney Way and Arelious Walker from 65 feet to 80 feet, and the increase in height for the buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson from 65 feet to 80 feet would be relatively minor in the context of a dense urban setting with multi-story buildings of varying heights, including several towers. These buildings would be largely internalized within the Candlestick Point project area and therefore would not result in new significant impacts to the scenic resources. These height modifications would not be noticeable in long-range views of the site, nor restrict any views of the Bay. Additionally, these buildings would be subject to mitigation measures MM AE-7a1-7a3, which would mitigate the potential for light and glare impacts to a less than significant level. Therefore, these proposed height increases would not result in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

The conversion would slightly reduce overall development because 15,500 square feet of office use would be replaced with 6,000 square feet of retail use. This conversion would not create new significant aesthetic impacts or significantly increase the impacts identified in the FEIR. The office to retail conversion would be accommodated in areas already planned for development and considered in the FEIR aesthetic analysis. Therefore, this land use conversion would not result in new

significant aesthetic impacts or an increase in the severity of significant impacts identified in the FEIR and no new mitigation measures would be required.

<u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

The proposed parking and transportation system modifications would not result in changes in the location of the Project or add new elements requiring the construction of additional Project structures. The relocation of parking spaces may result in a potential modest increase in the size of the CP Center garage, which would be unlikely to be noticeable in the dense urban context of the overall CP Center structure's height or bulk as identified in the FEIR, or create any new sources of light and glare other than those considered in the FEIR. Thus, these proposed modifications would not create new significant aesthetic impacts or significantly increase the impacts identified in the FEIR.

Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would result in no new significant aesthetic impacts and no more severe significant aesthetic impacts than identified in the FEIR and no new mitigation measures would be required. The FEIR aesthetic cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.5 Shadows

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts : (1) SH-1a, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (2) SH-1b, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space; (3) SH-1, less than significant impacts as implementation of the Project would not result in new structures with the potential to cast shadows on existing or proposed parks and open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space in a manner that would have an adverse effect on the use of the open space; (4) less than significant cumulative shadow impacts.³

Tower Relocation/Height Increases

Exhibit O (IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo) includes the shadow studies showing the December 21st (worst case) shadow impacts from Candlestick Point development with the proposed tower relocations and height increases. The analysis has been prepared to identify shadow impacts from the relocated towers on Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park (located outside the Project boundary) and the CPSRA, Bayview Gardens/Wedge Destination Park (BGWDP), Mini-Wedge Community Park (MWCP) and the Jamestown Hillside Community Park (JHCP) The provisions of Planning Code

³ The FEIR found that the Project under Tower Variants C and D, would have a significant and unavoidable shadow impact on Gilman Park (FEIR, Comments and Responses, p. 2445). Exhibit O shows that Towers G, J, and K would not contribute to this impact. Other shadow impacts of the towers were found to have a less than significant impact because they would not have an adverse effect on the use of open space (Impact SH-1a).

Section 295, commonly referred to Proposition K, apply only to Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park and do not apply to CPSRA, BGWDP, MWCP, and JHCP. The shadow impacts were measured at three times during the day on winter solstice (10 a.m., 12 p.m., and 3 p.m.), which is consistent with the shadow analysis in the FEIR. These times were chosen to reflect the worst-case scenario, because shadows cast on the winter solstice are the longest of any time of the year due to the low angle of the sun, and therefore represent the greatest potential impact. The shadows in the FEIR layout and the layout for the analysis in Exhibit O were generated in Google Sketchup. The topography within the model is based on a survey of lands surrounding the site at 5 foot contour intervals, and the proposed topography within the Project site at 1 foot contour intervals. The shadow studies in Exhibit O show the 2010 shadow and 2016 shadows in different colors. Neither the tower relocations nor the increased building heights add new shadows to Bayview Hill Park or Gilman Park at any of the times studied.

At 10:00 a.m., the relocated Tower G would cast a minor increase in shadow (approximately 3%) on the JHCP open space area across Arelious Walker Drive and this small area of shadow would be gone by noon. The shadow would not have an adverse impact on the use of this area, because it is a relatively narrow strip of extremely steep land between two streets which does not contain any park amenities such as benches or play areas for children and is generally not usable due to the steep grade. Thus, the additional shade would not likely affect its use. At 10:00 a.m. the relocated Tower J would result in a minor increase in shadowing on the BGWDP. These increases in shadow would be minor and would not be a significant impact under the FEIR shadow significance criteria.

At 12:00 p.m., the relocated Tower G would not shadow any park or open space. At 12:00 p.m the relocated Tower J would add two slivers of shade to the BGWDP, similar to the shadow pattern already shown in the FEIR in Figure III-F-4 and approved under the 2010 Project approvals. Furthermore, the shadow from Tower J would shift away from the proposed Bus Rapid Transit station location (improving solar access to this high-activity zone) to a less activated portion of the park east of Ingerson. Tower J would also add a small amount of shadow to the MWCP. Tower K and the midrise building along Harney Way (Block 8a) would result in an increase of shadowing to the BGWDP of approximately 15-18 feet for one block length of approximately 200 feet. These slivers of shade would be unlikely to significantly affect use of the Project's wedge parks and would not be a significant impact under the FEIR shadow significance criteria.

At 3 p.m., the relocated Tower G would not add additional shadow on any park or open space. The relocated Tower J would add a small increase in shadow on CPSRA. The additional shadow would add approximately 10,000 square feet (.02 ac) of additional shadow to the shadow already cast at this location, which would represent approximately .02% of the total CPSRA area. The Project buildings approved in 2010 would already cast modest shadow impacts on CPSRA, generally in the late afternoon and evening. This small amount of additional shadow added to a shadow pattern that would occur under the approved development would be unlikely to adversely affect use of CPSRA. The small amount of additional shadow at this time of day would not be noticeable to most park users and significant areas of the park not in shadow at this time would be available to park users. Tower J would also add a minor increase in shadow to MWCP, which, when combined with the shadows expected in 2010, would shade the entirety of MWCP at this time. MWCP is part of the Project and

thus this increase in shading is not a Project impact on the existing environment. Additionally, this small wedge park, located between Project buildings, would be substantially in shadow at this time of the year and day from other Project buildings as acknowledged in the EIR (EIR, p. III.F-10.). The EIR found that that the orientation of the narrow wedge parks with respect to the path of the sun and the close proximity to Project buildings along the parks' southwestern boundaries combine to make these wedge parks most susceptible to new shade. (EIR, p. III.F-26.) The EIR acknowledged that the heights, layouts, and orientations of the Project buildings would result in variable levels of shading throughout the day on Project neighborhood parks, but public use of the proposed parks would not be adversely affected by these shade conditions. (EIR, p. III.F-26.) The new shadow would be consistent with the type of shadow impacts expected in the new highly urban development Project and would not result in a new significant shadow impact.

The shadow analyses prepared for the relocated towers and building height increase show that these proposed Project modifications would not result in a new significant impact or an increase in the severity of a previously identified significant impact. No new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR shadow cumulative impact conclusions would remain the same.

Conversion of /Office Use to Retail Use

The office to retail conversion would not create any new or more severe significant shadow impacts because this modification adjusts square footage but does not involve a change in building location or a height increase. This modification would reduce the overall amount of development and thus would not result in new or more severe shadow impacts.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The relocation of parking spaces would not result in new shadow impacts because these spaces will be relocated to the approved CP Center garage and would not involve a height increase for that structure. The transportation system modifications would not create new or more severe significant shadow impacts because these modifications propose horizontal construction and do not involve the construction of tall structures.

Therefore, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to shadow impacts. Additionally, the modifications would not affect the FEIR shadow cumulative impact conclusions and this impact would continue to be less than significant.

4.6 Wind

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) W-1a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measure W-1a, as implementation of the Project at Candlestick Point, with mitigation, would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (2) W-1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation

measures, as implementation of the Project at HPS Phase II would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (3) W-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; (a) W-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not include tall structures that would result in ground-level-equivalent wind speed exceeding 26 mph for a single hour of the year in pedestrian corridors and public spaces; and (4) less than significant cumulative wind impacts.

Tower Relocations

Under the proposed tower relocations development would continue to occur on areas of the Project site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The FEIR wind analysis assumed multiple towers at Candlestick Point. Implementation of mitigation measure W-1a, designed to address wind impacts and adopted as part of the 2010 Project approvals, would be unchanged by the tower relocations. Mitigation MM W-1a requires a wind analysis to be undertaken at schematic design stage for high-rise buildings with a maximum height over 100 feet. The wind analysis will assess the potential impacts of the building and make design recommendations to minimize those impacts. Therefore, the proposed tower relocations would not result in in a new significant wind impact or a substantial increase in a previously identified significant wind impact. The wind impacts associated with the towers would remain less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Height Increases

The proposed height increase for the buildings at the western corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue and along Harney Way and Ingerson within and adjacent to the CP Center would be limited to 80 feet. The proposed height increase for the performance venue/film arts center location at the corner of West Harney Way and Ingerson would be up to 120 feet. Buildings approximately 100 feet in height or higher have the potential to create wind impacts. The proposed Project modifications would allow the height of one building – the performance venue at CP Center – to exceed 100 feet in height. The other proposed height increases would be below 100 feet. The FEIR assumed that some Project buildings would exceed 100 feet in height and mitigation measure W-1a was adopted as part of the Project approvals to address wind impacts from these buildings. This mitigation measure would be implemented during the design review process for individual buildings and would ensure that potential adverse wind impacts would be mitigated. Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to wind and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

This proposed Project modification involves an adjustment to the allocation of square footage for certain Project land uses, would not require the construction of additional structures, and would not change the height of Project buildings. Thus, this proposed modification would not result in new or increased wind impacts.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The proposed Harney Way and Gilman Avenue modifications primarily involve horizontal construction and would not include construction of tall structures that could result in wind impacts. Consequently, these transportation system modifications would not change the Project's effects related to wind. The proposed relocation of on-street spaces to the CP Center garage would not increase the height of the garage which is subject to a 65-foot height limit and thus would not create significant wind impacts.

All development in the Project must comply with the wind mitigation measures, which have been designed by the City to ensure no significant wind impacts will result from tall buildings. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to wind impacts. Additionally, the FEIR wind cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.7 Air Quality

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) AQ-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emission of criteria pollutants; (2) AQ-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emissions of diesel particulate matter; (3) AQ-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction emissions of toxic air contaminants; (4) AQ-4, significant and unavoidable impacts from mass emissions of criteria pollutants during project operations; (5) AQ-5, less than significant impact from carbon monoxide emissions due to motor vehicle trips during project operation; (6) AQ-6, less than significant impacts with implementation of mitigation measures from emissions of toxic air contaminants due to operation of research and development uses; (7) AQ-7, less than significant impact from vehicle emissions of PM_{2.5} during project operation; (8) AQ-8, less than significant impacts from odors during project operations; (9) AQ-9 less than significant related to conformity with regional air quality plan objectives; and (10) less than significant cumulative impacts, except for the project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts from emissions of toxic air contaminants and PM_{2.5}.

Ramboll Environ reviewed the prosed Project modifications for consistency with the FEIR air quality findings and the discussion below reflects their analysis and conclusions. (See, Exhibit P, 1/22/16 Ramboll Environ letter.)

Tower Relocations

Although the three towers would be relocated, the proposed relocations would not result in any change in the overall location of the Project or the amount of development evaluated in the FEIR. Because the tower relocation would not change the overall land use square footage of the Project, this modification would not alter the analysis of criteria air pollutant emissions (CAP) in the FEIR. This modification would have a negligible effect on the FEIR health risk assessment (HRA) performed for construction emissions because the towers would be relocated within the same sub-phases as analyzed in the FEIR. The HRA analysis in the FEIR assumed construction emission would be

distributed throughout the sub-phase, thus relocation of towers within the respective sub-phases would not change the analysis.

Height Increases

The proposed height increases would change the massing of the affected buildings, but would not change the floor area or the overall land use square footage of the Project. Although certain Project modifications such as the height increases may slightly increase construction activity, other modifications may slightly decrease construction activities. In any event, the overall amount of development and number of residential units at CP would be consistent with that analyzed in the FEIR such that no significant increase in construction activities would be expected from the Project modifications. Consequently, this modification would not alter the analysis of CAP in the FEIR, because the models used in the FEIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage. This modification would have a negligible effect on the FEIR health risk assessment (HRA) performed for construction emissions, because total construction emissions would be unchanged from the FEIR assumptions.

Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

This analysis evaluates the proposed conversion of office floor space to local-serving retail floor space. The analysis is structured to determine the necessary reduction in the amount of office square footage that would be required to allow a 6,000-square-foot increase in neighborhood retail without increasing any of the Project criteria air pollutant (CAP) evaluated in the FEIR.

To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail without increasing the total Project operational criteria pollutant emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated 2030 criteria pollutant emissions associated with the proposed 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail using California Emission Estimator Model version 2013.2.2 (CalEEMod®).⁴ The proposed neighborhood retail is modeled as "Strip Mall", which is consistent with the land use category used for the local-serving (neighborhood) retail in the FEIR. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air Resources Board (ARB)'s EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default that was based on EMFAC2011. EMFAC2014 incorporates new vehicle emissions standards and rules and regulations (e.g., Advanced Clean Cars and Truck & Bus Rule).

The Project criteria pollutant emissions presented in the FEIR were modeled using URBEMIS 2007 version 9.2.4 for year 2030.⁵ The minimum square footage of the approved office floor space entitlement that would be converted and its associated CAP emissions were scaled from the previous calculation presented in Appendix H1 of the FEIR by matching the worst case pollutant (i.e., NOx) of

⁴ CalEEMod® is a statewide program designed to calculate both criteria and GHG emissions from development projects in California. It was developed in collaboration with California air districts led by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and is currently supported by several lead agencies for use in quantifying the emissions associated with development projects undergoing environmental review.

⁵ URBEMIS was the land use emissions inventory model recommended used for the EIR. It was widely used before the development of CalEEMod®.

the local-serving retail emissions discussed above. The emission comparison is summarized in Exhibit P, Table 1. As presented in Table 1, adding 6,000 square feet neighborhood retail development to the Project without increasing the emissions of any criteria pollutant previously estimated in the FEIR would require a removal of at least 10,300 square feet of office. The proposed Project modification would remove 15, 500 square feet of office space.

The proposed neighborhood retail development is designed to offer the community retail services (e.g., dry clean, barbershop, grocery and other businesses) within walking distance. The mobile source emissions in this analysis were evaluated using CalEEMod® default trip rates based on ITE Trip Generation, which does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the transit-oriented nature of the development plan. (See Exhibit P, Table 1.) Therefore, the estimated emissions for the proposed neighborhood retail uses are conservative. If a detailed site specific trip generation rate were available, it would be likely that less office space would need to be replaced due to lower emissions from mobile sources.

The construction emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated based on the Project construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed neighborhood retail would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the operational criteria pollutant comparison discussed above, the equivalent neighborhood retail would be smaller in size than the office space to be removed. Therefore, converting office into local-serving retail would not generate increased criteria pollutant emissions, cancer risks, noncancer chronic hazard index (HI), or acute HI associated with the construction activities presented in the EIR.

Relocation of On-street Parking Spaces to CP Center Garage

The proposed relocation of certain on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garages is expected to have a negligible effect on construction activity, because the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage will not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. Consequently, there would be no change in the overall CAP emissions from that evaluated in the FEIR. This proposed modification would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions would not increase from the estimates in the FEIR.

Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

The proposed modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This proposed modification would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would spread the same amount of work over a longer time. Because this proposed modification only divides the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there is no change in the overall CAP emissions. This proposed modification would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions would not increase from the estimates in the FEIR.

Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

This modification will result in less construction. The original cross-section proposed to widen Gilman Avenue to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle. The curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. This revision reflects a reduction in construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway), thus the construction activity would be reduced from the FEIR assumptions. As such, there would be no increase in overall CAP and GHG emissions. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are reduced from the FEIR assumptions.

Consequently, the Project modifications would not affect air quality-related impact analyses. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to air quality impacts. All Project impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR air quality cumulative impact conclusions would be unchanged.

4.8 Noise and Vibration

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts:

(1) NO-1a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at Candlestick Point on increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction), they would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (2) NO-1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at HPS Phase II on increased noise levels for both off-site and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would be temporary, they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (3) NO-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction activities associated with the Project on increased noise levels for both offsite and on-site sensitive receptors; however, the Project's construction noise impacts would occur primarily in noise-sensitive areas adjacent or near to active construction sites (which would vary in location and duration over the entire period the proposed Project would be under construction); they would also not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction noise that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code; (4) NO-2a, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as a result of construction at Candlestick Point by creating excessive ground-borne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels. Although the Project's construction vibration impacts would be temporary, would not occur during recognized sleep hours, and would be consistent with the requirements for construction activities that exist in Sections 2907 and 2908 of the Municipal Code, vibration levels would still be significant; (5) NO-2b, significant and

unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from rock removal activities in the Alice Griffith and Jamestown districts resulting in vibration levels that exceed the FTA threshold of 80 VdB or could cause damage to structures from vibration caused by the fracturing of bedrock for excavation; (6) NO-2c, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction at HPS Phase II that would create excessive ground-borne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels is complete; (7) NO-2, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities associated with the Project that would create excessive ground-borne vibration levels in existing residential neighborhoods adjacent to the Project site and at proposed on-site residential uses should the latter be occupied before Project construction activity on adjacent parcels is complete; (8) NO-3, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities associated with the Project that would result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels; (9) NO-4, less than significant impacts with implementation of the Project, including the use of mechanical equipment or the delivery of goods, on exposure to noise-sensitive land uses on or off site to noise levels that exceed the standards established by the City; (10) NO-5, less than significant impacts from the Project regarding the generation or exposure of persons on or off site to excessive ground-borne vibration; (11) NO-6, significant and unavoidable impacts with operation of the Project as it would generate increased local traffic volumes that could cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in existing residential areas along the major Project site access routes; (12) NO-7, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on noise during football games and concerts at the proposed stadium resulting in temporary increases in ambient noise levels that could adversely affect surrounding residents for the duration of a game or concert; (13) NO-8, less than significant impacts from Project exposure of residents and visitors to excessive noise levels from flights from San Francisco International Airport such that the noise would be disruptive or cause annoyance; and (14) less than significant cumulative noise and vibration impacts.

Tower Relocations/Height Increases/Conversion of Office Use to Neighborhood Retail Use

These proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the overall nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The proposed height increases might result in a slightly greater amount of construction activity, but these modest increases would not result in significant increases in noise impacts associated with the construction activities and would be within the scope of noise impacts expected for the overall Project. While the location of the three towers would change, the number of towers would remain the same and the towers would be located within the area analyzed for construction noise impacts in the FEIR. The office to retail land use conversion would reduce the overall amount of development because 6,000 square feet of retail space would be substituted for 15,500 square feet of office space. This reduction in development would offset any minor increase in construction activity related to the proposed height increase. Thus, no new noise construction impacts would be expected as a result of these proposed Project modifications.

Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The change in phasing of Harney Way improvements would change the construction timing of the planned improvements, but would not increase construction noise impacts assumed in the FEIR analysis. Revisions to Gilman Avenue would modify the street configuration but would not increase the scope of construction and thus construction noise impacts would not increase. The relocation of the on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage would increase the number of spaces assumed in the garage. The Project Sponsor has stated it is likely that these spaces would be accommodated through space allocation within the same garage footprint that could be assumed for the garage. Thus, the overall amount of construction noise would not be expected to significantly increase. Moreover, the reduction in the amount of office space at CP would offset the potential for other slight increases in construction impacts such as those associated with the increased heights. Consequently, no additional construction impacts would be expected.

The FEIR assumed that sensitive residential receptors in and outside the Project area would be exposed to construction-related noise and vibration impacts and operational traffic noise impacts. Under the FEIR, this was identified as significant and unavoidable, and the Project approvals included adoption of all identified feasible mitigation measures to reduce these noise- and vibration-related impacts. This impact will remain the same under the proposed Project modifications. The proposed Project modifications would result in similar sensitive residential receptor exposure to construction and operational noise and vibration impacts and would not alter these assumptions or conclusions.

Therefore, the Project modifications would not change or alter any of the FEIR's findings with respect to noise and vibration impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable with mitigation, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR noise and vibration cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.9 Cultural and Paleontological Resources

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) CP-1a, less than significant impacts on the significance of an historical resource during construction at Candlestick Point; (2) CP-1b, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, due to a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource at HPS Phase II; (3) CP-1, significant and unavoidable impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, due to a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource at the combined Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II (Project); (4) CP-2a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American, Chinese fishing camp, and maritime-related archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources, with construction at HPS Phase II; (6) CP-2, less than significant impacts, with
implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of archaeological resources, including prehistoric Native American resources, Chinese fishing camps, and maritime related resources with construction at Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II combined (7) CP-3a, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resources during construction at Candlestick Point; (8) CP-3b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resources during construction at HPS Phase II; (9) CP-3c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements activities, including in-water activities; (10) CP-3d, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during pile driving associated with construction of the Yosemite Slough bridge, shoreline improvements, and the marina improvements (11) CP-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, on the significance of a paleontological resource during construction activities associated with the Candlestick Point and HPS Phase II Project; and (4) less than significant cumulative archaeological and paleontological impacts and significant and unavoidable cumulative historical resource impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in any changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increase would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space, which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (EIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90.) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in additional excavation or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. Consequently, there would be no changes to the Project's effects related to cultural and paleontological resources. The mitigation measures have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's cultural and paleontological resources impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or significant and unavoidable with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR cultural and paleontological resources cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant for archeological and paleontological impacts and significant and unavoidable for historical resource impacts.

4.10 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) HZ-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to known contaminants during construction activities; (2) HZ-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to previously unidentified contaminants during construction; (3) HZ-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from off-site transport and disposal of contaminated soil and groundwater during construction; (4) HZ-4, less than significant impacts from installation of underground utilities; (5) HZ-5, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from installation of foundation support piles; (6) HZ-6, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from soil handling, stockpiling, and transport within the project site boundaries during construction; (7) HZ-7, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from contaminated surface runoff from construction sites; (8) HZ-8, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous material releases that have not been fully remediated (9) HZ-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials in conjunction with limited remediation activities during construction of the Yosemite Slough Bridge; (10) HZ-10, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials during construction of shoreline improvements; (11) HZ-11, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to hazardous materials while constructing infrastructure on Navy-owned property; (12) HZ-12, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from remediation activities conducted in conjunction with development activities at HPS Phase II early transfer parcels; (13) HZ-13, less than significant impacts from exposures to hazardous materials contamination during construction of off-site roadway improvements; (14) HZ-14, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure of ecological receptors to hazardous materials from construction activities; (15) HZ-15, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure to naturally occurring asbestos from construction activities; (16) HZ-16, less than significant impacts from exposure to hazardous materials in buildings and structures; (17) HZ-17, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from exposure of workers to hazardous materials during construction; (18) HZ-18, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction activities with potential to generate hazardous air emissions within one-quarter mile of a school; (19) HZ-19, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from release of contaminants from historic uses or fill; (20) HZ-20, less than significant impacts from routine use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials during Project construction; (21) HZ-21, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from routine maintenance of properties; (22) HZ-22, less than significant impacts from routine use, storage, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials during Project operation; (23) HZ-23, less than significant impacts from exposure to hazardous materials caused by upset or accident conditions; (24) HZ-24, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from hazardous air emissions associated with R&D uses within one-guarter mile of a school; (25) HZ-25, no impacts from safety hazards from conflicts with airport land use plans; (26) HZ-26, no impact from safety hazards from proximity to private air strips; (27) HZ-27, less than significant impact from fire hazards or conflicts with emergency response and

evacuation plans; and (28) less than significant cumulative impacts from hazards and hazardous materials.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space, which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation and operational activities would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (EIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in additional excavation or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. Additionally, none of these modifications would involve new or increased use of hazardous materials. Consequently, there would be no changes to the Project's effects related to hazards and hazardous materials. The mitigation measures have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's hazards and hazardous materials impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR hazards or hazardous materials cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant.

4.11 Geology and Soils

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) GE-1, 1a, 1b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures from construction on soil erosion; (2) GE-2, 2a, 2b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on settlement from dewatering activities; (3) GE-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on destabilization of bedrock from rock removal activities; (4) GE-4, 4a, 4b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced groundshaking; (5) GE-5, 5a, 5b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced ground failure: (6) GE-6, 6a, 6b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to seismically induced landslides; (7) GE-7, 7a, 7b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to shoreline instability; (8) GE-8, 8a, 8b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to landslides; (9) GE-9, 9a, 9b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to

damage from settlement; (10) GE-10, 10a, 10b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to expansive soils; (11) GE-11, 11a, 11b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on exposing people and structures to corrosive soils; (12) GE-12, no impact from surface fault rupture; (13) GE-13, no impact from the use of soils incapable of supporting septic tanks or alternative wastewater systems; (14) GE-14, no impact from the destruction of unique geologic features; and (15) less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, to cumulative geology and soils impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, this potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space which would reduce the overall construction. The FEIR assumed that excavation and grading would occur across the entire development areas of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Generally, the FEIR acknowledged that Project construction activities would involve extensive construction to accommodate new development and site preparation could include deep excavations for large structures, installation of foundation piles, trenching for utilities, grading and compaction and other earth-disturbing activities. (FEIR, pp. III.K-57, K-90) Thus, these Project modifications would not result in grading or other land alteration impacts that were not anticipated in the FEIR. (See, Exhibit Q, CP Development Co. Excavation Quantities Memo.) Consequently, there would be no changes to The mitigation measures and regulatory the Project's effects related to geology and soils. requirements summarized in the FEIR have been designed to address to potential impacts at any depth of excavation, grading, or construction activities. Therefore, the Project modifications would not result in any changes in the FEIR's geology and soils impact conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR geology and soils cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation measures.

4.12 Hydrology and Water Quality

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) HY-1, 1a, 1b, 1c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction regarding compliance with water quality standards and waste discharge requirements; (2) HY-2, less than significant impacts from construction on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge; (3) HY-3, less than significant impacts from construction on erosion and siltation; (4) HY-4, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on flooding; (5) HY-5, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on storm sever system capacity; (6) HY-6, 6a, 6b, 6c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on storm sever system capacity; (6) HY-6, 6a, 6b, 6c, less than significant impacts of the Yosemite Slough Bridge, from project operations regarding compliance with water quality standards

and waste discharge requirements; (7) HY-7, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on water quality; (8) HY-8, no impact from project operations on groundwater supplies and groundwater recharge; (9) HY-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on erosion or siltation effects; (10) HY-10, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on flooding from surface runoff; (11) HY-11, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, from project operations on storm sewer system capacity; (12) HY-12, 12a, 12b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, related to placing housing in a flood hazard area; (13) HY-13, 13a, 13b, 13c, less than significant impacts at Candlestick and the Yosemite Slough Bridge and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, at HPS Phase II related to placing structures within a flood hazard zone; (14) HY-14, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation, regarding other flood risks; (15) HY-15, less than significant impacts related to seiche, tsunami, and mudflows; (16) less than significant cumulative hydrology and water quality impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project. the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units, or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Although the increases in height may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the proposed reduction in office space which would reduce the overall construction. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The Project modifications would not involve significant additional grading, construction, other land alteration impacts, or new operational activities that were not anticipated in the FEIR, because these modifications involve relocation of certain approved Project components, modest height increases for approved building sites, and changes in the timing and configuration of off-site roadway improvements. The FEIR assumed that excavation, construction, and operational activities would occur across the entire development area of the Project site and the off-site improvement areas. Additionally the FEIR mitigation measures and compliance with the regulatory requirements for water guality, runoff control, and stormwater management will continue to ensure that Project impacts are mitigated in accordance with the FEIR analysis and conclusions. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified impacts with respect to hydrology and water quality impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR hydrology and water quality cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.13 Biological Resources

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) BI-1, no construction impact on regional conservation plans; (2) BI-2, less than significant impacts from construction on common species and habitat; (3) BI-3a and 3b, no construction impact on sensitive plants; (4) BI-4a, 4b, 4c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures,

from construction on waters of the United States and navigable waters; (5) BI-5a, 5b, no construction impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on eelgrass beds; (6) BI-6a, 6b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on sensitive bird species; (7) BI-7a, 7b. less than significant impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on foraging habitat for raptors; (8) BI-8a, 8b, less than significant impacts from construction on the western red bat; (9) BI-9a, 9b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on marine mammals and fish; (10) BI-10a, 10b, 10c, less than significant impacts from construction on mollusks; (11) BI-11a, 11b, 11c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on special-status fish species; (12) BI-12a, 12b, 12c, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on essential fish habitat; (13) BI-13a, 13b, less than significant impacts at Candlestick and less than significant impact, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on wildlife movement; (14) BI-14a, 14b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on local plans and policies; (15) BI-15a, 15b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II from construction on contaminated soils or sediments; (16) BI-16a, 16b, less than significant impacts from project operations on sensitive birds and animals; (17) BI-17a, 17b, no impact from project operations on nesting American peregrine falcons; (18) BI-18a, 18b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II, from project operations on sensitive aquatic species, mollusks, and designated essential fish habitat; (19) BI-19a, 19b, no impact at Candlestick and less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, at HPS Phase II, from project operations on contaminated sediments; (20) BI-20a, 20b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on the movement of bird species; (21) BI-21a, 21b, less than significant, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on local plans and policies; (22) BI-22, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on specialstatus and/or legally protected species; (23) BI-23, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on sensitive habitats; (24) BI-24, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on wetlands and jurisdictional waters; (25) BI-25, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on fish or wildlife movement; (26) BI-26, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on local plans and policies; and (27) less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, to cumulative biological resource impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall location of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, or the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Even with the proposed Project modifications, development (construction and operational activities) would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. In

particular, the proposed tower relocations would shift the towers to sites previously identified for development. Thus, the new locations were fully considered in the analysis, conclusions and mitigation measures in the FEIR. The revised location for Tower G would be in a location previously occupied by the stadium. The stadium has been demolished and the site is devoid of vegetation. (See Exhibit K, p. 5.) Thus, there are no biological resources on this site. Consequently, the proposed tower relocations and other proposed Project modifications would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of a previously identified biological resource impacts. Additionally the FEIR mitigation measures and compliance with the regulatory requirements designed to protect and mitigate for impacts to biological resources will continue to ensure that Project impacts are mitigated in accordance with the FEIR analysis and conclusions. All impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR biological resource cumulative impact conclusions would not change.

4.14 Public Services

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) PS-1, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on police protection; (2) PS-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from project operations on police protection; (3) PS-3, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from construction on fire protection and emergency medical services; (4) PS-4, less than significant impacts from project operations on fire protection and emergency medical services; (5) PS-5, no impact from construction on schools; (6) PS-6, less than significant impacts from project operations on library services; (8) PS-8, less than significant impacts from project operations on library services; and (9) less than significant cumulative impacts, except for the project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts on police services.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although certain Project modification such as the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, other modifications may slightly reduce construction activities. In any event, the overall amount of development and number of residential units at CP would be consistent with that analyzed in the FEIR such that no significant increase in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Consequently, there would be no increase in the demand for public services. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change or alter the FEIR's findings with respect to public service impacts. Project impacts would be required. Additionally,

the FEIR public service cumulative impact conclusions would continue to be less than significant except for the Project's contribution of significant impacts on police services.

4.15 Recreation

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) RE-1, less than significant impacts as construction of the parks, recreational uses, and open space proposed by the Project would not result in substantial adverse physical environmental impacts beyond those analyzed and disclosed in the EIR; (2) RE-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, as implementation of the Project would not increase the use of existing parks and recreational facilities that would cause the substantial physical deterioration of the facilities to occur or to be accelerated, nor would it result in the need for, new or physically altered park or recreational facilities; (3) RE-3, less than significant impacts, as implementation of the Project would decrease the size of Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA) but would not, overall, adversely affect the recreational opportunities offered by that park, nor would it substantially adversely affect windsurfing opportunities at the Project site; and (4) less than significant cumulative recreation impacts.

Tower Relocations

The FEIR and 2010 Project approvals included the towers proposed for relocation, thus the towers are not a new Project element. The proposed tower relocations would occur in areas planned for development and would not affect the location, amount, use, or type of park and open space approved within the Project. Additionally, the proposed tower relocations would not affect plans for the reconfiguration and improvement of the CPSRA and would not affect use of the park. The CPSRA General Plan as amended in 2013 acknowledges that the park is located in an intensely urban area surrounded by industrial and residential uses, and, formerly, the stadium. (See Exhibit L.) The State Park and Recreation Commission Resolution 1-2013 acknowledged that "the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands and other areas with a large mixed use development." (See Exhibit L.) The CPSRA General Plan describes the vision and role of the park as "an urban state park" where its "urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend." (See Exhibit L.) The Plan notes that the "proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a 'green front lawn' for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences." (See Exhibit L.) Thus, the State Park and Recreation Department, in establishing goals and objectives for the park, has recognized that the park must be designed to function with the development. As such, the new surrounding development would be compatible with

its recreational goals for the park. The tower relocations will change the location of three towers but not the overall planned development and the development and park would remain compatible.

Towers J and K would be relocated within Candlestick Point South. (Exhibit C.) These towers would move approximately 100 feet closer to the CPSRA, but this relatively modest change would not be noticeable in the context of the larger development. Intervening development with lower heights in Candlestick Point South would continue to separate the towers from the CPSRA. Thus, the modest relocation of these towers would not adversely affect use of the CPSRA.

As shown on Exhibit K, p.1, Tower G would be a minimum of 600 feet from the closest point to one corner of CPSRA in the area known as the "Last Port" which parallels Harney Way. The relocated Tower G would be approximately 1,860 feet from the area of the park known as "Wind Meadow" and 1,682 feet from the area known as the Last Rubble." (Exhibit K, p.1). Given these distances from the CPSRA, the dense urban context that would be created by the approved Project, the intervening streets (Harney Way and Arelious Walker), landscaping and other development (CP south) between this tower and the park, the relocation of Tower G would not interfere with use of CPSRA. Tower G would be part of the large, dense CP Center and would fit within the urban context approved for development adjacent to the CPSRA. Moreover, Tower G would be located on a site formerly occupied by the football stadium, which was a dominant feature near the CPSRA and visible from many areas in the CPSRA. (Exhibit K, pp.1-4.) Scenic views from the park to the water would not be affected by the relocated Tower G, which would be located behind the viewer. Thus, the proposed location of Tower G would not contribute to the deterioration or degradation of the CPSRA or reduce it recreational opportunities.

Height Increases

The proposed modifications to allow modest height increases at CP Center would not result in any changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of construction or operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, or the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial development. Development would continue to occur on the same areas of the site analyzed for development in the FEIR. The proposed height increases are modest and would be limited to the CP Center so that no height increases are proposed near the CPSRA. No changes to the Project's park and open space system are proposed. These proposed changes would not affect the use of the CPSRA or any of its improvements.

<u>Relocation of Displaced On-Street Parking Spaces to the CP Center Garage; Change in Phasing of</u> <u>Harney Way Off-Site Improvements; Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue</u>

These proposed modifications would have not affect recreation areas and do not implicate the FEIR recreation significance criteria.

Consequently, the relocated towers would not result in new significant impacts or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts related to recreation. No new

mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, with the relocated towers, the FEIR recreation cumulative impact conclusions would not change.

4.16 Utilities

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) UT-1, less than significant impacts regarding the need for new or expanded water entitlements and resources; (2) UT-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding the need for construction of new or expanded water treatment or conveyance facilities; (3) UT-3, 3a, 3b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding the need for expansion of off-site wastewater conveyance facilities; (4) UT-4, less than significant impacts regarding the potential to exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board; (5) UT-5, 5a, 5b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding construction-related solid waste generation; (6) UT-6, 6a, 6b, less than significant impacts regarding disposal of construction-related hazardous waste; (7) UT-7, 7a, 7b, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding operational solid waste generation; (8) UT-8, 8a, 8b, less than significant impacts regarding disposal of operational generated hazardous waste; (9) UT-9, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, regarding compliance with solid waste regulations; (10) UT-10, less than significant impacts regarding dry utility infrastructure and service capacity; (11) less than significant cumulative utility impacts.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the net reduction in office space which would reduce overall construction. Additionally, the minor increases in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Consequently, there would be either minor or no increase in the demand for utility services from construction or operational activities. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not alter the FEIR's findings with respect to utility service impacts. Project impacts would remain less than significant or less than significant with mitigation and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR utility cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.17 Energy

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) ME-1, less than significant impact from energy use during construction; (2) ME-2, less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of electricity in a wasteful manner for the operation of buildings constructed under the Project; (3) ME-3, less than significant

impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of natural gas in a wasteful manner for the operation of buildings constructed under the Project; (4) ME-4 less than significant impacts, with implementation of mitigation measures, from the use of large amount of energy in a wasteful manner for vehicle trips associated with the Project; and (5) less than significant cumulative impacts related to energy use during project construction and operation.

Proposed Modifications

The proposed Project modifications would not result in changes to the overall location of the Project, the overall extent of operational activities, the nature of the Project land uses, the overall number of housing units or an increase in the square footage of commercial space, or overall Project population and employment projections (as discussed above). Although the height increases may slightly increase construction activities, these potential construction increases would be offset by the net reduction in office space which would reduce overall construction. Additionally, any potential minor increases in construction activities would be done by workers already working on the site and thus would not generate additional workers. Although some of these changes may slightly increase energy use and some may slightly decrease energy use, on balance Project energy use would be substantially as estimated in the FEIR because the proposed Project modifications are not the type or scale of modifications that would substantially affect energy use. Therefore, the proposed Project modifications would not change the FEIR's findings with respect to energy impacts. All Project energy impacts would be required. Additionally, the FEIR energy cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

4.18 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The FEIR determined that the Project would result in the following level of impacts: (1) GC-1, less than significant impact, as the Project would not result in a substantial contribution to global climate change by increasing GHG emissions in a manner that conflicts with the state goal of reducing GHG emissions in California to 1990 levels by 2020 (e.g., a substantial contribution to global climate change) or conflict with the San Francisco's Climate Action Plan by impeding implementation of the local GHG reduction goals established by the San Francisco 2008 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Ordinance; (2) less than significant cumulative greenhouse gas emissions impacts.

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed Project modifications for consistency with the FEIR air quality findings and the discussion below reflects their analysis and conclusions. (See Exhibit P.)

Tower Relocations

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed tower relocations and determined that the relocation of three towers would not affect the analysis of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions in the FEIR because the overall square footage of the Project would not be increased.

Height Increases

Ramboll Environ reviewed the proposed increase in maximum building height for three locations in CP Center and determined that this modification would not affect the analysis of GHG emissions in the FEIR because, while the massing of the buildings would increase, the overall square footage of the Project would not be increased. Because the models used in the FEIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage; there would not be a material difference in the way the emissions are estimated. Therefore, this Project revision would not change the analysis in the FEIR.

Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space

Ramboll Environ evaluated whether this conversion of office use to neighborhood retail use would increase the GHG emissions findings in the FEIR. To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail without increasing the total Project operational GHG emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated the 2020 GHG emissions associated with proposed 6,000 square feet of neighborhood retail using CalEEMod®. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air ARB's EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default as discussed in the Air Quality section above. In addition, the GHG emissions associated with energy incorporate the 2013 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24) and Pacific Gas and Electric's 2020 carbon intensity factor.

The Project GHG emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated for year 2020. In the analysis for this Addendum, Ramboll Environ determined the minimum square footage of the previously approved office land use that would require removal from the Project to ensure that the proposed increase in neighborhood retail would not increase Project GHG emissions. The land use GHG emissions for this analysis are calculated using the same methodology presented in F E I R Appendix S (Climate Change Technical Report). As presented in Exhibit P, Table 2, adding 6,000 square feet local-serving retail development to the Project without increasing the GHG emissions previously estimated in the FEIR would require a removal of at least 9,200 square feet of previously approved office land use. The CalEEMod® default trip rates does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the nature of the development plan. Therefore, the estimated GHG emissions for the proposed local-serving retail are conservative. Since the office use would be reduced by 15,500 square feet, no increase in GHG emissions above the emissions estimated in the FEIR would occur with this modification.

The construction emissions presented in the FEIR were calculated based on the Project specific construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed neighborhood retail would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the GHG emission comparison discussed above, the equivalent local-serving retail would be smaller in size than the office space proposed for removal/conversion. Therefore, converting office space to neighborhood-retail space would not generate increased GHG emissions associated with the construction activities analysis presented in the EIR.

Relocation of On-Street Parking Spaces to CP Center Garage

The proposed relocation of certain on-street parking to the CP Center garage is expected to have negligible effect on construction activity, because the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage either would not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. Consequently, there would be no change in the overall GHG emissions from that evaluated in the EIR.

Change in Phasing of Harney Way Off-Site Improvements

This proposed modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This proposed modification would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would spread the same amount of work spread over a longer time. Because this proposed modification only divides the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there would be no change to the GHG emissions.

Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue

The original cross-section proposed to widen the Gilman to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle – the curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. This modification reflects a reduction in construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway) that was analyzed in the FEIR. Consequently, there would be no increase in the overall GHG emissions from this proposed modification.

Accordingly, there would be no new impacts or increases in the severity of previously identified impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions and no new mitigation measures would be required. The impacts would remain less than significant, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the FEIR greenhouse gas emissions cumulative impact conclusions would remain less than significant.

5. Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, OCII concludes that the analysis and conclusions reached in the FEIR certified on June 3, 2010 remain valid, and that no supplemental environmental review is required for the proposed modifications to the Project. The modified Project would neither cause new significant impacts nor result in the substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the Project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the modified project would contribute considerably, and no new information has been put forward which shows that the modified Project would cause significant environmental impacts. Consequently, the Project changes do not require major revision of the FEIR, and the project sponsors may implement the proposed modifications without additional CEQA review,

consistent with California Public Resources Code Section 21166 and California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines) Section 15164. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond this Addendum.

Date of Determination:

2

0

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to state and local requirements.

Tiffany Bohee Executive Director Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure

Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

Date: February 5, 2016

CANDLESTICK POINT Proposed Project Revisions Associated with Development Plan Application for Sub-Phase 02-03-03 and Updates to Project Documents, Including: CP Major Phase 1 Application, CP Design for Development (D4D), CP Streetscape Master Plan, CP-HPS-Phase 2 MMRP, CP Transportation Plan

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)	
		Revision	
TIER 1: Substantive Project Revisions			
<u>1. Tower Relocation</u> : The sub-phase application proposes relocating Towers G, J and K. Tower G would be relocated within CP-02, but outside the approved tower zone. Tower J and K would be moved approximately 100 feet southeast. Tower K would remain in an approved tower zone and Tower K would be in a new fixed location.	D4D located Tower G in the approved tower location in the center of CP-02. D4D located Towers J and K in CP-South, approximately 100 feet north of the proposed location.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Figure 6.1 • Figure 6.5 • Figure 6.6 • Figure 6.7 • Figure 6.8 D4D:	
		Table 4.3Figure 4.3Figure 8.1	
2. <u>Height Increase – CP Center at corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to increase the height of the building at CP Center on the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet. The Film Arts Center will be developed at this location.	D4D limits height at this location to 85 feet.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Figure 6.1 • Figure 6.3 • Figure 6.4 • Figure 6.5 • Figure 6.6 • Figure 6.7 • Figure 6.8 D4D:	
		Figure 4.3Figure 8.1	

Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

3 Height Increase – CP Center at corner of Arelious Walker Drive and Harney Way. The sub-phase	D4D limits height at this location to 65 feet	Major Phase 1 Application
application proposes to increase the height of the CP center at the corner of Arelious Walker Drive and	D+D mints height at this location to 05 leet.	• Section 1.1
Harney Way from 65 feet to 80 feet. A building containing a hotel office and performance venue floor		• Section 1.1
space will be developed at this location.		D4D [.]
		• Figure 4.3
		• Figure 8.1
4. Height Increase – CP Center on both Sides of Harney Way & Ingerson Avenue at CP Center: The sub-	D4D limits height at this location to 65 feet.	Major Phase 1 Application
phase application proposes to increase the height of buildings along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue		• Section 1.1
from 65 feet to 80 feet. These buildings will be developed with retail land uses at ground floor, with a		• Figure 6.1
maximum of five stories of residential or commercial uses above. The D4D defines a maximum		• Figure 6.3
percentage of the block's developable area that can be built within the 80 ft height zone, and includes		• Figure 6.4
additional guidelines encouraging buildings to be designed with varied height to add architectural interest		• Figure 6.5
to the streetscape.		• Figure 6.6
		• Figure 6.7
		• Figure 6.8
		D4D:
		• Section 4.2.2
		• Figure 4.3
		• Section 5.2.2
		• Figure 5.5
		• Section 5.3.2
		• Figure 5.7
		• Section 5.4.2
		• Figure 5.9
		• Figure 8.1
<u>5. Conversion of Office Space to Neighborhood Retail Space:</u> The sub-phase application proposes to	Project approvals provide for 150,000 square feet	Major Phase 1 Application
convert 15,500 square feet of entitled office space in Candlestick Point to 6,000 square feet of	of office and 125,000 Square feet of neighborhood	• Section 1.1
neighborhood retail space. This will result in the neighborhood retail floor space increasing from 125,000 square fact to	retail use at Candiestick Point	• Figure 6.1
134,500 square feet.		• Table 6.1
		Transportation Plan:
		• Table 4
		• Table 14
6. <u>Relocation of On-Street Parking</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to relocate 269 on-street spaces	430 on-street spaces	Major Phase 1 Application
of the planned 430 on-street spaces to the CP Center garage.		• Section 1.1
		• Section 8.6
		• Figure 8.7

Exhibit A: 02/05/16: Tier 1 Project Revisions

7. <u>Harney Way Revised Off-Site Phasing:</u> The sub-phase application proposes to divide construction of the off-site Harney Way roadway improvements into two phases: 1) from Arelious Walker Drive to Executive Park Boulevard East, and 2) from Executive Park Boulevard East to Thomas Mellon Drive. The sidewalk and cycle track along Harney Way would be completed as originally the planned from Arelious Walker Drive to Thomas Mellon Drive.	First phase of Harney Way improvements extended to Thomas Mellon Drive.	Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1 • Section 2.5 • Section 8.1 MMRP: • MM-TR-16
8. <u>Gilman Avenue Revised Cross Section</u> : The sub-phase application proposes to revise the cross section configuration to retain 15-foot sidewalks	Two lanes of travel in each direction; on- street parking on both sides of street; 12-foot sidewalks.	Infrastructure Plan: • Section 2.1.3 A • Figure 2.1.3 Major Phase 1 Application • Section 1.1
and on-street parking on both sides of street. Only one travel lane in each direction and a center turn lane would be provided. The intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker would be signal controlled.	All-way stop sign at the intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker.	 Section 8.1 MMRP: MM-TR-23.1 Transportation Plan:
		 Figure 7M Infrastructure Plan: Section 2.1.3 E Figure 2.1.5

Date: February 5, 2016

CANDLESTICK POINT

Tier 2 and Tier 3 Revisions Associated with Development Plan Application for Sub-Phase 02-03-03 and Updates to Project Documents, Including: CP Major Phase 1 Application, CP Design for Development (D4D), CP Streetscape Master Plan, CP-HPS-Phase 2 MMRP, CP Transportation Plan

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s) Revision
TIER 2: D4D. Streetscape Plan. and Major Phase 1 Applica	tion Refinements and Clarificati	ions
1. <u>Additional Signage Provisions</u> : Provisions amended to provide a greater level of guidance for signage, specifically in relation to intent, variety, style, orientation, lighted signs, safety, new technology signs, temporary signage and prohibited signage. Specific standards for commercial and residential signage are removed.	D4D: • Existing provisions in Section 4.3.2 I	D4D: • Section 4.4, p. 138-139
2. <u>Podium Heights</u> : Add provisions to the D4D to clarify massing and bulk controls for tower podiums and add maximum podium heights for each tower.	D4D: • No existing provisions	D4D: • Table 4.3 (p. 84), • Section 4.3.2 (p. 87) • Table 4.5 (p. 87)
3. <u>Ground Floor Retail Height In Mixed Use Residential District</u> : Add provisions to the D4D minimum floor-to-floor height of 15 feet for non-residential uses.	 D4D: Figure 4.6 – Minimum retail height of 12 feet for Mixed Use High Rise Section 4.3.1 B – All retail spaces shall be a minimum of 12 feet height 	D4D: • Figures 4.7 to 4.12 (p 97 to 102) • Section 4.3.1 (A) (p. 110) • Section 4.3.1 (B) (p. 116) Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) • Section 6.1 (p. 52)
4. <u>Parking Garage Entry</u> and <u>Curb Cuts Widths</u> : Revise D4D to allow a maximum of 27 foot width for garage entrance and curb cuts if needed to accommodate large service vehicles and emergency services.	 D4D Section 4.3.1 D (p. 128) – Maximum combined parking & loading entry width 24 ft Section 4.4.3 (p. 152) – Maximum curb cut width 24 ft 	D4D: • Section 4.3.1 D (p. 123) • Section 4.4.3 (p. 144) Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) • Section 8.7 (p. 79)
5. <u>CP Center Internal Access</u> : Eliminate extension of Earl Street and 8 th Street into CP Center and eliminate Bill Walsh Street. Add four pedestrian only corridors. Allow service vehicles to use one pedestrian corridor.	 D4D: Various figures, images and location plans show the extension of Earl Street and 8th Street into CP Center, with a new Bill Walsh Street. 	 D4D: Figure 2.1 (p. 21) Image: Density of residential and services is clustered around transit stops (p. 23)

Exhibit B Page 1 of 10

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		 Revision Image: Parks and Open Space Illustrative Plan (p. 24) Figure 2.2: Parks and Open Space Network (p. 25) Figure 2.3 (p. 27) Figure 2.4 (p. 29) Figure 2.5 (p. 33) Figure 2.6 (p. 37) Figure 2.7 (p. 39) Figure 3.1 (p. 47) Figure 3.2 (p. 49) Figure 3.2 (p. 49) Figure 3.3: Public Streets Network (p. 57) Figure 3.4: Parks and Open Space (p. 64) Figure 3.10: Conceptual Plan – Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (p. 72) Figure 4.1: Development Blocks (p. 77) Figure 4.2: Land Use Districts (p. 79) Figure 4.3: Building Heights (p. 85) Figure 4.4: Street Wall Conditions (p. 94) Figure 5.1: Character Neighborhoods (p. 155) Figure 5.6: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (p. 177) Figure 5.7: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 183) Figure 7.1: Block Plan (p. 201) Figure 7.2: Building Heights (p. 205) Figure 7.4: Iamestown Urban Design
		(p. 209)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	 Project Document(s) Revision Figure 8.1: Building Heights – Shipyard South R&D Option (p. 214) Figure 9.3: Candlestick Center Block Plan (p. 228) Location Plan (p. 35) Location Plan (p. 50) Location Plan (p. 51) Image: Location of Retail Streets (p. 59) Image: Location of Boulevard Streets (p. 60) Image: Location of Local Streets (p. 61) Image: Location of Alice Griffith Community Park (p. 65) Image: Location of Candlestick Community Park – Final location to be determined in the future (p. 66) Image: Location of Mini-wedge Community Park (p. 68) Image: Location of Jamestown Hillside Community Park (p. 69) Image: Location of State Recreation Area and Bay Trail (p. 70) Location Plan (p. 95) Location Plan (p. 97) Location Plan (p. 99) Location Plan (p. 101)
		 Location Plan (p. 101) Location Plan (p. 102)
		 Location Plan (p. 102)
		• Location Plan (p. 104)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		• Image: Street block orientated at 45° to
		prevailing winds (p. 106)
		• Location Plan (p. 150)
		 Location Plan (p. 151) Location Plan (p. 156)
		• Location Plan (p. 150)
		 Location Plan (p. 104) Location Plan (p. 174)
		• Location Plan (p. 184)
		• Section 5.3.3: Candlestick Center –
		Urban Design (pp. 194-195)
		Major Phase 1 Application:
		• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
		• Figure 2.1 (p. 10)
		• Figure 2.2 (p. 12)
		• Figure 2.3 (p. 14)
		• Figure 2.4 (p. 17)
		• Figure 2.5 (p. 18)
		• Figure 2.6 (p. 19)
		• Figure 2.7 (p. 20)
		• Figure 2.8 (p. 21)
		• Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
		• Figure 5.1 (p. 36)
		• Figure 5.2 (p. 37)
		• Figure 6.1 (p. 40)
		• Figure 6.2 (p. 42)
		• Figure 6.3 (p. 43)
		• Figure 6.4 (p. 44)
		• Figure 6.5 (p. 45)
		• Figure 6.6 (p. 46)
		• Figure 6.7 (p. 47)
		• Figure 6.8 (p. 48)
		• Figure 7.1 (p. 54)

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		• Figure 8.1 (p. 67)
		• Figure 8.2 (p. 69)
		• Location Plan (p. 70)
		• Location Plan (p. 71)
		• Location Plan (p. 72)
		• Location Plan (p. 73)
		• Figure 8.3 (p. 74)
		• Figure 8.4 (p. 75)
		• Figure 8.5 (p. 76)
		• Figure 8.6 (p. 77)
		• Figure 9.1 (p. 83)
		• Figure 9.2 (p. 85)
		• Figure 9.3 (p. 86)
		• Figure 9.4 (p. 87)
		• Figure 9.5 (p. 88)
		• Figure 9.6 $(p, 89)$
		• Figure 9.7 (p. 90)
		 Figure 9.8 (p. 91)
		• Figure 10.1 (p. 94)
		• Figure 10.5 (p. 100)
		- I Iguie 10.5 (p. 100)
6. Arelious Walker Entry Plaza: Add D4D provisions encouraging a vehicle/pedestrian entry plaza.	D4D:	D4D
	No existing provisions	• Section 5.3.2 S8 and G5 (p. 182)
		• Figure 5.7: Candlestick Center Urban
7. CP Enter Parking Garage Entry and Curb Cuts Widths: Add D4D provisions to allow garage entry and curb cuts widths up to	D4D:	Design (p. 105)
50 feet. All one parking garage entry and associated curb cut larger than 27 feet on Ingerson. Provide for a safe and comfortable	• Section 4.3.1 D, p. 128 – Maximum	• Section 4.3.1 D: Parking Structure (p.
pedestrian and bicyclist crossing.	combined parking & loading entry	123)
	width 24 ft	• Section 4.4.3: Loading, Mechanical
	• Section 4.4.3, p. 152 – Maximum curb	Equipment and Meters (p. 144)
	cut width 24 ft	• Section 5.5.2 57. Farking Structure

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s) Revision
8. <u>Grocery Store Garage Door and Curb Cut Widths</u> : Add D4D provisions allowing a garage door and curb cut width greater than 27 feet for the grocery store to accommodate a loading dock. Incorporates requirements for screening and design features to ensure a safe and comfortable pedestrian and bicyclist crossing.	 D4D: Section 4.3.1 D (p. 128) – Maximum combined parking & loading entry width 24 ft Section 4.4.3 (p. 152) – Maximum curb cut width 24 ft 	D4D: • Section 5.2.2 G3: Grocery Store (p. 171)
9. <u>Blank Building Facades</u> : Revise D4D provisions to allow blank facades where floor area is below grade or for essential building service area and to avoid blank facades along paseos.	D4D:Blank facades prohibited.	 D4D: Section 4.3.1: Retail and Mixed Use (p. 116) Major Phase 1 Application: Section 6.6 (p. 52)
10. <u>Remove Parking Space Dimensions</u> : Remove D4D minimum parking space dimension requirements.	 D4D: Parallel parking spaces shall be a minimum of 7 ft by 22 ft; angled parking spaces shall be a minimum of 9 ft by 18 ft. 	D4D:Section 4.5.2: On-street Parking
11. <u>Cinema and Grocery Store Parking Ratio</u> : Update D4D to include off-street car parking ratios for Cinema and Grocery Store.	D4D:No existing provisions	 D4D: Table 4.7 (p. 140) Major Phase 1 Application: Table 8.3 (p. 87) Transportation Plan Table 9 (p. 60)
12. <u>Hotel Location</u> : Update D4D to reflect new hotel location at the corner of Harney Way and Arelious Walker.	 D4D:Hotel in location in middle of CP Center, but indicates the location may move. Maximum of two curb-cuts allowed on Earl Street or 8th Street for the provision of passage drop off and loading. 	 D4D: Section 4.3.1 B: Commercial – Hotel (p. 119) Figure 5.6: Candlestick Center Illustrative Site Plan (p. 177) Section 5.3.3 G3: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 195) Figure 5.10: Candlestick Center Urban Design (p. 197)

Exhibit B Page 6 of 10

Proposed Revision	Existing Provision	Project Document(s)
		Revision
		Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) • Figure 2.2 (p. 12) • Figure 6.1 (p. 40) • Table 6.1 (p. 41) • Figure 6.6 (p. 45) • Figure 6.7 (p. 46)
		• Figure 6.8 (p. 47)
13. Width of Pedestrian Path to Water Mews in Mid-Block Breaks: D4D provision added to require a minimum 10 foot width for	D4D:	D4D:
pedestrian path to water mews.	No existing provisions	• Section 4.6.2: Mid-block Breaks (p. 147)
14. <u>Alice Griffith Outdoor Seating</u> : Add D4D provision to encourage outdoor seating in large sidewalk areas at the northern and southern ends of Egbert Avenue.	D4D: • No existing provisions	 D4D: Section 5.1.1: Alice Griffith General Description (p. 158)
15. <u>Alice Griffith Setbacks</u> : 9 foot setback to apply at Alice Griffith to properties fronting Donner Avenue, Fitzgerald Avenue and G Street	D4D: • 10 foot setback	 D4D: Section 5.1.2 S4: Setbacks to Donner Avenue Fitzgerald Avenue & G Street
16. <u>Wedge Park Phasing</u> : Accelerate development of Wedge Park 2a to Major Phase 1. Wedge Park 2b would remain in Major Phase 2.	Major Phase 1 Application: • Figure 2.9	Major Phase 1 Application: • Section 2.5 (p. 22-23) • Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
17. <u>Timing and Grading for Jamestown Avenue Improvements</u> : Reconstruction of Jamestown Avenue will end approximately 1,000 feet sooner than originally contemplated in order to avoid significant grade differences between the road and adjoining properties. Resurfacing of this section of roadway will be occur in Major Phase 2 along with the resurfacing of Jamestown to Third Street originally planned for Major Phase 2.	 Major Phase 1 Application: Figure 2.9 Infrastructure Plan: Section 2.1.3.C (no changes required) 	 Major Phase 1 Application: Section 2.5 (p. 22-23) Figure 2.9 (p. 22)

18. Bulb-outs: Several bulb-outs along Ingerson and Harney have been removed to accommodate SFFD and SFPUC concerns.	CP Streetscape Master Plan:	Major Phase 1 Application:
	• Figure 5.3	• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
	• Figure 5.4	
		CP Streetscape Master Plan:
		• Figure 5.4
		• Figure 5.5
19. Adjustment to CP-04 Boundary: The block depth in CP-04 would be increased to accommodate townhomes and this would	Major Phase 1 Application:	Major Phase 1 Application:
adjust the boundary of CP-04 approximately 100 feet southeast.	Major Phase 1 Application:	• Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5)
	• Section 1.1	• Figure 2.1 (p. 10)
	• Figure 2.1	• Figure 2.2 (p. 12)
	• Figure 2.2	• Figure 2.3 (p. 14)
	• Figure 2.3	• Figure 2.4 (p. 17)
	• Figure 2.4	• Figure 2.5 (p. 18)
	• Figure 2.5	• Figure 2.6 (p. 19)
	• Figure 2.6	• Figure 2.7 (p. 20)
	• Figure 2.7	• Figure 2.8 (p. 21)
	• Figure 2.8	• Figure 2.9 (p. 22)
	• Figure 2.9	• Figure 5.1 (p. 36)
	• Figure 5.1	• Figure 5.2 (p. 37)
	• Figure 5.2	• Figure 6.1 $(p, 40)$
	• Figure 6.1	• Figure 6.2 (p. 42)
	• Figure 6.2	• Figure 6.3 (p. 43)
	• Figure 6.3	• Figure 6.4 (p. 44)
	• Figure 6.4	• Figure 6.5 $(p, 45)$
	• Figure 6.5	• Figure 7.1 (p. 54)
	• Figure 6.6	• Figure 8.1 $(p. 67)$
	• Figure 6.7	• Figure 8.2 (p. 69)
	• Figure 6.8	• Location Plan (p. 70)
	• Figure 7.1	• Location Plan (p. 71)
	• Figure 8.1	• Location Plan (p. 72)
	• Figure 8.2	 Location Plan (p. 72)
	• Figure 8.3	• Figure 8.3 (\mathbf{p} 74)
	• Figure 8.4	• Figure 8.4 (n. 75)
	• Figure 8 5	• Figure 8.5 $(n, 76)$
	• Figure 8.6	= Figure 8.6 (p. 77)
	• Figure 9.1	= Figure 0.1 (p. 83)
	Figure 0.2	• Figure 9.1 (p. 65)
	• Figure 9.2	

	 Figure 9.3 Figure 9.4 Figure 9.5 Figure 9.6 Figure 9.7 Figure 9.8 Figure 9.9 Figure 9.10 Figure 10.1 Figure 10.5 	 Figure 9.2 (p. 85) Figure 9.3 (p. 86) Figure 9.4 (p. 87) Figure 9.5 (p. 88) Figure 9.6 (p. 89) Figure 9.7 (p. 90) Figure 9.8 (p. 91) Figure 10.1 (p. 94) Figure 10.5 (p. 100)
	• various Location Plans	
20. <u>Performance Venue Modification</u> : The CP Center performance venue square footage would be divided between two locations. Approximately 42,000 square feet would be located at Harney Way and Ingerson for a 1,200 seat Film Arts Center and approximately 33,000 square feet would be located on the lot with the hotel at the corner of Arelious Walker and Harney Way.	 Major Phase 1 Application: Section 2.2 Table 2.1 Figure 2.2 Table 6.1 Figure 6.1 Figure 6.6 Figure 6.7 Figure 6.8 Depicts the 75,000 sf arena / performance venue entitlement Transportation Plan: Table 2, p. 3 Table 4, p. 20 Table 14, p. 64 	Major Phase Application: • Section 2.2 (p. 11) • Figure 2.2 (p. 12) • Figure 6.1 (p. 40) • Table 6.1 (p. 41) • Figure 6.6 (p. 45) • Figure 6.7 (p. 46) • Figure 6.8 (p. 47) Transportation Plan: • Table 2, p. 3 • Table 4, p. 20 • Table 14, p. 64
21. <u>Street Width Changes:</u> The width of right-of-ways at Candlestick Point were widened to ensure a 26 foot unobstructed access for SF Fire Department vehicles.	 Transportation Plan: Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Gilman Avenue – 113 foot right-of-way Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way – 109 foot right-of-way B Street – 51 foot right-of-way Gilman Avenue, east of Harney Way – 51 foot right-of-way 	 Major Phase 1 Application: Section 1.1 (pp. 4-5) Section 8.2 (pp. 70-73) Transportation Plan: Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Gilman Avenue – 84 foot right-of-way Arelious Walker Drive between Ingerson Avenue and Harney Way

Exhibit B Page 9 of 10

22. <u>Building Height Percentages for Blocks with Multiple Height Zones:</u> Clarify building height massing for blocks with multiple	 Harney Way between Egbert Avenue and Donner Avenue – 58 foot right-of- way Ingerson Avenue between Harney Way and West Harney Way – 51 foot right- of-way D4D: 	 B Street – 56 foot right-of-way Gilman Avenue, east of Harney Way – 59 foot right-of-way Harney Way between Egbert Avenue and Donner Avenue – 78.5 foot right- of-way Ingerson Avenue between Harney Way and West Harney Way – 70 foot right- of-way D4D:
height zones by including a percentage of the developable block area that the higher height zone(s) cannot exceed.	No existing provision	• Section 4.2.2
		• Figure 4.3
Tier 3: Editorial Revisions to the D4D, Streetscape Plan, and Major Phase 1 Application		
1. <u>D4D Updates/Approvals Since 2010</u> : Remove reference to stadium, reflect implementation of Variant 2A, updates to reflect	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:
changes analyzed in Addendum 1, add certain mitigation measures from the FEIR, add neighborhood retail parking ratio		• Refer to attached change logs
2 DAD Relocation of Text: Jamestown provisions consolidated in new section 7. Shinyard South R&D variant consolidated in	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:
2. <u>D+D Refocation of Text</u> , satisfies to solution consolidated in new section 7. Singyard South R&D variant consolidated in new section 8. Block plans moved from section 5 to the Appendix	Refer to detailed attachment	 D4D. Befor to attached shange logs
new section 6. Dioek plans moved from section 5 to the Appendix.		• Refer to attached change logs
3. Clarifying Changes to Text, Tables, Figures, and Images in D4D: Clarify descriptions of project elements, interpretations of	Refer to detailed attachment	D4D:
certain standards, add cross-reference, update text and graphics to reflect current plan, delete repetition, add definitions and other		• Refer to attached change logs
minor changes that do not affect the location, type, density, or intensity of the development. See attached change log sheet.		
4. Updates and Edits to the Streetscape Master Plan: See attached change log sheet, including street furnishings and paving	Refer to detailed attachment	Streetscape Master Plan:
selections and the substitution of a deciduous rather than coniferous trees.		• Refer to attached change logs
5. Updates and Edits to the Major Phase 1 Application: See attached change log sheet, including update of Affordable Housing	Refer to detailed attachment	Major Phase 1 Application:
from 1025 units to 1560 units.		Refer to attached change logs

Notes:

- 1. The Transportation Plan and Infrastructure Plan were updated in July 2014 to reflect modifications to street cross sections and these modifications were approved by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (8/3/14 letter from Edward Reiskin, Director of Transportation)., San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (11/7/2014 letter from Michael Carlin, Deputy General Manager), and the San Francisco Fire Department (7/31/2014 letter from Joanne Hayes-White) in accordance with the approval process in the Interagency Cooperation Agreement.
- 2. As part of approval, obtain authority to update as necessary the FEIR tables and figures for the non-stadium variant 2a.

Exhibit B Page 10 of 10

Exhibit C: Tower Location Analysis Candlestick Point Design For Development _ Figure 4.3 Building Heights



Legend

- Fixed high-rise location IX Encouraged high-rise location Allowable high-rise location zone
 - Proposed high-rise location, 2015
- CP 02-03-04 SUB-PHASE BOUNDARY

Exhibit C Page 1 of 1

Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals



Exhibit D Page 1 of 3

Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals



Exhibit D Page 2 of 3

Exhibit D: Candlestick Center Mixed Use Height Visuals



Exhibit D Page 3 of 3



Exhibit E Page 1 of 5

Exhibit E: Candlestick Center Hotel Height Visual







Exhibit E Page 3 of 5





Exhibit E Page 4 of 5


Exhibit F: 12/14/15 Fehr & Peers Office to Retail Conversion Letter

June 25, 2015 (Updated December 14, 2015)

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Candlestick Point – Office to Local Serving Retail Conversion

Dear Joy and Lila,

The Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Since that time, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project. Variant 2A assumed the Candlestick Point site would include:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 6,225 residential dwelling units (includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith)
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail
- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 50,000 square feet of community-serving uses
- 10,000-seat arena¹

Since the Project has been approved, the project sponsor has requested that we study the conversion of office to 6,000 square feet of local serving retail.

To maintain the same number of peak hour vehicle trips as was forecasted in the EIR's transportation analysis, the proposed size of office to be converted to neighborhood-serving retail has been based on the number of PM peak hour vehicle trips 6,000 square feet of local

¹ The Draft Sub-Phase CP 02 03 04 Application proposes to replace the arena with a proposed performance venue/nightclub with no more than 5,000 seats. However, since it is uncertain whether this represents a negligible change in the project, or whether that must undergo a separate review and approval process, this analysis evaluates the currently-approved land uses, which include an arena and not the performance venue.

serving retail space would generate. **Table 1** documents the number of PM peak hour vehicle trips. The PM peak hour was chosen for this analysis because it represents the period when the retail space would be most active. As shown, based on the rates used in the EIR, 6,000 square feet of local serving retail would generate 19 peak hour trips. The same number of trips would be generated by 15,500 square feet of office space. Therefore, the proposed change would result in a total of 131,000 square feet of local serving retail and 134,500 square feet of office at the Candlestick Point site.

TABLE 1. OFFICE TO NEIGHBORHOOD-SERVING RETAIL	CONVERSION
TABLE I. OFFICE TO INLIGHDORHOOD-SERVING RETAIL	CONVERSION

Land Use	Size (ksf)	PM Peak Hour Trip Rate ¹	PM Peak Hour Trips	
Local Serving Retail	6	3.22	19	
Office	15.5	1.25	19	

Notes:

 Based on the effective vehicle trip generation rate used in the EIR, accounting for some internalization of trips that may occur within the development. This provides a conservative assumption by lowering the "credit" for external trip generation associated with the office and by using a "blended" rate for retail, which includes local serving and regional retail, resulting in a higher rate than simply using the effective rate for local serving retail only.
Fehr & Peers, 2015

For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

K 1

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

January 22, 2016

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Candlestick Point / Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Revised Parking Ratio Assessment (SF08-0407)

Dear Joy:

As you know, the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Redevelopment Plan EIR was certified in July 2010. The Project's Transportation Plan and EIR outlined specific maximum offstreet parking supply ratios that could be constructed associated with various land uses. The Project's EIR also included a discussion of forecasted peak parking demand and a forecast of the on- and off-street parking supply that would be constructed if the maximum amount of on- and off-street parking were constructed.

Since that time, as project plans and details have been developed, the amount of on-street parking has been substantially reduced compared to what was described in the EIR to accommodate better clearance for emergency vehicles as well as the sidewalk amenities that will be provided (e.g., fire hydrants, transit stops and shelters, ADA facilities, etc.) where parking may be precluded. Further, the proposed off-street parking supply has been modified to reflect more specific land use development proposals. Because of this reduction in the overall amount of parking, the project sponsor has requested additional spaces be provided in the parking structure for the CP Retail Center equal to the number of off-street parking spaces that have been removed from the plan. The purpose of this letter is to describe the effect that this change would have on the analysis described in the Project's EIR.

On-Street Parking Supply

As part of the application for construction of CP-02-03-04, the project's street plans have been designed to a greater level of detail than available when the original EIR analysis was performed. The more detailed designs have resulted in a reduction from the original estimates of on-street parking. For those streets proposed to be constructed as part of CP 02-03-04, the original EIR estimates assumed that 430 on-street parking spaces could be constructed. Design considerations such as ADA design standards, fire hydrants, and utility equipment, would limit the number of on-street parking spaces and result in decreasing on-street parking supply from 430 to 161 parking spaces (a decrease of 269 parking spaces) just for those streets that comprise CP 02-03-04. This represents a reduction in overall parking supply at Candlestick Point compared to what was assumed in the EIR.

Exhibit G Page 1 of 5

Off-Street Parking Supply

The project sponsor is currently in the application process for Sub-phases CP-02-03-04. Table 1 presents the maximum amount of off-street parking supply permitted as part of CP-02-03-04 based on the original 2010 plan for Variant 2A as described in the EIR. The maximum off-street parking supply was calculated by multiplying the maximum parking ratios in the project's Transportation Plan and Design for Development document by the total amount of approved development by land use type.

The current application for CP-02-03-04 includes some refinements to the land uses within the CP Center, including:

- replacing 15.5 ksf of office space with 6 ksf of local serving retail
- the addition of a grocery store (which is considered part of the local-serving retail square footage already approved)
- the change from the originally contemplated arena to a smaller performance venue and movie theater, and
- the addition of 540 more housing units in this sub-phase (with a corresponding decrease in housing units to be supplied in future sub-phases, such that the total number of residential units in Candlestick Point remains the same).

For the cinema and grocery store, current Planning Code ratios from Planning Code Table 151.1 are applied. In the case of the grocery store, the current Planning Code ratio is the same as the ratio for regional retail. The Project Sponsor also requests that the loss of the 269 on-street parking spaces be supplied in the CP Center garage. Table 2 summarizes the proposed new parking calculation:

Exhibit G Page 2 of 5

Land Use	Proposed Maximum Supply I Amount Rate		Maximum Number of Spaces			
Non-Residential Parking – CP Center (2010 Plan)						
Office	150 ksf	1 space / ksf	150 spaces			
Hotel	220 rooms	0.25 spaces / room	55 spaces			
Performance Arena	10,000 seats	1 space / 15 seats	667 spaces			
Regional Retail	635 ksf	2.7 spaces / ksf	1,715 spaces			
Local-Serving Retail	125 ksf	1 space / ksf ¹	125 spaces			
	Non	-Residential Subtotal	2,712 spaces			
Residential Parking – CP Center (2010 Pla	<u>an)</u>					
Housing Units – CP Center	280	1 space / unit	280 spaces			
Housing Units – Elsewhere in Subphase	745	1 space / unit	745 spaces			
		Residential Subtotal	1,025 spaces			
		Grand Total	3,737 spaces			

TABLE 1 CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM PERMITTED SUPPLY AT CP-02-03-04(ORIGINAL 2010 PLAN)

1. The Design for Development document states that parking for local-serving retail would be "shared with" parking for regional retail; however, it does not include a specific rate. The project's Transportation Plan and EIR transportation analysis was based on a maximum rate of 1 space per 1,000 square feet for local-serving retail. Therefore, that ratio is used in this calculation.

Land Use	Proposed Amount	Maximum Supply Rate ¹	Maximum Number of Spaces					
<u>CP Center Parking (Retail/Entertainment)</u>								
Regional Retail	635 ksf	2.7 spaces / ksf	1,715 spaces					
Local Serving Retail	96 ksf ²	1 space / ksf	96 spaces					
Office ³	134.5 ksf	1 space / ksf	35 spaces					
International African Market Place and CPSRA Welcome Center	8 ksf	1 space / 2 ksf	4					
Performance Venue	4,400 seats/standing (33 ksf)	1/15 seats ⁴	147 spaces					
Movie Theater	1,200 seats (42 ksf)	1/8/10 seats ⁵	145 spaces					
Lost On-Street Parking Spaces			269 spaces					
	2,411 spaces							
CP Center Residential & Community Services Parking								
Harney/Ingerson Housing	265 units	1 space / unit	265 spaces					
SFPD	1 ksf	1 / 2 ksf	1					
Subtoto	266 spaces							
Other CP 02-03-04 Uses Provided Se	eparately by Site Developers							
Community Uses (e.g. Fire Station/School)	41 ksf	1 / 2 ksf	21					
Grocery	35 ksf	2.7 / 1 ksf	95					
Residential Tower at CP Center	220 units	1 space / unit	220 spaces					
Other Residential	1,080 units	1 space / unit	1,080 spaces					
Hotel	220 rooms	0.25 spaces / room	55 spaces					
Office Parking to be made available	100 spaces							
Subtotal Cl	P 02-03-04 Uses Provided Separa	ately by Site Developers	1,570 spaces					
		Grand Total ⁶	4,246 spaces					

TABLE 2 CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM PERMITTED SUPPLY AT CP-02-03-04(REVISED 2015 PLAN)

Exhibit G Page 4 of 5

TABLE 2 CALCULATION OF MAXIMUM PERMITTED SUPPLY AT CP-02-03-04 (REVISED 2015 PLAN)

- 1. Some maximum rates have been revised from what was in the 2010 Transportation Plan, based on more specificity in proposed uses now compared to 2010. Detailed explanation for the revisions is included in the Subphase CP-02-03-04 Application.
- 2. Includes originally-approved 125 ksf of local-serving retail, less 35 ksf grocery store (which are considered a part of the local-serving retail) plus additional 6 ksf of local-serving retail proposed as a result of eliminating 15.5 ksf of approved office space (see letter to Planning Department and OCII, dated June 25, 2015).
- 3. Office parking shared with retail and entertainment. Number of parking spaces within the structure is reduced by approximately 75% (from 135 spaces to 35 spaces). The balance of entitled parking (100 spaces) will be made available for future development sites on Candlestick Point, provided by the site developer(s).
- 4. Assumes performance venue patrons will share parking with retail patrons. Reduce maximum number of spaces by half.
- 5. 1/8/10 seats = 1 parking space / 8 seats up to 1,000 seats + 1 parking space / 10 seats above 1,000 seats
- 6. Grand total excludes car-share parking spaces. A total of 50 car-share parking spaces will be in the CP Center parking structure and an additional 9 spaces will be provided separately by site developers, totaling 63 car-share spaces.

The revised proposed land uses and off-street parking supply for CP-02-03-04 would yield up to 509 more off-street parking spaces in this sub-phase than if the original land uses and parking ratios were used. However, the 2010 original plan did not account for the 25 Community Uses parking spaces and the grocery store, considered a local serving use, is now using a higher parking rate (2.7 parking space / 1 ksf compared to 1 parking space / 1 ksf). When adjusted for the fact that this sub-phase includes 540 additional housing units and their associated spaces (which are simply being relocated into this sub-phase from another future sub-phase, and do not affect the overall site total), the proposed parking supply would be nearly identical to the amount of off-street spaces previously proposed at the same time that the on-street parking supply has also been reduced by 269 spaces. In fact, the revised 2015 parking supply is less than the 2010 total with the added 540 housing units by approximately 30 parking spaces.

Given that further reductions to the on-street parking supply are likely as additional more detailed plans are developed for future sub-phases, we expect the overall on- and off-street parking supply to be lower than what was contemplated in the 2010 EIR. The reduction to overall parking supply would not result in new significant impacts nor would it substantially worsen any significant impacts identified in the EIR. If anything, fewer people would drive to the site and transit capacity is adequate to accommodate minor increases associated with less driving, if that were to materialize. The relocation of on-street parking does not affect the total trips generated or trip patterns assumed in the EIR because the primary paths of travel would remain the same. For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto at (415) 348-0300.

Sincerely, FEHR & PEERS

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

Exhibit G Page 5 of 5

Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure

RESOLUTION NO. 1-2014 Adopted January 7, 2014

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND APPROVING THE STREETSCAPE PLAN AND THE SIGNAGE PLAN FOR CANDLESTICK POINT AND THE MAJOR PHASE APPLICATION FOR MAJOR PHASE 1 AND CONFORMING CHANGES TO THE PROJECT DOCUMENTS PURSUANT TO THE DISPOSITION AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT WITH CP DEVELOPMENT CO., LP, SUBJECT TO APPROVAL FROM THE AFFECTED CITY DEPARTMENTS AND MAYOR UNDER AND TO THE EXTENT REQUIRED BY THE ICA AND THE PLANNING COOPERATION AGREEMENT; BAYVIEW HUNTERS POINT AND HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PROJECT AREAS

- WHEREAS, Under Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011, Assembly Bill No. 1X26 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session), and Assembly Bill No. 1484 (Chapter 26, Statutes of 2011-12, Regular Session) (collectively, as amended from time to time, the "Dissolution Law"), the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco ("SFRA" or the "Redevelopment Agency") was dissolved and the non-affordable housing assets and obligations of SFRA were transferred to the Successor Agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco ("Successor Agency"), commonly known as the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure ("OCII"), by operation of law; and,
- WHEREAS. Subsequent to the adoption of AB 1484, on October 2, 2012 the Board of Supervisors of the City, acting as the legislative body of the Successor Agency, adopted Ordinance No. 215-12 (the "Implementing Ordinance"), which Implementing Ordinance was signed by the Mayor on October 4, 2012, and which, among other matters: (a) acknowledged and confirmed that, as of the effective date of AB 1484, the Successor Agency is a separate legal entity from the City, and (b) established the Successor Agency Commission (the "Commission") and delegated to it the authority to (i) act in place of the Redevelopment Commission to, among other matters, implement, modify, enforce and complete the Redevelopment Agency's enforceable obligations, (ii) approve all contracts and actions related to the assets transferred to or retained by the Successor Agency, including, without limitation, the authority to exercise land use, development, and design approvals, consistent with applicable enforceable obligations, and (iii) take any action that the Dissolution Law requires or authorizes on behalf of the Successor Agency and any other action that this Successor Agency Commission deems appropriate, consistent with the Dissolution Law, to comply with such obligations; and,
- WHEREAS, The Board of Supervisors' delegation to the Commission includes the authority to grant approvals under specified land use controls for the Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard Project (the "Project"); and,
- WHEREAS, In connection with the Project, the Board of Supervisors on August 3, 2010, approved amendments to the Hunters Point Shipyard Redevelopment Plan and the Bayview Hunters Point Redevelopment Plan by ordinances 210-10 and 211-10, respectively (the "Redevelopment Plans"), the SFRA approved the Candlestick Point Design for Development and the Hunters Point Shipyard Phase 2 Design for Development (as more particularly defined in the Phase 2 DDA, the "Design for Development") by Resolution 62-2010 and the SFRA and CP Development Co., LP (as more particularly

defined in the Phase 2 DDA, "Developer") entered into a Disposition and Development Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard), dated for reference purposes as of June 3, 2010 (as amended and as the same may be further amended from time to time, the "Phase 2 DDA") by Resolution 69-2010. The Phase 2 DDA was amended on December 18, 2012 by a First Amendment to the Phase 2 DDA, pursuant to OCII Resolution No. 3-2012. Capitalized terms used but not otherwise defined in this Resolution have the meanings ascribed to or provided for them in the Phase 2 DDA; and,

- WHEREAS, The Phase 2 DDA establishes Developer's rights to develop within the parameters of the Redevelopment Plans and Design for Development and incorporates through exhibits and attachments various Project Documents including the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure ("DRDAP"), the Below -Market Rate Housing Plan, the Transportation Plan, the Infrastructure Plan, the Community Benefits Plan, the Design for Development, the Parks and Open Space Plan and the Incorporated Sustainability Requirements and Sustainability Goals and other documents (all as more particularly described in the Phase 2 DDA, together, the "Project Documents"); and,
- WHEREAS, The Phase 2 DDA is an enforceable obligation under the Dissolution Law and shown on line HPSY 30 of the Recognized Obligation Payment Schedule for January to June 2014, which was approved by the Oversight Board and the California Department of Finance ("DOF"). On December 14, 2012, DOF issued a final and conclusive determination under California Health and Safety Code § 34177.5 (i) that the Phase 2 DDA and the HPS Phase 1 DDA are enforceable obligations that survived the dissolution of the Redevelopment Agency; and,
- WHEREAS, The Interagency Cooperation Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard) (as more particularly defined in the Phase 2 DDA, the "ICA") between OCII and the City establishes procedures for interdepartmental coordination related to the implementation of the Project. The ICA was executed by the Redevelopment Agency and the City, including by and through the San Francisco Port Commission, the San Francisco Public Utility Commission, the Department of Public Works, the San Francisco Fire Chief and Fire Marshall, the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, the City Administrator, the Controller, the Mayor and the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors, and was consented to by Developer as a third party beneficiary thereof; and,
- WHEREAS, The Planning Cooperation Agreement (Candlestick Point and Phase 2 of the Hunters Point Shipyard) (as more particularly defined in the Phase 2 DDA, the "Planning Cooperation Agreement") between OCII and the Planning Department of the City and County of San Francisco establishes procedures for coordination between OCII and the Planning Department related to the implementation of the Project, including with respect to the review and approval of Major Phase Applications; and,
- WHEREAS, In accordance with the Phase 2 DDA (including the DRDAP), Developer must submit a Streetscape Plan, a Signage Plan, a Major Phase Application and a Sub-Phase Application before commencing construction on any phase of the Project; and,
- WHEREAS, Developer has submitted a Streetscape Plan and a Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and a Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1 (collectively, the "CP Plans"). As part of the submittal of the CP Plans and as contemplated by the Phase 2 DDA, Developer has proposed refinements to the Project Documents that were adopted in 2010, including to the Phasing Plan, the Infrastructure Plan and the Transportation Plan (collectively, the "Project Refinements"). The Project Refinements are

Exhibit H Page 2 of 6

described in Attachment 6A-6N in the OCII memorandum prepared in connection with the approval of this Resolution; and,

- WHEREAS, The Signage Plan includes historic content to illustrate how the history of Candlestick Point and Hunters Point Shipyard may be conveyed through signage. Historic narratives reported in interpretive displays signs shall rely on resources such as the Bayview Library's Oral Histories Project and allow for additional community input through a process defined in collaboration with OCII and the Hunters Point Shipyard CAC; and,
- WHEREAS, Final approval of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, under this Resolution is subject to approval from the affected City departments and Mayor under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has determined that the CP Plans are complete under, and are consistent with, the Phase 2 DDA, the Project Documents, and the Redevelopment Plans, with the only modifications to the Project Documents being the Project Refinements; and,
- WHEREAS, The affected City departments have completed a thorough review of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, under and in accordance with the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement; OCII staff expects that the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, will be approved by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff seeks approval of the Project Refinements as part of the approval of the CP Plans. Subsequent to the adoption of this Resolution and approval of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement, OCII staff and Developer will make conforming changes to the applicable Project Documents; and,
- WHEREAS, Once the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, have been approved by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement, the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, will be deemed finally approved by the Commission without further action from the Commission; and,
- WHEREAS, On June 3, 2010, the SFRA Commission by Resolution No. 58-2010 and the San Francisco Planning Commission by Motion No. 18096, certified the Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") for the Project as adequate, accurate, and objective and in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq.) ("CEQA") and the CEQA Guidelines (14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq.); the Board of Supervisors affirmed the Planning Commission's certification of the FEIR by Motion No. 10-110 on July 14, 2010; and,
- WHEREAS, As part of its approval of the Project on June 3, 2010, in addition to certifying the FEIR, the SFRA Commission, by Resolution No. 59-2010 adopted findings pursuant to CEQA, regarding the alternatives, mitigation measures, and significant environmental effects analyzed in the FEIR, including a Mitigation Monitoring and

Exhibit H Page 3 of 6

Reporting Program and a Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Project, which findings are incorporated into this Resolution by this reference; and,

- WHEREAS, Subsequent to the certification of the FEIR, the Planning Department, at the request of OCII and in response to the proposed Project Refinements as part of the first Major Phase and Sub-Phase Applications, issued an addendum to the FEIR ("Addendum No. 1"); and,
- WHEREAS, Addendum No. 1 addresses changes to the phasing schedule for the Project and corresponding changes to the schedules for implementation of related transportation system improvements in the Transportation Plan, including the Transit Operating Plan, the Infrastructure Plan and other public benefits; and minor proposed revisions in two adopted mitigations measures, TR-16 Widen Harney Way, and UT-2 Auxiliary Water Supply System; and,
- WHEREAS, Mitigation Measure TR-16 Widen Harney Way is proposed to be amended to provide for implementation prior to issuance of the occupancy permit for the Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, instead of the first grading permit for Major Phase 1 of the Project, and to provide for a two-way cycle track on Harney Way rather than the previously proposed bicycle lane; and,
- WHEREAS, Mitigation Measure UT-2 Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) is proposed to be amended to no longer specify a loop system for the AWSS; and,
- WHEREAS, Based on the analysis in Addendum No. 1, the Planning Department concludes that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the FEIR on June 3, 2010, remain valid and the proposed Project Refinements and the amendments to the two adopted mitigation measures will not cause new significant impacts not identified in the FEIR, and no new mitigation measures will be necessary to reduce significant impacts; further, other than as described in the Addendum No. 1, no Project changes have occurred, and no changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the proposed Project that will cause significant environmental impacts to which the Project will contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the Project will cause significant environmental impacts and, therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required under CEQA beyond the Addendum No. 1 to approve the first Major Phase and Sub-Phase Applications; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed and considered the FEIR, Addendum No. 1, and supporting documentation in preparing necessary findings for the Commission's consideration, and has made the FEIR, Addendum No. 1, and supporting documentation available for review by the Commission and the public and these files are part of the record before the Commission; and,
- WHEREAS, Copies of the FEIR and Addendum No. 1 and supporting documentation are on file with the Commission Secretary and are incorporated in this Resolution by this reference; and,
- WHEREAS, The FEIR and the CEQA Findings adopted by the SFRA Commission by Resolution No. 59-2010 on June 3, 2010 reflected the independent judgment and analysis of the SFRA Commission, were and, except for the proposed minor amendments to Mitigation Measures TR-16 and UT-2, remain adequate, accurate and objective, and were prepared and adopted following the procedures required by CEQA; and,
- WHEREAS, OCII staff has reviewed the CP Plans and finds that they are acceptable and recommends approval of the CP Plans; and,

- WHEREAS, As noted above, the Phase 2 DDA is an enforceable obligation under the Dissolution Law. Review and approval of the CP Plans is an implementing action under the Phase 2 DDA; and,
- WHEREAS, Under the Phase 2 DDA, Developer is expected to propose Insurance Requirements as part of each Major Phase Application. Developer and OCII staff have substantially completed the Insurance Requirements for Major Phase 1 CP and are in final discussions regarding same, including with their respective insurance consultants. The OCII Director and Developer will agree upon the final Insurance Requirements for Major Phase 1 CP prior to commencement of construction. The Insurance Requirements include the form, amount, type, terms and conditions; and,
- WHEREAS, The Hunters Point Shipyard Citizen's Advisory Committee ("CAC"), the Alice Griffith Tenants, and the Bayview Hunters Point community generally have participated in the review of the CP Plans through a series of workshops held at Alice Griffith, the Hunters Point Shipyard and the Southeast Community Facility; and,
- WHEREAS, The CAC, at its meeting of December 9, 2013 reviewed and endorsed the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements; now, therefore, be it
- RESOLVED, That the Commission has reviewed and considered the FEIR, together with Addendum No. 1 and any additional environmental documentation in the OCII's files, and adopts the CEQA Findings set forth in 59-2010 and amends them to incorporate the minor modifications to the Mitigation Measures TR-16 and UT-2, as set forth in Addendum 1 and in these findings as follows:

MM TR-16 Widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation **Study.** Prior to issuance of the *grading occupancy* permit for *Development Phase 1 of* the Project, Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02, the Project Applicant shall widen Harney Way as shown in Figure 5 in the Transportation Study, with the modification to include a two-way cycle track, on the southern portion of the project right of way. Prior to the issuance of grading permits for *Candlestick Point Major* Phases 2, 3 and 4, the Project Applicant shall fund a study to evaluate traffic conditions on Harney Way and determine whether additional traffic associated with the next phase of development would result in the need to modify Harney Way to its ultimate configuration, as shown in Figure 6 in the Transportation Study, unless this ultimate configuration has already been built. This study shall be conducted in collaboration with the SFMTA, which would be responsible for making final determinations regarding the ultimate configuration. The ultimate configuration would be linked to intersection performance, and it would be required when study results indicate intersection LOS at one or more of the three signalized intersection on Harney Way at mid-LOS D (i.e., at an average delay per vehicle of more than 45 seconds per vehicle). If the study and SFMTA conclude that reconfiguration would be necessary to accommodate traffic demands associated with the next phase of development, the Project Applicant shall be responsible to fund and complete construction of the improvements prior to occupancy of the next phase.

MM UT-2 <u>Auxiliary Water Supply System</u>. Prior to issuance of occupancy permits, as part of the Infrastructure Plan to be approved, the Project Applicant shall construct an Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) *loop* within Candlestick Point to connect to the City's planned extension of the offsite system off-site on Gilman Street from Ingalls Street to Candlestick Point. The Project Applicant shall construct an additional AWSS *loop* on HPS Phase II to connect to the existing system at Earl Street and Innes

Exhibit H Page 5 of 6

Avenue and at Palou and Griffith Avenues, with *looped* service along Spear Avenue/Crisp Road.

The Commission finds that these amendments are supported by the analysis in Addendum 1 and incorporates such analysis in these findings by this reference; and be it further

- RESOLVED, That the Streetscape Plan and the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and the Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1, each dated January 7, 2014, are hereby approved, including approval of the Project Refinements; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Streetscape Plan and the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and the Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1 will not be deemed finally approved by the Commission until the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Refinements, have been approved by the affected City departments under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement. No further action is required by the Commission with respect to the Streetscape Plan or the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point or the Major Phase Application for Major Phase 1 or conforming changes to the Project Documents as approved by this Resolution, and this Resolution shall constitute Approval of the Streetscape Plan and the Signage Plan for Candlestick Point and Major Phase Approval for Major Phase 1 under the Phase 2 DDA, unless the conforming changes to Project Documents are not made consistent with this Resolution, in which case Developer will propose an alternative solution to ensure the conformity of the CP Plans to the Project Documents in accordance with the Phase 2 DDA; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby authorizes and directs the OCII Director and such OCII staff as the OCII Director may designate, upon approval by the affected City departments of the CP Plans and conforming changes to the Project Documents, including the Project Modifications, under and to the extent required by the ICA and the Planning Cooperation Agreement, to together with Developer make changes to the Project Documents so that they conform to the CP Plans, including the Project Refinements, and to take such additional actions as the OCII Director deems necessary or appropriate in connection therewith, including approving the Insurance Requirements under the Phase 2 DDA, provided, however, that the OCII Director determines that such additional actions are not inconsistent with this Resolution and do not materially increase the burdens and responsibilities of OCII or materially decrease the benefits to OCII with respect of the Project; and be it further
- RESOLVED, That the Commission hereby authorizes and directs the OCII Director to take all actions as needed, to the extent permitted under applicable law and subject to the Project Documents (as modified pursuant hereto), to effectuate OCII's performance under the Project Documents (as modified pursuant hereto).

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Commission at its meeting of January 7, 2014.

Natasha Jones

Commission Secretary

Exhibit H Page 6 of 6

December 9, 2015

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II: Implementaiton Phasing for Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 (Widening of Harney Way)

Dear Joy:

The *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Subsequently, the San Francisco Planning Commission and the Commission on Community Investment and Infrastructure certified an addendum to the EIR, dated December 11, 2013. Both the EIR and the Addendum include Mitigation Measure MM TR-16, which calls for the widening and reconfiguration of Harney Way west of the development area, between Arelious Walker Drive and Thomas Mellon Drive.

Currently, this section of Harney Way provides two auto travel lanes in each direction and an eight-foot sidewalk on the north side of the street. No sidewalk is provided along the south side of the street, although a parallel Class I shared use path is provided as part of the San Francisco Bay Trail within State Parks lands, just south of Harney Way.

Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 calls for an initial widening of Harney Way that would maintain two travel lanes in each direction, add two BRT lanes on the north side, add a center median to accommodate left-turn lanes at intersections, and add a median between the westbound travel lanes and the BRT lanes to accommodate a dedicated westbound right turn lane at Executive Park Boulevard East and an eastbound BRT stop just west of Executive Park Boulevard. The 2013 Addendum maintained this general configuration and called for provision of a 12-foot sidewalk on the north side of Harney Way and a 13-foot two-way Class I bicycle facility on the south side, separated from traffic by a five-foot median.

Exhibit I Page 1 of 7

A long-term configuration for Harney Way was also included as part of Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 that would replace the cycletrack with an on-street Class II bicycle lane in the westbound direction and an additional westbound travel lane. Eastbound bicyclists (and westbound cyclists who wish not to ride in the roadway) would be directed to the existing Class I shared use path through State Parks. The long-term configuration for Harney Way is illustrated in the Project's Transportation Plan and the Transportation Impact Study.¹

The Addendum also clarified the timing of implementation of this measure. The Addendum calls for the initial configuration to be constructed prior to occupancy of the Candlestick Point retail center (Candlestick Point Sub-Phase CP-02), with ongoing monitoring of traffic congestion levels that may ultimately trigger implementation of the longer-term configuration. The Addendum also specifies that the BRT service is not scheduled to begin for several years after completion of the initial configuration, until Major Phase 2, Subphase CP-07 and HP-04, which are currently anticipated by 2023.

It is our understanding that there is currently some uncertainty regarding the timing of the Geneva Avenue extension and replacement of the US 101 / Harney Way interchange. It is likely that the interchange will not be constructed prior to operation of the BRT system, which would preclude the originally conceived BRT alignment from operating in the early stages of development of the project.

As a result, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) is currently conducting a study to define an alternate interim BRT alignment that uses some combination of existing tunnels underneath US 101 at Blanken Avenue and Alana Way. Because that alignment may affect the way in which the BRT lanes are constructed along Harney Way, the SFCTA and the City propose to construct the initial Harney Way Configuration in two phases. Phase 1, shown on **Figure 1**, would construct the initial Harney Way improvements between Arelious Walker and Executive Park Boulevard East, although the sidewalk and Class I cycletrack would be completed all the way to Thomas Mellon Drive. **Figure 2** details the intersection configuration and striping at the Harney Way and Executive Park Boulevard East intersection that would be constructed as part

Exhibit I Page 2 of 7

¹ The City is currently performing an evaluation of the Geneva Avenue extension and replacement of the US 101 / Harney Way interchange in collaboration with the City of Brisbane as part of several ongoing studies. The long-term configuration of Harney Way may need to be revised in the future based on the recommended configuration of the US 101 / Harney Way interchange. However, because those other studies are ongoing, no changes to the long-term configuration of Harney Way are currently proposed. Refer to the EIR for illustrations of the long-term configuration of Harney Way.

of Phase 1 of the initial configuration. It also illustrates the way in which the new Phase 1 striping will conform to the existing striping just west of Executive Park Boulevard East. Phase 2 of the initial improvements would construct the remaining portion of Harney Way, between Executive Park Boulevard and Thomas Mellon Drive, at a later time, prior to operation of the BRT, and in a way that matches the BRT alignment recommended in the SFCTA's study (and accommodates future permanent alignment).

Exhibit I Page 3 of 7



Figure 1

Harney Way Interim Configuration – Phase 1

Exhibit I Page 4 of 7



Source: BKF Engineers

Figure 2

Harney Way Interim Configuration – Phase 1 Detail

Exhibit I Page 5 of 7

Under this proposed phasing for the initial configuration of Harney Way, there would be no additional transportation impacts, as described below:

- Traffic. There would continue to be two lanes of travel in both directions at all times until monitoring required construction of the ultimate configuration, as envisioned by Mitigation Measure TR-16. The initial phase would also include construction of the westbound left-turn lane at Executive Park Boulevard East. Thus, even with the phased implementation of the near-term configuration for Harney Way, the roadway would continue to have the same number of lanes and traffic capacity at all times.
- Transit. The proposed phasing would require that the BRT facilities be constructed in a manner consistent with the alternative BRT alignment determined by the SFCTA and SFMTA prior to operation of the BRT system. Therefore, transit service would not be affected by the proposed phasing of improvements to Harney Way.
- 3. Bicycles. The phased approach proposed would include the full two-way cycletrack on the south side of Harney Way for the extent of the project's responsibility for improvements to Harney Way, between Arelious Walker Drive and Thomas Mellon Drive, as part of the very first phase. Therefore, the phasing will have no effect to bicycle conditions compared to what was described in the EIR Addendum.
- 4. Pedestrians. There would be a continuous sidewalk on the north side of the street. Between Arelious Walker Drive and Executive Park Boulevard East, the sidewalk would be widened to 12-feet including 6' of landscaping. However, the existing eight-foot sidewalk on the north side of Harney Way between Executive Park Boulevard East and Thomas Mellon Drive would remain, and would instead be widened to 12-feet simultaneously with the construction of the BRT lanes, prior to operation of the BRT route. Despite the fact that widening of a portion of the northern sidewalk would not occur for several years after opening of the Candlestick Point retail center, the retail center is not expected to generate a substantial number of new pedestrian trips along Harney Way and the existing facilities are expected to be adequate.
- 5. Parking. Although parking conditions are not considered an impact by the City of San Francisco, information is provided for informational purposes only. There is no on-street parking on Harney Way under existing conditions and none of the proposals for reconfiguration and widening of Harney Way would provide parking. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on parking in the area.

Exhibit I Page 6 of 7

- 6. **Loading.** Similar to parking, there are currently no loading facilities on Harney Way, and none of the proposals would add loading. Therefore, the phased approach proposed would have no effect on parking in the area.
- 7. **Emergency Vehicle Access.** Because the phased implementation approach would maintain the same number of traffic lanes as the approach envisioned in the Addendum, there would be no effect to emergency vehicle access by using the proposed phased implementation.

We hope you have found this useful. Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

Cis Matter

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

SF08-0407

Exhibit I Page 7 of 7

Exhibit J: 8/13/15 Fehr & Peers Gilman Letter FEHR PEERS

August 13, 2015

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Draft Analysis of Transportation Effects of Proposed Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue in Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan

Dear Joy and Lila,

As you know, the *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Since that time, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project. Some refinements to the project were proposed in late 2013, resulting in an EIR Addendum certified in December 2013.

One of the most substantial changes contemplated in the December 2013 Addendum was a change to the project phasing, such that the CP Retail Center would be advanced much sooner than originally contemplated. As part of this, certain off-site roadway infrastructure and transit service was proposed to occur sooner than originally contemplated to ensure that the near term transportation system would be adequate to serve the CP Retail Center. One key aspect of the infrastructure required to be constructed commensurate with the Candlestick Point (CP) Retail Center is improvements to Gilman Avenue.

Gilman Avenue has historically served not just as a neighborhood street, but also as one of three primary access routes to and from large events at Candlestick Park. As a result, it is currently configured to facilitate egress from the Park, with one lane eastbound and two lanes westbound (when Candlestick Park was in operation, parking was prohibited on the north side of the street on game days such that a third westbound lane was provided for stadium egress). The originallyproposed and approved concept for Gilman Avenue as part of the project EIR would make the

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 2 of 20



street cross section more symmetric, providing on-street parking on both sides and two travel lanes in each direction. Sidewalks would be narrowed from 15 feet to 12 feet. The originallyproposed configuration is shown in in **Figure 1(A)**. At some point in the longer-term future, one of the travel lanes in each direction may be converted to transit-only as part of a mitigation measure for project impacts to transit travel times, as shown in **Figure 1(B)**.

Although a cross-section for Gilman Avenue had been developed in collaboration with the community during the project's planning process prior to the EIR, the City and project team felt it would be appropriate to re-engage the community prior to preparation of more detailed design to confirm the concept. Based on an initial round of outreach, the neighborhood, SMFTA, and the Planning Department all expressed concerns regarding the proposed reduction in sidewalk widths. Further, the originally-proposed changes would require relocation of existing utilities, and no funding is available for this work.

As a result, the project team has begun to test a new concept that would retain the existing sidewalk widths, and instead provide on-street parking and one travel lane in each direction, with a center turn lane. Far-side bus stops with bulb-outs would be located at Ingalls Street and Griffith Street. To compensate for the reduction in capacity associated with the reduction in auto lanes, the existing all-way stop controlled intersections would be converted to signalized intersections, which generally have a much higher throughput.

This letter documents Fehr & Peers' analysis findings associated with a revised concept for Gilman Avenue and incorporates some minor adjustment to traffic forecasts at the intersection of Arelious Walker Drive/Gilman Avenue associated with newly defined details for the CP Retail Center.

SUMMARY

The assessment indicates that the proposed design changes result in similar or better conditions than those presented in the EIR for all modes; therefore, no additional impacts are anticipated and no additional mitigation is required.

TRAVEL DEMAND

Although the land uses proposed as part of the project have not changed, the designs for the CP retail center have been developed to a more detailed level than when prior analyses were

Exhibit J Page 2 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 3 of 20



conducted. As a result, we now have better information regarding the size of the proposed parking structure and the relative size and location of the access points on the surrounding network. This more detailed information suggests that revisions to the overall traffic assignment associated with the CP Retail Center may be warranted.

Original EIR Assumptions

The parking structure associated with the CP retail center was intended to serve the following uses:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 472 residential dwelling units
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail
- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 10,000-seat arena¹

The EIR forecasted that these uses would generate 3,257 PM peak hour vehicle trips, including 1,490 inbound and 1,767 outbound trips. However, since further design of the CP retail center, an additional 192 residential units have been proposed for the CP center site (relocated from elsewhere in the CP site). Parking for 210 of the residential units and the hotel will be accessed from a separate entrance, adjacent to the retail center. Furthermore, the office is no longer proposed to be constructed at the CP center and instead will be proposed at some other location within CP.

Overall, the total number of vehicle trips generated from the Project will remain the same; however, the number of Project trips destined for the CP retail center garage (i.e., excluding trips associated with the office, the hotel, and 210 of the 472 residential units) would decrease to 2,969 PM peak hour trips, including 1,381 inbound and 1,588 outbound trips.

The proposed parking structure will accommodate approximately 2,900 spaces, which suggests that if all project trips for uses the structure is intended to serve were to use the garage, each

¹ The Draft Sub-Phase CP 02 03 04 Application proposes to replace the arena with a proposed 45,000 square foot performance venue/nightclub. However, since it is uncertain whether this represents a negligible change in the project, or whether that must undergo a separate review and approval process, this analysis evaluates the currently-approved land uses, which include an arena and not the performance venue.

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 4 of 20



space would have to turn over more than once per hour. This is not a realistic scenario; instead, the limited parking supply will likely cause travelers to switch modes to transit, bicycles, and walking. However, for purposes of this analysis, we have assumed that the originally-forecasted vehicle trips use the proposed parking structure.

Revised Design Assumptions

Figure 2 shows the Cumulative Plus Project volume assumptions used in the EIR. Note that of the intersections presented, only Third Street / Gilman Avenue and Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue were analyzed in the EIR; intersection analyses at the other, smaller internal intersections were not evaluated in detail in the EIR. The analysis in the EIR assumed that the majority of project trips using the parking garage would access the site from Arelious Walker Drive. However, since completing the EIR, the CP Retail Center parking garage design has been designed to greater level of detail to include and define access points, including:

- Arelious Walker Drive (Primary, signalized, full access)
- Arelious Walker Drive (Secondary, right-in/right-out only)
- Harney Way (Signalized, egress only)
- Ingerson Avenue (Stop-controlled, right-in/right-out only)

Figure 3 shows the latest parking garage design and four access points.

Based on the current understanding of parking stall locations and access points, Fehr & Peers has refined the anticipated trip assignment through local intersections to better align with the current proposed layout. In addition, it has been determined that due to BRT operations along Harney Way, vehicles traveling southbound will not be able to turn right onto Arelious Walker Drive. This will not result in an adverse impact to intersection operations.

Figure 4 shows the trip assignment for trips associated with the parking structure based on the trip generation and distribution forecasts from the EIR and the most recent proposed layout of the parking structure.

Gilman Avenue Corridor

As described above, the EIR assumed conversion of Gilman Avenue to a four-lane roadway with a parking lane in each direction. To accomplish this, existing sidewalks would be reduced to 12 feet – still consistent with Better Streets Plan standards, but less than the existing 15 feet. Upon

Exhibit J Page 4 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 5 of 20



completing the EIR, the study team conducted several meetings with the neighborhood and City staff to review and discuss the Gilman Avenue corridor. Based on these discussions, it was more desirable to keep existing sidewalk widths and modify the travel way to accommodate the future traffic and transit. The Project team worked with SFMTA and others to define a potential revision to the cross-section that would keep the current 15-foot sidewalks and retain on-street parking. As noted earlier, the revised cross section would provide one lane of travel in each direction with a center turn lane and intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker would be modified from all-way-stop-control (AWSC) to signal control. In addition, far-side bus stops with bulb-outs would be located on the corridor at Ingalls Street and Griffith Street. Figure 1(C) shows the revised cross section and Figure 4 shows the revised PM peak hour intersection volumes. As a result of the revised Gilman Avenue cross section and detailed access points to the CP Retail Center garage, the lane configuration and volume at Gilman Avenue / Arelious Walker has changed, though the total number of vehicles along the Gilman Avenue corridor has remained the same. The eastbound and westbound approach on Gilman Avenue would result in a one left turn lane, one through lane, and one right-turn lane. The northbound approach on Arelious Walker would provide one left turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through-right lane. The southbound approach would remain the same.

ANALYSIS

Transit Operations

This section describes the transit travel time analysis methodology and results, comparing the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section proposal with the originally-proposed section from the EIR. Consistent with the methodology presented in the EIR, transit travel time is the sum of three components: travel delay, transit re-entry delay, and passenger boarding delay.

There are several measures that can be used to reduce traffic congestion delay or transit re-entry delay, as described below.

Transit signal priority (TSP) modifies the timing at signalized intersections to prioritize the movement of transit vehicles through an intersection. If TSP is implemented at an intersection, consistent with the EIR methodology, the traffic congestion delay for transit is assumed to be eliminated.

Exhibit J Page 5 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 6 of 20



Queue jump lanes are bus priority lanes that are installed at signalized intersections (either as a separate pocket lane or in an existing right turn pocket lane) that, in conjunction with a special signal phase, allow a bus to enter the intersection before other traffic is allowed to proceed. If queue jump lanes are implemented at an intersection and co-located with a right turn, the traffic congestion delay for transit is assumed to be equal to the vehicle delay for the right turn movement.

Bus bulb-outs are extensions of the sidewalk curb at the corner of intersections that allow buses to stop without needing to exit the travel lane. Bus bulb-outs eliminate transit re-entry delay for each stop at which they are implemented.

Transit-dedicated lanes are travel lanes on a roadway that permit only transit vehicles to operate. The exception to this is at some intersections, where other vehicles wishing to make a right turn can use the transit lane as a pocket lane. Therefore, when co-located with right turn movements at an intersection, the traffic congestion delay for transit is assumed to be equal to the vehicle delay for the right turn movement.

Far-side stops are transit stops that are placed downstream of an intersection such that a transit vehicle is able to pass through an intersection before stopping to allow passengers to board and alight. It is generally accepted that a far-side bus stop would result in time-savings benefit compared to a near-side stop. Based on a VISSIM simulation assessment completed for AC Transit, it was found that moving a near-side to far-side bus stop resulted in travel time savings of 15 to 40 seconds². Although this strategy was not considered in the EIR, for the purpose of this assessment, it was assumed that moving a near-side stop to a far-side stop at a signalized intersection resulted in a travel time savings of 15 seconds, the most conservative of the identified range.

Significance Criteria

As noted in the EIR, the Project would cause a significant impact if it would increase travel times such that additional transit vehicles would be required to maintain the proposed headways. This was assumed to be the case if the Project would increase the transit travel time along a given route by more than $\frac{1}{2}$ of the proposed headway for the route. Route 29 Sunset, which will continue to travel along Gilman Avenue under Project conditions, has a proposed headway of 5

² Fehr & Peers, Line 51 Corridor Delay Reduction & Sustainability Project, 2013

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 7 of 20



minutes. Therefore, if the increase in transit travel time associated with the Project is more than 2.5 minutes, the Project would cause a significant impact that requires mitigation.

Analysis Results

The EIR compared the increase in transit travel time from 2030 No Project conditions to the Proposed Project (and Project Variants) in order to identify significant impacts. The EIR identified that there would be a significant impact to transit travel time under Project Variant 2A, and that even with mitigation the impact would be significant and unavoidable. As mentioned earlier, since the completion of the EIR, some of the mitigations proposed for Gilman Avenue have been deemed infeasible. Therefore, the purpose of this analysis is to define the changes to the transit travel time analysis associated with the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section and identify feasible mitigation measures that can reduce the transit travel time to at least the same level as what was presented under mitigated conditions in the EIR. Table 1 presents the transit travel time associated with Project Variant 2A from the EIR and the revised, unmitigated Gilman Avenue cross-section.

Time	EIR (Project	Variant 2A)	EIR (PPV2A)	– Mitigated	Revised Gilman (No Mitigation)		
(min:sec)	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound	Eastbound	Westbound	
Travel Delay	14:45	18:36	10:45	14:36	13:25	17:44	
Transit Re- Entry	3:52	1:43	2:13	1:20	2:13	1:34	
Passenger Boarding	9:55	9:19	9:55	9:19	9:55	9:19	
Total Time	28:32	29:38	22:54	25:17	25:33	28:37	
Notes: For Muni Route 29 Sunset only							

TARIF 1	PROJECT	TRANSIT	TRAVFI	TIMF -	WFFKDAY	ΡΜ ΡΕΔ	
IADLL I	INOJECI	110411311					

For Muni Route 29 Sunset only.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

Table 1 shows that the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section has a better (i.e., lower) transit travel time than the unmitigated Project Variant 2A from the EIR, but is still approximately three minutes higher than the mitigated EIR scenario. Therefore, mitigation measures that could be

Exhibit J Page 7 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 8 of 20



implemented at some point in the future need to be implemented to bring the transit travel time to a level consistent with the mitigated Project Variant 2A scenario from the EIR.

The following is a revision to Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23.1 to bring the transit travel times for the 29 Sunset to levels consistent with the mitigated EIR scenario:

- Implement TSP at the intersections of Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street / Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard. The transit lane would begin on Gilman Avenue about 200 feet prior to Third Street and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue. (Note that this component of the mitigation measures was included in the original mitigation measure for the 29 Sunset. Changes to the proposed cross-section on Gilman Avenue do not affect this component and it remains feasible).

Figures 5 and 6 depict the revised mitigation measure along Route 29.

Using the transit travel time saving methodologies discussed above for the mitigation measures, **Table 2** compares the transit travel time for the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section with the mitigated Project Variant 2A from the EIR.

Exhibit J Page 8 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 9 of 20



Time (minuses)	EIR – M	itigated	Revised Gilman - Mitigated			
Time (min.sec)	Eastbound Westbound		Eastbound	Westbound		
Travel Delay	10:45	14:36	10:45	6:55		
Transit Re-Entry	2:13	1:20	1:58	1:20		
Passenger Boarding	9:55	9:19	9:55	9:19		
Total Time	22:54	25:17	22:38	17:34		
Notes: For Muni Route 29 Sunse	t only.					

TABLE 2 PROJECT TRANSIT TRAVEL TIME – WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR (MITIGATED)

For Muni Route 29 Sunset only. Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

Since passenger ridership is assumed to remain the same (and therefore the time associated with passenger boarding), the proposed mitigation measures focus on reducing traffic congestion delay and transit re-entry delay where feasible. Most travel time savings are from reductions in traffic congestion delay through the implementation of TSP, far-side stops, and transit-dedicated lanes. As **Table 2** shows, the proposed mitigation measures for the revised Gilman cross-section would reduce the total travel time due to the proposed project to slightly below the mitigated conditions under the original EIR in the eastbound direction and about eight minutes lower in the westbound direction.

Traffic Operations

This section describes the methodology and traffic analysis results comparing the revised Gilman Avenue cross-section proposal with the originally-proposed section, and also accounting for shifts in traffic associated with the more detailed CP Center garage proposal.

Methodology

To remain consistent with transportation studies completed as part of the EIR in 2009, the study intersections were evaluated using the HCM 2000 methodology. For signalized intersections, this methodology determines the capacity for each lane group approaching the intersection. The LOS is then based on average delay per vehicle (in seconds per vehicle) for the various movements within the intersection. A combined weighted average delay and LOS is presented for the intersection. In San Francisco, LOS E and F are considered unacceptable operating conditions for

Exhibit J Page 9 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 10 of 20



signalized intersections. For unsignalized intersections, average delay and LOS operating conditions are calculated by approach (e.g., northbound) and movement (e.g., northbound leftturn), for those movements that are subject to delay. For the purpose of this analysis, the operating conditions (LOS and delay) for unsignalized intersections are presented for the worst approach (i.e., the approach with the highest average delay per vehicle) for side-street STOP-sign controlled intersections, and average intersection delay is presented for all-way STOP controlled intersections. LOS calculation sheets are included in **Attachment A**.

Significance Criteria

The significance criteria used to evaluate the proposed revisions are the same as those stated in the EIR, Section 4.4 and summarized below.

The Project would result in a significant impact if:

- An intersection would result in a change in intersection operations from LOS D or better under the 2030 No Project condition to LOS E or LOS F, or from LOS E to LOS F, with the proposed Project
- If at an intersection that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 No Project conditions, and would continue to operate at LOS E or LOS F under Project conditions, the Project trips were reviewed to determine whether the increase would contribute considerably to critical movements operating at LOS E or LOS F.
- If it would increase travel times such that additional transit vehicles would be required to maintain the proposed headways. This was assumed to be the case if the Project would increase the transit travel time along a given route by more than ½ of the proposed headway for the route.

Analysis Results

The EIR analyzed two of the five intersections along this corridor; this analysis evaluates all five intersections along Gilman Avenue to assess the overall throughput of the corridor under the original proposal and the revised proposal. **Table 3** shows the intersection LOS and delay results and **Table 4** describes the arterial LOS results from the assessment.

As shown in **Table 3**, under the original concept, the smaller AWSC intersections between Third Street and Arelious Walker Drive are projected to operate at LOS E or F with an average delay exceeding 55 seconds per vehicle. With the revised alternative, reducing Gilman Avenue to a

Exhibit J Page 10 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 11 of 20



single through lane in each direction with a shared turn lane and installing signals throughout, intersection operations improve substantially, compared to the originally proposed configuration.

The intersection of Gilman Avenue / Third Street is still projected to operate at LOS F, the revised proposal does not propose to change any lane configurations or affect travel demand at this intersection, so the revised proposal for Gilman Avenue has no effect on the EIR impact analysis. The remaining intersections operate at LOS D or better, which represents a substantial improvement from what was projected in the EIR.

Exhibit J Page 11 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 12 of 20



TABLE 3 LOS AND DELAY RESULTS ALONG GILMAN AVENUE CORRIDOR (CUMULATIVE PLUS PROJECT)

Intersection	Origin	al Design (AWS)	C)	Revised Design (Signals)		
	Control	Avg Delay (s)	LOS	Control	Avg Delay (s)	LOS
Third Street / Gilman Avenue	Signal	>80	F	Signal	>80	F
Jennings Street / Gilman Avenue	AWSC	>80	F	Signal	31	С
Ingalls Street / Gilman Avenue	AWSC	>80	F	Signal	16	В
Hawes Street / Gilman Avenue	AWSC	36	E	Signal	<10	А
Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue	Signal	36	D	Signal	40	D

Bold indicates intersection operates at LOS E or LOS F.

Sources: Fehr & Peers, 2015

Exhibit J Page 12 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 13 of 20



Impact Analysis

Impact TR-1: On-Site and Off-Site Construction Impacts

As described in the EIR, construction of the Project would result in transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. The EIR concluded implementation of mitigation measure MM TR-1, which would require the Applicant to develop and implement a construction traffic management plan to reduce the impact of construction activity on transportation facilities, would reduce the impacts caused by construction, but not to a less-than-significant level.

The overall amount of construction anticipated to occur as part of the modified Project will be the same as originally conceived and described in the EIR or less because the proposed design does not relocate the existing curb or utilities. Instead the Project will resurface existing pavement, stripe new lane configurations, and construct new signals.

It is anticipated that the Project phasing would follow the assumed phasing documented in the December 2013 addendum (Analysis of Transportation Effects of Project Refinements to the Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project since Certification of the Project's Final EIR). Overall, although the timing and location of construction activities may vary within the site compared to what was originally anticipated, the construction activities are expected to create similar significant and unavoidable localized construction-related traffic impacts as were originally described in Impact TR-1 the EIR. Mitigation measure MM-TR-1, development of a Construction Traffic Management Program, would still apply, although impacts would continue to remain significant and unavoidable.

Therefore, construction of the modified project would not result in any new significant effects to transportation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-2 through TR-16: Traffic Impacts to Regional and Local Roadway System, Study Intersections, and Freeway Facilities

As described in the EIR, the Project would generate substantial amounts of new vehicular traffic resulting in a number of significant impacts and mitigation measures. More specifically, the EIR

Exhibit J Page 13 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 14 of 20



identified Impact TR-2, a significant impact related to the Project's overall increase in traffic generation in relation to the current roadway system capacity. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of the Project's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan as a means to lessen the severity of Project-generated traffic impact; however, Impact TR-2 would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The EIR identified Impacts TR-3 through TR-8, which described locations where the Project would create new project-related impacts or contribute to significant cumulative impacts at study intersections. Mitigation Measures MM TR-4 (restriping at the intersection of Tunnel/Blanken), MM TR-6 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue/US 101 interchange), MM TR-7 (restriping at the Amador/Cargo Way intersection), and MM TR-8 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Bayshore/Geneva intersection) were recommended to reduce the severity of Project-related impacts. However, due to uncertainty regarding implementation of mitigation measures, Impacts TR-3 through TR-8 were determined to remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The FIER also identified Impact TR-9, which described the project's less than significant impact to a number of other study intersections.

At a slightly larger scale, the EIR identified Impact TR-10, which describes the effect of Projectrelated traffic spilling over into nearby residential neighborhood streets. The EIR determined this impact to be significant, and referenced other mitigation measures described elsewhere in the EIR (including Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of a TDM Plan) as appropriate strategies to reduce the severity of Impact TR-10. However, the EIR determined that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

The EIR also identified a number of significant Project-related impacts to freeway facilities, including Impacts TR-11 through TR-15. No feasible mitigation measures were identified for Impacts TR-11 through TR-13 and these impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measures MM TR-14 and MM TR-15, which called for participation in the bi-county study and payment of a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue / US 101 interchange area, were identified to reduce the severity of Impacts TR-14 and TR-15; however, since the implementation of these measures was uncertain, Impacts TR-14 and TR-15 would also remain significant and unavoidable.

Finally, the EIR identified Impact TR-16, a significant impact associated with the Project's contribution to traffic on Harney Way, which will be a primary access route for all modes between

Exhibit J Page 14 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 15 of 20



the Project site and regional transportation facilities (US 101, Bayshore Caltrain, Balboa Park BART, the Bay Trail, etc.). Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 called for the project to construct the initial phase of Harney Way at the outset of construction of the first major phase, which would reduce the Project's impact to less than significant.

The primary factors that influence the Project's travel demand have not changed; therefore, the modified Project's travel demand forecasts for buildout conditions will be identical to those described in the EIR. Based on the traffic analysis above, the revisions to the Project would not result in any additional impacts as the results indicate similar or better intersection delay and travel times.

Impacts TR-17 through TR-30: Impacts to Local and Regional Transit Operations and Capacity

Transit ridership demand and frequency is expected to be the same under the revised proposal as under the Proposed Project. Therefore, the proposed changes do not affect the EIR analysis and conclusions related to Impacts TR-17 through TR-22, or Impacts TR-24 through TR-30. However, the EIR identified Impact TR-23, which concluded that traffic congestion on Gilman Avenue would result in a significant impact for transit. The EIR states that the City and Project Applicant shall develop a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule to maintain transit proposed headways. When transit travel times degrade to a certain point, Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 should be implemented. The adopted mitigation measure is as follows:

Convert one of the two travel lanes in each direction and narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 15 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-foot-wide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixed-flow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on-street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic.³

The EIR noted that additional outreach and analysis may be required to assess the feasibility of Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23, and therefore, the EIR found the impact to be significant and unavoidable. However, if the revised proposal for Gilman Avenue is adopted, implementing

³ The Draft EIR included several optional mitigation measures. However, based on further analysis, SFMTA determined that the other options were not feasible or desirable due to right of way constraints.

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 16 of 20



Mitigation MM-TR-23 will be infeasible. Therefore, MM-TR-23 has been revised to include feasible mitigations measures that would result in better transit operations than the original MM-TR-23. Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 should be revised, as follow:

- Implement TSP at the intersections of Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue, San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue, and Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a far-side stop in the eastbound and westbound directions at the intersection of Third Street / Gilman Avenue and a far-side stop in the westbound direction at the intersection of San Bruno Avenue / Paul Avenue.
- Implement a peak period, transit-dedicated lane in the westbound direction along Paul Avenue between Third Street and Bayshore Boulevard. The transit lane would begin on Gilman Avenue about 200 feet prior to Third Street and extend through the intersection to Paul Avenue.
- Convert one of the two travel lanes in each direction and narrow the existing sidewalks on Gilman Avenue from Third Street to Griffith Street (four blocks) from 15 feet to 12 feet in width. The resulting 12-foot-wide sidewalks would be consistent with the Better Streets Plan guidelines. The reduction in sidewalk width would allow for the provision of a 7-footwide on-street parking lane, an 11-foot-wide transit-only lane, and a 10-foot-wide mixedflow lane in each direction on Gilman Avenue. This would preserve on street parking along the corridor and provide four-block transit-only lanes on Gilman Avenue between Griffith Street and Third Street. Treatment for transit-only lanes can range from striping to physical elevation changes to protect right-of-way from mixed-flow traffic

Implementing revised Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 would result in a significant and unavoidable impact; however, the revised MM-TR-23 would result in better operations than what was reported in the approved EIR. Therefore, since the revisions do not propose more severe impacts to transit, the proposed changes and the revised Mitigation Measure MM-TR-23 do not result in any new significant impacts to transit operations and capacity.

Impacts TR-31 and TR-32: Bicycle Circulation

Neither the originally proposed configuration nor the revised configuration proposed dedicated bicycle facilities on Gilman Avenue. Both proposals continue to designate Gilman Avenue as a Class III facility. Therefore, since the revisions do not propose changes to the designation of

Exhibit J Page 16 of 37
Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 17 of 20



bicycle routes nor to any physical infrastructure dedicated for bicycles, the proposed changes will have less than a significant impact to bicycle circulation.

Impacts TR-33 and TR-34: Pedestrian Circulation

Sidewalks will remain at 15' thereby keeping existing pedestrian facilities instead of decreasing the width. This will result in improved conditions compared to the scenario that was originally proposed, and therefore the changes do not result in any new significant impact to pedestrian circulation.

Impacts TR-35 and TR-36: Parking

The proposed changes will not affect parking supply in the proposed project nor along Gilman Avenue. Therefore, the changes do not result in any new significant impacts to parking conditions.

Impact TR-37: Loading

The EIR identified Impact TR-37 and determined that the Project would provide adequate loading supply and therefore concluded that impacts related to loading would be less than significant, and that no mitigation measures would be required. As the revised design does not change the overall loading requirements, implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to loading and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impacts TR-38 through TR-50: Stadium Impacts

The EIR included a number of impacts related to operation of the proposed new NFL stadium in the Hunters Point Shipyard site. The revised design does not change the operation or travel demand of the proposed Stadium, therefore the implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to the Stadium and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact TR-51 through TR-55: Arena Impacts

The EIR included a number of impacts related to operation of the proposed Arena in the Hunters Point Shipyard site. The revised design does not change the operation or travel demand of the

Exhibit J Page 17 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 18 of 20



proposed Arena, therefore the implementation of the revised design would not result in any new significant impacts related to the Arena and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Impact TR-56: Air Traffic Impacts

The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air traffic. The revised design would contain the same overall land uses and general development form and would not change the EIR's conclusion regarding air traffic. The revised design would not create any new significant impacts with respect to air traffic and no additional mitigation measures are required.

Impact TR-57: Hazards due to Design Features

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would be designed in accordance with City standards, and would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction. As a result the Project's impacts to hazards would be less than significant. The revised design would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to design features have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

Impact TR-58: Emergency Access

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would adequately facilitate emergency access and be designed to City standards, which include provisions that address emergency vehicles. The revised design would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

Cumulative Impacts

As noted in the EIR, the discussion of cumulative impacts was included with the discussion of project-related impacts in Impacts TR-1 through TR-58 and no additional cumulative impact discussion is necessary. Similar to what is described above and in the EIR, since the revised design would generate the same levels of travel demand at buildout and would have a similar transportation infrastructure, the modified Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be the same as what is described in the EIR.

Exhibit J Page 18 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 19 of 20



CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the revised design, including proposed revisions to MM-TR-23, would not change or alter any of the EIR's findings with respect to transportation impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable, as previously identified, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the EIR's transportation cumulative impact conclusions would not be altered.

For questions or comments, please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

ns Mtt

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

Exhibit J Page 19 of 37

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure August 13, 2015 Page 20 of 20



<u>Figures</u>

- Figure 1 Proposed Cross-Sections: Gilman Avenue
- Figure 2 EIR Assumed Volumes and Study Intersection Locations
- Figure 3 CP Retail Center Parking Garage Site Plan
- Figure 4 Revised Design Assumed Volumes and Study Intersection Locations
- Figure 5 Gilman Avenue Transit Mitigation
- Figure 6 Paul Avenue/San Bruno Avenue Transit Mitigation

Attachments

Attachment A – LOS Calculations

Exhibit J Page 20 of 37

GILMAN AVENUE

		Gilman Avenue	Iker
S pJE nings St	galls St	twes St	relious W <mark>o</mark>

A) EIR Proposed Conditions:



B) EIR Mitigated Conditions:



C) New Proposed Conditions:





Figure 1 Proposed Cross-Sections: Gilman Avenue

Exhibit J Page 21 of 37



1. Third St/Gilman Ave	2. Jennings St/Gilman Ave	3. Ingalls St/Gilman Ave	4. Hawes St/Gilman Ave
Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 160 940 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR
5. Arelious Walker/Gilman Ave	6. Ingerson Ave/Parking Garage	7. Harney Way/Parking Garage	8. Arelious Walker/Parking Garage
Gilman Ave	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR	INTERSECTION NOT STUDIED IN EIR
EIR Study Intersection	- 1 Turn Lane	🔹 Traffic	Signal



EIR Study Intersection Intersection Not Studied in EIR

XXX Peak Hour Traffic Volume

Turn Lane

Traffic Signal Stop Sign



Figure 2 EIR Assumed Volumes and Study Intersection Locations

STOP

Exhibit J Page 22 of 37



7

Figure 3 CP Retail Center Parking Garage Site Plan

Exhibit J Page 23 of 37



1. Third St/Gilman Ave	2. Jennings St/Gilman Ave	3. Ingalls St/Gilman Ave	4. Hawes St/Gilman Ave
Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 130 Paul Ave Paul Ave 160 940 ↔ 160 940 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 1	St S	600 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	88 0 1 € 64 942 3 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51 4 19 776 51
5. Arelious Walker/Gilman Ave	6. Ingerson Ave/Parking Garage	7. Harney Way/Parking Garage	8. Arelious Walker/Parking Garage
Gilman Ave	173 → 135 173 → 100 173 → 100 175 → 100	Parking Garage 156 545 156 545 156 156 156 156 156 156 156 15	S85 100 make S85 111 4th Level Entry 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20
X Study Intersection	XXX Peak Hour Traffic Volume	🗊 Traffic Signal	

Turn Lane

🐵 🛛 Stop Sign

Þ

Study Intersection Volumes and Lane Configuration

Exhibit J Page 24 of 37

Figure 4



Figure 5 Gilman Avenue

Exhibit J Page 25 of 37





P



Figure 6 Paul Avenue / San Bruno Avenue Transit Mitigations

Exhibit J Page 26 of 37

ATTACHMENT A – LOS CALCULATIONS



Exhibit J Page 27 of 37

Page 3-1

Original EIR LOS Analysis

Intersection #1009: 3rd SI / Paul Ave / Gilman Ave Signal=Point Large: Signal=Point Up to the set of the set				ן 2000 H	_evel Of So CM Opera P	ervice Compu itions (Future PP Variant 2A	utation Repo Volume Alt	ort ernative)					
Super-Ported Types-Induced Types Super-Ported Types-Ported Types-	Intersection #1009	: 3rd St / Pau	ul Ave / Gilm	an Ave		T Fanan 25							
<pre>signal=Permit term is grant-Permit term is gra</pre>		Initial Vol: Lanes:	Signal= 220 0 1	Protect/Rigl 1770***	hts=Include	e 260 1							
100 0 100 1 220 940" 1 100 1 220 940" 1 100 1 220 940" 1 0 100 100 100 130 0 Ang Chi Delay (sective): 780.0 0 00 130 0 Ang Chi Delay (sective): 780.0 0 00 130 0 Ang Chi Delay (sective): 780.0 0 00 130 0 Ang Chi Delay (sective): 780.0 0 00 130 0 Ang Chi Delay (sective): 780.0 0 00 Movement: L - T R L - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I - T - R I <td>Sig Initial Vol: Lanes: Rig</td> <td>nal=Permit hts=Overlap</td> <td></td> <td>Vol Cnt I</td> <td>Date:</td> <td>n/a R</td> <td>ignal=Permi ights=Overl</td> <td>it ap Lar</td> <td>es: Initial</td> <td>Vol:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Sig Initial Vol: Lanes: Rig	nal=Permit hts=Overlap		Vol Cnt I	Date:	n/a R	ignal=Permi ights=Overl	it ap Lar	es: Initial	Vol:			
940" 1 0 Chical WC 3.412 0 0 130 0 Ang ChallegreeWH: 786.3 0 60 130 0 Image Wit 1 0 0 0 130 0 Image Wit 1 0 0 0 0 130 0 Image Wit 1 0 0 0 0 0 130 0 Image Wit 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 130 0 Image Wit Test Image Wit Test Image Wit 0	160 0 🔔	•	(Cycle Time (sec):	100		₹	1 22	0			
940 1 O Avg Cnill De (seeverb) 1388.6 1 000 130 0 Avg Delay (seeverb) 1388.6 0 00 SignetProcessor North Bound South Bound East Bound West Bound Movement: L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R Virk: 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 Virk: 5.0<	0	4		Loss Time (sec):	12	-	· ک)				
0 Ang Delay (sective) 198.8 1 130 0 Ang Delay (sective) 786.0 0 60 LOS: F F F F F F Signat=ProtectFignate-Inducts South Bound East Bound Weest Bound Movement: L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R Inin. Green 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Worement: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Winin. Green 1.00	940*** 1!	•		Critical	V/C:	3.412		⊢ `	1 66	0			
130 0 Ang Deby (secket) 7860 0 0 0 Lanes: 1 0 130 0 0 0 Street Name: Surd St F F 1 0 0 Street Name: North Bound South Bound East Bound West Bound Movement: L - T - R L - T - R YR: 5.0	0	₹	Avg C	rit Del (sec/	veh):	1386.8		¥ (1				
LOS: F Lance: 1 0 1 10 1 0 1 0 10 Signal=ProtectRights=include Street Name: North Bound Suth Bound East Bound West Bound Movement: L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R Min. Green: 12 49 49 12 49 49 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 24 YR: 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0 5.0	130 0	¥	Avg	Delay (sec/	veh):	786.0		€ °	0 60)			
Interve 0 1 0 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>LOS:</td> <td>F</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					LOS:	F							
Lanes: 1 1 1 1 1 0 Signal-ProtectRights-Induct Street Name: 3 rd St Farst Bound West Bound Movement: L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R R L - T - R R L - T - R R L - T - R R L - T - R R L - T - R R L - T - R R L - T - R R L - T - R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R R			▲ ▲		^►	(
Street Name: 3rd St Paul Ave / Gilman Ave Approach: North Bound South Bound East Bound West Bound Movement: L T R L T R L T R Min. Green: 12 49 49 24 </td <td></td> <td>Lanes: Initial Vol:</td> <td>1 0 90*** Signal=</td> <td>1 1310 Protect/Rigi</td> <td>1 hts=Includ</td> <td>0 60 e</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Lanes: Initial Vol:	1 0 90*** Signal=	1 1310 Protect/Rigi	1 hts=Includ	0 60 e							
Movement: L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T - R L - T R L C T T T C T R L T R L T P R L C T P R L C C C C C C	Street Name: Approach:	North	3rc Bound	l St Sou	ith Bo	ound	Ea	Paul ast Bo	Ave / und	Gilman We	n Ave est Bo	ound	
Min. Green: 12 49 49 24	Movement:	L - ?	r – R	L -	- Т 	– R	L -	- Т 	- R	L -	- T 	– R	
Volume Module: Base Vol: 90 1310 60 260 1770 220 160 940 130 60 660 220 Growth Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	Min. Green: Y+R:	12 4 5.0 5	49 49 .0 5.0	12 5.0	49 5.0	49 5.0	24	24 5.0	24 5.0	24 5.0	24 5.0	24 5.0	
Base Vol: 90 1310 60 260 1770 220 160 940 130 60 660 220 Growth Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	Volume Modul	 e:											
Growth AG1: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.	Base Vol:	90 133	10 60	260	1770	220	160	940	130	60	660	220	
Added Vol: 0	Initial Bse:	90 132	10 1.00 10 60	260	1770	220	1.00	1.00 940	1.00	1.00 60	1.00 660	220	
PasserByVol: 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Added Vol:	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
User Adj: 1.00 0 <	PasserByVol: Initial Fut:	0 90 13	0 0 10 60	0 260	0 1770	0 220	0 160	0 940	0 130	0 60	0 660	0 220	
PHF Adj: 0.98 0.100 1.00	User Adj:	1.00 1.0	00 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
PHF Volume: 92 133/ 61 263 1806 224 163 959 133 61 613 224 Reduct Vol: 92 1337 61 265 1806 224 163 959 133 61 673 224 PCE Adj: 1.00<	PHF Adj:	0.98 0.9	98 0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	0.98	
Reduced Vol: 92 1337 61 265 1806 224 163 959 133 61 673 224 PCE Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	Reduct Vol:	92 I.3. 0	37 61 0 0	265 0	1806	224	163 0	959	133	01	6/3 0	224	
PCE Adj: 1.00	Reduced Vol:	92 133	37 61	265	1806	224	163	959	133	61	673	224	
MLF Adj: 1.00	PCE Adj:	1.00 1.0	00 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Saturation Flow Module: Saturation Flow Module: Sat/Lane: 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900 1900	MLF Adj: FinalVolume:	1.00 1.0 92 133	37 1.00 37 61	1.00 265	1.00	1.00 224	1.00 163	1.00 959	1.00 133	1.00 61	1.00 673	1.00 224	
Sat/Lane: 1900 1100 1000 100 100	Saturation F												
Adjustment: 0.90 0.88 0.88 0.90 0.89 0.89 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.28 0.61 0.61 0.61 0.80 Lanes: 1.00 1.91 0.09 1.00 1.78 0.22 0.13 0.76 0.11 0.17 1.83 1.00 Final Sat.: 1718 3198 146 1718 3005 373 70 409 57 194 2137 1519 	Sat/Lane:	1900 190	00 1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	
Lanes: 1.00 1.91 0.09 1.00 1.78 0.22 0.13 0.76 0.11 0.17 1.83 1.00 Final Sat.: 1718 3198 146 1718 3005 373 70 409 57 194 2137 1519	Adjustment:	0.90 0.8	88 0.88	0.90	0.89	0.89	0.28	0.28	0.28	0.61	0.61	0.80	
Capacity Analysis Module: Vol/Sat: 0.05 0.42 0.42 0.15 0.60 0.60 2.35 2.35 2.35 0.32 0.32 0.15 Crit Moves: **** **** Green/Cycle: 0.12 0.49 0.49 0.12 0.49 0.49 0.27 0.27 0.39 0.27 0.27 0.39 Volume/Cap: 0.45 0.85 0.85 1.29 1.23 1.23 8.69 8.69 6.02 1.17 1.17 0.38 Uniform Del: 40.9 22.3 22.3 44.0 25.5 25.5 36.5 36.5 30.5 36.5 36.5 21.8 IncremntDel: 6.8 5.9 5.9 160.5 108 107.6 3477 3477 2269 91.6 91.6 1.8 InitQueuDel: 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	Final Sat.:	1718 319	91 0.09 98 146	1718	3005	373	0.13 70	409	57	194	1.83 2137	1519	
Vol/Sat: 0.05 0.42 0.42 0.15 0.60 0.60 2.35 2.35 0.32 0.32 0.15 Crit Moves: **** **** **** **** **** Green/Cycle: 0.12 0.49 0.49 0.49 0.27 0.27 0.39 0.27 0.27 0.39 Volume/Cap: 0.45 0.85 0.85 1.29 1.23 1.23 8.69 8.69 6.02 1.17 1.17 0.38 Uniform Del: 40.9 22.3 22.3 44.0 25.5 25.5 36.5 30.5 36.5 36.5 21.8 IncremntDel: 6.8 5.9 5.9 160.5 108 107.6 3477 3477 2269 91.6 91.6 1.8 InitQueuDel: 0.0	Capacity Ana												
Crit Moves: **** **** **** Green/Cycle: 0.12 0.49 0.12 0.49 0.27 0.27 0.39 0.27 0.27 0.39 Volume/Cap: 0.45 0.85 0.85 1.29 1.23 1.23 8.69 8.69 6.02 1.17 1.17 0.38 Uniform Del: 40.9 22.3 22.3 44.0 25.5 25.5 36.5 30.5 36.5 36.5 21.8 IncremntDel: 6.8 5.9 5.9 160.5 108 107.6 3477 3477 2269 91.6 91.6 1.8 InitQueuDel: 0.0 <td< td=""><td>Vol/Sat:</td><td>0.05 0.4</td><td>42 0.42</td><td>0.15</td><td>0.60</td><td>0.60</td><td>2.35</td><td>2.35</td><td>2.35</td><td>0.32</td><td>0.32</td><td>0.15</td><td></td></td<>	Vol/Sat:	0.05 0.4	42 0.42	0.15	0.60	0.60	2.35	2.35	2.35	0.32	0.32	0.15	
Volume/Cap: 0.45 0.85 0.85 1.29 1.23 1.23 8.69 8.69 6.02 1.17 1.17 0.38 Uniform Del: 40.9 22.3 22.3 44.0 25.5 25.5 36.5 36.5 30.5 36.5 36.5 21.8 IncremntDel: 6.8 5.9 5.9 160.5 108 107.6 3477 3477 2269 91.6 91.6 1.8 InitQueuDel: 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	Crit Moves: Green/Cycle:	****	49 0.49	0.12	****	0.49	0.27	****	0.39	0.27	0.27	0.39	
Uniform Del: 40.9 22.3 22.3 44.0 25.5 25.5 36.5 36.5 30.5 36.5 36.5 21.8 IncremntDel: 6.8 5.9 5.9 160.5 108 107.6 3477 3477 2269 91.6 91.6 1.8 InitQueuDel: 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	Volume/Cap:	0.45 0.8	85 0.85	1.29	1.23	1.23	8.69	8.69	6.02	1.17	1.17	0.38	
IncremntDel: 6.8 5.9 5.9 160.5 108 107.6 3477 3477 2269 91.6 91.6 1.8 InitQueuDel: 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	Uniform Del:	40.9 22	.3 22.3	44.0	25.5	25.5	36.5	36.5	30.5	36.5	36.5	21.8	
Delay Adj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	IncremntDel: InitOueuDel:	6.8 5	.9 5.9	160.5	108	107.6	34//	34//	2269	91.6	91.6	1.8	
Delay/Veh: 47.7 28.2 28.2 204.5 133 133.1 3513 3513 2300 128.1 128 23.7 User DelAdj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	Delay Adj:	1.00 1.0	00 1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
User DelAaj: 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.0	Delay/Veh:	47.7 28	.2 28.2	204.5	133	133.1	3513	3513	2300	128.1	128	23.7	
LOS by Move: D C C F F F F F F F F F C HCM2kAvgQ: 3 22 22 18 59 59 174 174 166 22 22 5 Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per lane.	User DelAdj: AdiDel/Veh·	1.00 1.0	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00 3513	1.00	1.00 2300	1.00	1.00	1.00 23.7	
HCM2kAvgQ: 3 22 22 18 59 59 174 174 166 22 22 5 Note: Queue reported is the number of cars per la <u>ne</u> .	LOS by Move:	D	C C	5 F	F	 F	F	F	F	F	F	, C	
	HCM2kAvgQ: Note: Oueue	3 2 report.ed	22 22 is the r	18 number	59 of ca	59 ars per	174 lane	174	166	22	22	5	-

Page 3-2

Original EIR LOS Analysis



Copyright (c) 2008 Dowling Associates the hibit J Page to 29 Ports, 3,7A

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 2: Jennings Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	•	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	-
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		đĥ			đ þ			4			\$	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	85	1045	130	67	752	61	43	83	56	68	195	145
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	89	1100	137	71	792	64	45	87	59	72	205	153
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1						
Volume Total (vph)	639	687	466	460	192	429						
Volume Left (vph)	89	0	71	0	45	72						
Volume Right (vph)	0	137	0	64	59	153						
Hadj (s)	0.10	-0.11	0.11	-0.06	-0.10	-0.15						
Departure Headway (s)	8.8	8.6	8.8	8.6	9.4	8.1						
Degree Utilization, x	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	0.50	0.97						
Capacity (veh/h)	412	423	412	428	369	432						
Control Delay (s)	287.5	319.5	117.2	103.6	21.4	64.2						
Approach Delay (s)	304.1		110.4		21.4	64.2						
Approach LOS	F		F		С	F						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			187.0									
Level of Service			F									
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ition		97.9%	IC	CU Level o	of Service			F			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 3: Ingalls Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	*	٩.	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		đ þ			4î þ			\$			\$	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	130	962	77	30	730	58	31	83	12	35	216	119
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	137	1013	81	32	768	61	33	87	13	37	227	125
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1						
Volume Total (vph)	643	587	416	445	133	389						
Volume Left (vph)	137	0	32	0	33	37						
Volume Right (vph)	0	81	0	61	13	125						
Hadj (s)	0.14	-0.06	0.07	-0.06	0.03	-0.14						
Departure Headway (s)	8.4	8.2	8.2	8.1	9.1	7.7						
Degree Utilization, x	1.0	1.0	0.95	1.0	0.34	0.83						
Capacity (veh/h)	438	447	432	445	365	389						
Control Delay (s)	262.2	192.1	59.2	70.5	16.6	38.2						
Approach Delay (s)	228.7		65.1		16.6	38.2						
Approach LOS	F		F		С	E						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			135.7									
Level of Service			F									
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	tion		88.3%	IC	CU Level o	of Service			E			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Unsignalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 4: Hawes Street & Gilman Avenue

	≯	-	\rightarrow	1	-	•	٩.	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4î þ			đ ĥ			\$			÷	
Sign Control		Stop			Stop			Stop			Stop	
Volume (vph)	64	942	3	51	776	19	4	5	0	37	10	38
Peak Hour Factor	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Hourly flow rate (vph)	67	992	3	54	817	20	4	5	0	39	11	40
Direction, Lane #	EB 1	EB 2	WB 1	WB 2	NB 1	SB 1						
Volume Total (vph)	563	499	462	428	9	89						
Volume Left (vph)	67	0	54	0	4	39						
Volume Right (vph)	0	3	0	20	0	40						
Hadj (s)	0.09	0.03	0.09	0.00	0.12	-0.15						
Departure Headway (s)	6.2	6.1	6.4	6.3	7.5	6.8						
Degree Utilization, x	0.97	0.85	0.82	0.75	0.02	0.17						
Capacity (veh/h)	576	580	551	556	463	512						
Control Delay (s)	53.2	33.0	31.4	24.8	10.6	11.2						
Approach Delay (s)	43.7		28.2		10.6	11.2						
Approach LOS	E		D		В	В						
Intersection Summary												
Delay			35.4									
Level of Service			E									
Intersection Capacity Utilization	n		67.7%	IC	U Level o	of Service			С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 1: 3rd Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	۶	-	\rightarrow	4	+	*	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations		4			Aî∳	1	5	≜ t≽		ሻ	≜t ≽	
Volume (vph)	160	940	130	60	660	220	90	1310	60	260	1770	220
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)		5.0			5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	
Lane Util. Factor		1.00			0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95	
Frt		0.99			1.00	0.85	1.00	0.99		1.00	0.98	
Flt Protected		0.99			1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)		1824			3525	1583	1770	3516		1770	3480	
Flt Permitted		0.36			0.64	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)		667			2257	1583	1770	3516		1770	3480	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	168	989	137	63	695	232	95	1379	63	274	1863	232
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	4	0	0	0	43	0	4	0	0	9	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	0	1290	0	0	758	189	95	1438	0	274	2086	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA		Prot	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6	3	7	4		3	8	
Permitted Phases	2			6		6						
Actuated Green, G (s)		28.5			28.5	44.0	8.1	41.0		15.5	48.4	
Effective Green, g (s)		28.5			28.5	44.0	8.1	41.0		15.5	48.4	
Actuated g/C Ratio		0.28			0.28	0.44	0.08	0.41		0.16	0.48	
Clearance Time (s)		5.0			5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0		5.0	5.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)		3.0			3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)		190			643	775	143	1441		274	1684	
v/s Ratio Prot						0.04	0.05	c0.41		0.15	c0.60	
v/s Ratio Perm		c1.93			0.34	0.08						
v/c Ratio		6.79			1.18	0.24	0.66	1.00		1.00	1.24	
Uniform Delay, d1		35.8			35.8	17.6	44.6	29.5		42.2	25.8	
Progression Factor		1.00			1.04	1.18	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2		2615.6			91.1	0.1	11.1	23.3		54.4	112.6	
Delay (s)		2651.4			128.3	20.8	55.7	52.8		96.6	138.4	
Level of Service		F			F	С	E	D		F	F	
Approach Delay (s)		2651.4			103.1			52.9			133.6	
Approach LOS		F			F			D			F	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			635.0	Н	CM 2000) Level of	Service		F			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capacity	ratio		3.10									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			100.0	S	um of los	st time (s)			15.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	1		163.8%	IC	CU Level	of Service	;		Н			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

Synchro 8 Report Page 1

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 2: Jennings Street & Gilman Avenue

3/26/2015

	≯	-	\mathbf{r}	1	-	*	1	1	1	1	Ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	ţ,		ሻ	4Î			\$			\$	
Volume (vph)	85	1045	130	67	752	61	43	83	56	68	195	145
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Frt	1.00	0.98		1.00	0.99			0.96			0.95	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.99			0.99	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1832		1770	1842			1764			1759	
Flt Permitted	0.21	1.00		0.06	1.00			0.69			0.88	
Satd. Flow (perm)	394	1832		111	1842			1238			1569	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	89	1100	137	71	792	64	45	87	59	72	205	153
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	5	0	0	3	0	0	16	0	0	20	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	89	1232	0	71	853	0	0	175	0	0	410	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6			4			8	
Permitted Phases	2			6			4			8		
Actuated Green, G (s)	67.0	67.0		67.0	67.0			25.0			25.0	
Effective Green, g (s)	67.0	67.0		67.0	67.0			25.0			25.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.67	0.67		0.67	0.67			0.25			0.25	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	263	1227		74	1234			309			392	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.67			0.46							
v/s Ratio Perm	0.23			0.64				0.14			c0.26	
v/c Ratio	0.34	1.00		0.96	0.69			0.57			1.05	
Uniform Delay, d1	7.0	16.5		15.2	10.1			32.8			37.5	
Progression Factor	0.13	0.83		0.70	0.69			1.00			1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	0.3	8.8		78.6	2.3			2.4			57.8	
Delay (s)	1.2	22.5		89.2	9.4			35.2			95.3	
Level of Service	А	С		F	А			D			F	
Approach Delay (s)		21.1			15.5			35.2			95.3	
Approach LOS		С			В			D			F	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			31.3	Н	CM 2000	Level of	Service		С			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capac	city ratio		1.02									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)	<u> </u>		100.0	S	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	tion		104.3%	IC	CU Level o	of Service	: 		G			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 3: Ingalls Street & Gilman Avenue

	٦	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	*	1	1	۲	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	¢Î		۲	et 🗧			\$			\$	
Volume (vph)	130	962	77	30	730	58	31	83	12	35	216	119
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Frt	1.00	0.99		1.00	0.99			0.99			0.96	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.99			1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1842		1770	1842			1816			1774	
Flt Permitted	0.23	1.00		0.09	1.00			0.71			0.96	
Satd. Flow (perm)	433	1842		169	1842			1309			1712	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	137	1013	81	32	768	61	33	87	13	37	227	125
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	3	0	0	3	0	0	4	0	0	17	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	137	1091	0	32	826	0	0	129	0	0	372	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6			4			8	
Permitted Phases	2			6			4			8		
Actuated Green, G (s)	68.0	68.0		68.0	68.0			24.0			24.0	
Effective Green, g (s)	68.0	68.0		68.0	68.0			24.0			24.0	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.68	0.68		0.68	0.68			0.24			0.24	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	294	1252		114	1252			314			410	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.59			0.45							
v/s Ratio Perm	0.32			0.19				0.10			c0.22	
v/c Ratio	0.47	0.87		0.28	0.66			0.41			0.91	
Uniform Delay, d1	7.5	12.6		6.3	9.3			32.0			36.9	
Progression Factor	0.27	0.29		0.62	0.78			1.00			1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	1.3	2.3		5.3	2.4			0.9			23.0	
Delay (s)	3.3	5.9		9.2	9.6			32.9			59.9	
Level of Service	А	А		А	А			С			E	
Approach Delay (s)		5.7			9.6			32.9			59.9	
Approach LOS		А			А			С			E	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			16.4	Н	CM 2000	Level of S	Service		В			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capac	city ratio		0.88									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			100.0	S	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilizat	ion		91.2%	IC	CU Level o	of Service	<u>;</u>		F			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 4: Hawes Street & Gilman Avenue

	٭	-	$\mathbf{\hat{z}}$	4	+	*	1	Ť	۲	1	ŧ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	۲	¢Î		۲	et 🗧			\$			\$	
Volume (vph)	64	942	3	51	776	19	4	5	0	37	10	38
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Frt	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00			1.00			0.94	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00			0.98			0.98	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1862		1770	1856			1822			1714	
Flt Permitted	0.31	1.00		0.24	1.00			0.91			0.86	
Satd. Flow (perm)	575	1862		456	1856			1693			1499	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	67	992	3	54	817	20	4	5	0	39	11	40
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	31	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	67	995	0	54	836	0	0	9	0	0	59	0
Turn Type	Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA		Perm	NA	
Protected Phases		2			6			4			8	
Permitted Phases	2			6			4			8		
Actuated Green, G (s)	83.8	83.8		83.8	83.8			8.2			8.2	
Effective Green, g (s)	83.8	83.8		83.8	83.8			8.2			8.2	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.84	0.84		0.84	0.84			0.08			0.08	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0			4.0			4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0			3.0			3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	481	1560		382	1555			138			122	
v/s Ratio Prot		c0.53			0.45							
v/s Ratio Perm	0.12			0.12				0.01			c0.04	
v/c Ratio	0.14	0.64		0.14	0.54			0.07			0.48	
Uniform Delay, d1	1.5	2.8		1.5	2.4			42.4			43.9	
Progression Factor	1.35	0.98		1.00	1.00			1.00			1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	0.3	1.0		0.8	1.3			0.2			3.0	
Delay (s)	2.3	3.7		2.3	3.7			42.6			46.9	
Level of Service	А	А		А	А			D			D	
Approach Delay (s)		3.6			3.6			42.6			46.9	
Approach LOS		A			A			D			D	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			5.7	Н	CM 2000	Level of	Service		А			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capac	city ratio		0.62									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			100.0	S	um of lost	time (s)			8.0			
Intersection Capacity Utilization	tion		66.1%	IC	CU Level o	of Service	:		С			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												

HCM Signalized Intersection Capacity Analysis 5: Gilman Avenue & Arelious Walker Drive

3/26/2015

	٦	-	\mathbf{r}	4	+	*	1	Ť	۲	1	Ļ	~
Movement	EBL	EBT	EBR	WBL	WBT	WBR	NBL	NBT	NBR	SBL	SBT	SBR
Lane Configurations	ሻ	•	1	ሻ	•	1	5	≜1 }		ሻ	A	
Volume (vph)	102	173	704	38	422	206	381	432	9	81	671	43
Ideal Flow (vphpl)	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900	1900
Total Lost time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Lane Util. Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.95		1.00	0.95	
Frt	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00	0.85	1.00	1.00		1.00	0.99	
Flt Protected	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (prot)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583	1770	3529		1770	3507	
Flt Permitted	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00	1.00	0.95	1.00		0.95	1.00	
Satd. Flow (perm)	1770	1863	1583	1770	1863	1583	1770	3529		1770	3507	
Peak-hour factor, PHF	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.95
Adj. Flow (vph)	107	182	741	40	444	217	401	455	9	85	706	45
RTOR Reduction (vph)	0	0	39	0	0	93	0	1	0	0	5	0
Lane Group Flow (vph)	107	182	702	40	444	124	401	463	0	85	746	0
Turn Type	Prot	NA	pm+ov	Prot	NA	Perm	Prot	NA		Prot	NA	
Protected Phases	1	6	7	5	2		7	4		3	8	
Permitted Phases			6			2						
Actuated Green, G (s)	8.1	34.9	63.9	3.6	30.4	30.4	29.0	47.2		8.3	26.5	
Effective Green, g (s)	8.1	34.9	63.9	3.6	30.4	30.4	29.0	47.2		8.3	26.5	
Actuated g/C Ratio	0.07	0.32	0.58	0.03	0.28	0.28	0.26	0.43		0.08	0.24	
Clearance Time (s)	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0		4.0	4.0	
Vehicle Extension (s)	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0		3.0	3.0	
Lane Grp Cap (vph)	130	591	977	57	514	437	466	1514		133	844	
v/s Ratio Prot	c0.06	0.10	c0.19	0.02	c0.24		c0.23	0.13		0.05	c0.21	
v/s Ratio Perm			0.25			0.08						
v/c Ratio	0.82	0.31	0.72	0.70	0.86	0.28	0.86	0.31		0.64	0.88	
Uniform Delay, d1	50.2	28.4	16.6	52.7	37.8	31.2	38.6	20.6		49.4	40.3	
Progression Factor	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	
Incremental Delay, d2	32.6	0.3	2.5	32.3	14.0	0.4	18.4	0.1		9.7	10.9	
Delay (s)	82.8	28.7	19.1	85.0	51.9	31.6	57.0	20.7		59.1	51.2	
Level of Service	F	С	В	F	D	С	E	С		E	D	
Approach Delay (s)		27.4			47.5			37.6			52.0	
Approach LOS		С			D			D			D	
Intersection Summary												
HCM 2000 Control Delay			40.1	Н	CM 2000	Level of	Service		D			
HCM 2000 Volume to Capa	icity ratio		0.87									
Actuated Cycle Length (s)			110.0	S	um of los	t time (s)			16.0			
Intersection Capacity Utiliza	ation		82.2%	IC	CU Level	of Service	<u>;</u>		E			
Analysis Period (min)			15									
c Critical Lane Group												



Exhibit K Page 1 of 5



Exhibit K Page 2 of 5



Exhibit K Page 3 of 5



Exhibit K Page 4 of 5



Exhibit K Page 5 of 5



DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

Major General Anthony L. Jackson, USMC (Ret), Director

Resolution 1-2013 Adopted by the CALIFORNIA STATE PARK AND RECREATION COMMISSION at its regular meeting in Brisbane, California January 18, 2013

General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report for Candlestick Point State Recreation Area

WHEREAS, the Director of California State Parks has presented to this Commission for approval the proposed General Plan and Final Environmental Impact Report ("Plan") for Candlestick Point State Recreation Area ("Park"); and

WHEREAS, the Park is the first and one of the few intensely urban units in the State Park System, surrounded by industrial and residential uses and Candlestick Park stadium; and

WHEREAS, the Park is located in an urban area surrounded by the proposed Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II project, which will dramatically alter the neighborhood surrounding the park, replacing the existing Candlestick Park stadium, vacant lands, and other areas with a large, mixed-use development; and

WHEREAS, California State Parks entered into a land exchange agreement with the City and County of San Francisco that will reconfigure the park boundary, adding land in some of the narrowest areas and removing it from others and in exchange, California State Parks will receive funding to improve and enhance Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, and

WHEREAS, this general plan will guide the development and management of the Park for public use and resource protection for the next 20 or more years, by establishing goals and guidelines to assist in the daily and long-term management of the park to ensure that its resources are protected, while encouraging a variety of recreation activities; and

WHEREAS, the Plan is subject to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and includes the Environmental Impact Report (EIR) as a part of a General Plan, pursuant to Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 5002.2 and the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 15166 (CEQA Guidelines), providing discussion of the probable impacts of future development, establishing goals, policies and objectives, and addressing all the requirements of an EIR; and

WHEREAS, the Plan and EIR function as a "tiered EIR" pursuant to PRC 21093, covering general goals and objectives of the Plan, and that the appropriate level of CEQA review will be conducted for each project relying on the Plan; and

WHEREAS, the Plan establishes a foundation to designate the remaining portions of lands at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area for park priority use in the Bay Plan managed and maintained by the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC);

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

CONTINUED FROM PAGE 1

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED: That this Commission has reviewed and considered the information and analysis in the Plan prior to approving the Plan, and this Commission finds and certifies that the Plan reflects the independent judgment and analysis of this Commission and has been completed in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act; and be it

RESOLVED: In connection with its review of the Plan prior to approving the General Plan, this Commission independently finds that the environmental conclusions contained in the Environmental Analysis Section of the Plan are supported by facts therein and that each fact in support of the findings is true and is based on substantial evidence in the record and that mitigation measures or other changes or alterations have been incorporated into the Plan which will avoid or substantially lessen the potential impacts identified in the Plan; and be it

RESOLVED: The location and custodian of the Plan and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings on which the Commission's decision is based is: State Park and Recreation Commission, P.O. Box 942896, Sacramento, California 94296-0001, Phone 916/653-0524, Facsimile 916/653-4458; and be it

RESOLVED: The California State Park and Recreation Commission hereby approves the Department of Parks and Recreation's General Plan and certifies the Environmental Impact Report prepared for Candlestick Point State Recreation Area, dated January 2012; and be it

FURTHER RESOLVED: That a Notice of Determination will be filed with the Office of Planning and Research within five days of this approval.

Attest: This Resolution was duly adopted by the California State Park and Recreation Commission on January 18, 2013 at the Commission's duly-noticed public meeting at Brisbane, California.

By: ORIGINAL SIGNED BY Date: 1-18-13

Louis Nastro Assistant to the Commission For Major General Anthony L. Jackson, USMC (Ret), Director Secretary to the Commission Exhibit L: Excerpts from the CPSRA General Plan and Approval Resolution



S.1 Park Description

Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA, or the park) is located in the City and County of San Francisco along the southeastern waterfront, adjacent to San Francisco Bay. It occupies 151 acres within San Francisco's Bayview Hunters Point neighborhood, and is surrounded by industrial uses, residential uses, and Candlestick Park stadium. As California's first urban state park, CPSRA provides access to open space, the Bay, and recreational opportunities in a highly urbanized and industrial area of San Francisco.

The shoreline of CPSRA is perhaps its most defining feature. The park skirts the western shore of San Francisco Bay for approximately 3.4 miles, offering access to the Bay and long-range scenic views. Visitors from the local and regional community engage in a wide range of day-use recreation activities, including trail use, picnicking, windsurfing, wildlife viewing, and beach use, among others.

Although CPSRA is built entirely on reclaimed land, the park conserves important natural and cultural resources. A rare open space resource in San Francisco's southeastern corner, CPSRA provides habitat for birds, small mammals, and other wildlife. The park's position along the Pacific flyway makes it a valuable stopover for migrating birds. CPSRA's history of use, from the Ohlone people, to Chinese fishing camps, to the filling of the Bay, enriches its story as the state's first urban state park.

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)
- U.S. Department of the Navy (USNA)
- California State Lands Commission (SLC)
- California Department of Boating and Waterways (DBW)
- Ohlone Indian Tribe
- California State Parks Foundation
- San Francisco Bay Trail
- Literacy for Environmental Justice
- Sierra Club, San Francisco Bay Chapter
- Golden Gate Audubon Society
- California Native Plant Society
- Nature in the City
- Bay Access

Public outreach included a variety of methods: four public workshops; a webpage on State Parks' website; and mailing materials, including emails, postcards, flyers, and newsletters. Notices of the public meetings were placed at CPSRA and in local business storefronts.

S.4 Park Vision

The park vision describes the future desired outcome of CPSRA, expressing what the park represents and its role as a state park. The vision for CPSRA is as follows:

The vision of Candlestick Point SRA, California's first urban state park, is to bring state park values and mission into an urban setting. Visitors from the local community, state of California and farther afield will enjoy a range of opportunities to participate in recreational activities and experience nature along the San Francisco Bay. Sweeping views of the Bay, native coastal landscapes, tidal marshes, beaches, and areas for community gathering and activity will all contribute to the character of CPSRA. The park will encourage active, healthy lifestyles while at the same time serving as a respite from the urban surroundings of San Francisco and the larger Bay Area. Recreation programs and facilities will maximize access to the Bay and be developed in concert with CPSRA's natural surroundings, treading lightly on the land. CPSRA will enhance the public's understanding of the Bay – its natural history, stories of settlement and development, and future challenges related to sea level rise. The park will foster community and encourage stewardship, and in doing so, become a destination along the Bay for visitors both near and far.

Exhibit L: Excerpts from the CPSRA General Plan and Approval Resolution

1.4 Sense of Place

What characteristics make CPSRA distinctive, and draw users to this unit? What inherent qualities should be protected, highlighted, and enhanced? The first response must be the relationship of the site with San Francisco Bay, with over three miles of coastline, and ever-changing, sweeping Bay views that include distant mountains and ridges to the east. The presence of the Bay can be sensed throughout the entire unit, either through direct recreational activities with the water, or as a backdrop sensed through the taste of salty cool air, the sounds of water birds, gusting winds, and lapping waves, or the open and bright expanse beyond a tree-protected meadow. The changing shoreline offers a variety in Bay experience, from wind-driven choppy waves, to quieter protected coves and beaches, to the inlet of Yosemite Slough, where the water is a narrow channel marked by the presence of the bird-covered "Double Rock" feature.

Also idiosyncratic are the often-present strong winds, traveling from the Pacific Ocean through the Alemany Gap and swirling around the adjacent Bayview Hill. While the wind poses challenges for human comfort, it is undeniably a distinct characteristic of the site, and is what makes CPSRA a world famous windsurfing area. Despite being an urban site, with the influence of the Bay, the wind, and the backdrop of the undeveloped Bayview Hill, the park offers a sense of being in contact with natural forces. It is seen as a source of respite and renewal, although at times a bracing one.

Nonetheless, CPSRA is an urban state park. Its urban edge is as long as its shoreline, with CPSRA as the intermediary where these very different environments meet and blend. The existing urban context of acres of parking lot and a rarely used stadium means the park is rather isolated, and often with few visitors. This factor in itself contributes to the sense of being an "urban getaway" for a quiet walk alone.

The land, which is almost entirely fill, is a created landscape, characterized by features that were either placed there or that naturalized over time. Large areas of the park are undeveloped, and apart from the natural factors previously mentioned, offer a sense of place that resembles an open canvas. The shape of the shoreline follows the tidal lots where the Bay was sold off in rectangular blocks to be filled for new land. The very shape of the park offers an authentic story that is part of the spirit of the area.

The proposed redevelopment surrounding the park will greatly change the character of the urban edge. The park will provide a "green front lawn" for the planned community of townhomes, high rises, and shopping districts. There will be many more people visiting the park, looking to enjoy the incredible water's edge recreation, as well as contact with nature and a respite from city life. Thus, future development of the park must carefully navigate this intermediary nature between the city and shoreline edges. CPSRA's spirit of place will continue to evolve, as a gradient of these urban and natural experiences. December 21, 2015

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

Subject: Candlestick Point – Revised Project Description

Dear Joy and Lila,

The *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Following the approval, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project.

Since the Project has been approved, the project sponsor has proposed minor revisions to the approved land uses. Specifically, the sponsor is proposing to construct a portion of the previously-approved arena/performance venue space as a new movie theater, while retaining the balance of the previously-approved square footage for future performance venue. This letter summarizes the transportation analysis results conducted to determine whether this modification would result in changes to the conclusions from the EIR.

PROJECT LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS

As described in the EIR, Variant 2A (the Project) assumed the Candlestick Point site would include:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 6,225 residential dwelling units (includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith)
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail

- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 50,000 square feet of community-serving uses
- 10,000-seat arena

Since the Project was approved, the project sponsor proposed to replace 15,500 square feet of office space with 6,000 square feet of local serving retail. This change resulted in either a net decrease or no net change to peak hour trip generation for the peak hours evaluated in the EIR (see memo to SF Planning Department and Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, dated June 25, 2015).

Currently, the project sponsor is proposing to replace a portion of the approved arena with a movie theater; the remaining portion would be left as a performing arts theater/arena. **Table 1** summarizes the land use assumptions.

TABLE 1: LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS								
		Total ¹						
Land Use	Units	EIR / Variant 2A	Revised Land Uses with No Office ⁵	Revised Project to Include Movie Theater				
Regional Retail	ksf	635,000	635,000	635,000				
Local Serving Retail	ksf	125,000	131,000	183,000				
Office	ksf	150,000	134,500	0				
Performance Venue / Arena ²	seats	10,000	10,000	4,400				
Recreational Community Center	ksf	50,000	50,000	50,000				
County Park	acres	97	97	97				
Hotel	rooms	220	220	220				
Residential Units ³	dwelling units	6,225	6,225	6,225				
Movie Theater ⁴	seats	0	0	1,200				

Notes:

1. Bold indicates a change in land use assumption.

2. EIR and revised Project assume 75,000 sf arena and 33,000 sf arena, respectively. Number of Arena seats interpolated based on square-feet to seat ratio used in the EIR.

3. Residential units includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith that would be replaced.

4. The revised Project movie theater is 42,000 sf.

5. See memo to SF Planning Department and Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, dated June 25 2015 (Updated December 14, 2015).

This letter assesses the impacts of converting a portion of the originally-approved arena into a movie theater and includes the conversion of office to local serving retail.

PROJECT TRAVEL DEMAND

The EIR forecasted weekday AM (8:00 to 9:00 AM) and PM (5:00 to 6:00 PM) peak hour¹ trip generation by calculating person trips generated by each land use. Peak hour person trips were distributed to geographical origins/destinations throughout the Bay Area and by mode split. For this analysis, the trip rates, trip distribution, including internalization, and mode splits methodology are consistent with those used in the EIR.

The movie theater is a specific land use that was not included in the original traffic generation forecasts (although the trip generation rates for "shopping center" in the EIR analysis do include movie theaters). In this case, the analysis is based on the specific "movie theater" rates since the specific use is known. Trip generation rates provided by the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE), *Trip Generation Manual*, 9th Edition, were used to forecast movie theater trips. AM peak hour trip generate traffic during the AM peak hour and because the ITE data did not provide AM peak hour data. Movie Theater trips are likely to behave similarly to retail uses; therefore, the mode splits and geographic distribution originally forecasted for retail were applied to the theater trips as well.

Performance Venue (Arena) Travel Demand

The EIR analyzed traffic generation associated with the arena under conditions with and without an event. The "with event" analysis evaluates pre-event conditions for the weekday PM peak hour to address transportation impacts associated with sold-out events. As described in the EIR, the arena travel demand assumes that weekday evening events would begin at 7:00 PM. and about half of arena attendees (2,200 attendees) would arrive during the PM peak hour. The EIR forecasted that 20 percent of attendees would arrive by transit and the remaining 80 percent would arrive by car.

¹ In addition to the weekday AM and PM peak hours, the EIR evaluated the weekday daily and Sunday PM peak hour trip generation. For this study, only the weekday AM and PM peak hours were evaluated because they are the critical peak periods.

This results in approximately 440 transit users and 587 vehicles (assumes 3 spectators per auto) during the weekday PM peak hour associated with a sold-out event.

TABLE 2: WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOUR PERSON AND VEHICLE TRIPS								
Commin	Perso	on Trips	Vehicle Trips					
Scenario	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour				
EIR No Event ¹	6,578	12,632	2,235	4,981				
EIR With Event ^{1, 2}	6,578	22,632	2,235	6,315				
Revised Project No Event	6,530	12,798	2,219	5,050				
Revised Project With Event ²	6,530	17,198	2,219	5,637				

Table 2 describes the total AM and PM peak hour person and vehicle trip generation.

Notes:

1. These numbers include the conversion of approved office space to retail, as described earlier. This land use change results in a slight change in AM and PM peak hour person trips to what was reported in the EIR.

2. Assumes no trips during the AM peak hour associated with a major event; however, does account for arena employees.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

As shown in the table above, with the movie theater and without an event, the revised Project would generate 16 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday AM peak hour and 69 more vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour. With the movie theater and an event, the revised Project would generate 678 fewer vehicle trips during the weekday PM peak hour.

IMPACT ANALYSIS

The remainder of this report discusses the extent to which the proposed project revision would change any impact conclusions from the EIR.

TR1-1: ON-SITE AND OFF-SITE CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS

As described in the EIR, construction of the Project would result in transportation impacts in the Project vicinity due to construction vehicle traffic and roadway construction and would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the Project vicinity. The EIR concluded implementation of mitigation measure MM TR-1, which would require the Applicant to develop and implement a

construction traffic management plan to reduce the impact of construction activity on transportation facilities, would reduce the impacts caused by construction, but not to a less-than-significant level.

The overall amount of construction anticipated to occur as part of the revised Project will be approximately the same as originally conceived and described in the EIR. The revised Project anticipates constructing the proposed movie theater with construction of sub-phases 02-03-04, while the event space venue may be constructed at a later time, within the CP-02 boundary. Overall, although the timing and location of construction activities may vary within the site compared to what was originally anticipated, the construction activities are expected to create similar significant and unavoidable localized construction-related traffic impacts as were originally described in Impact TR-1 the EIR. Mitigation measure MM-TR-1, development of a Construction Traffic Management Program, would still apply, although impacts would continue to remain significant and unavoidable.

Therefore, construction of the revised Project would not result in any new significant effects to transportation beyond those identified in the EIR or a substantial increase in the severity of a significant impact, and no new mitigation measures would be required.

IMPACTS TR-2 THROUGH TR-16: TRAFFIC IMPACTS TO REGIONAL AND LOCAL ROADWAY SYSTEM, STUDY INTERSECTIONS, AND FREEWAY FACILITIES

The EIR evaluated 60 intersections throughout the Project site and surrounding area. As described in the EIR, the Project would generate substantial amounts of new vehicular traffic resulting in a number of significant impacts and mitigation measures. More specifically, the EIR identified Impact TR-2, a significant impact related to the Project's overall increase in traffic generation in relation to the current roadway system capacity. The EIR identified Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of the Project's Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan as a means to lessen the severity of Project-generated traffic impact; however, Impact TR-2 would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The EIR identified Impacts TR-3 through TR-8, which described locations where the Project would create new project-related impacts or contribute to significant cumulative impacts at study intersections. Mitigation Measures MM TR-4 (restriping at the intersection of Tunnel/Blanken), MM TR-6 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue/US 101
interchange), MM TR-7 (restriping at the Amador/Cargo Way intersection), and MM TR-8 (participating in the bi-county study and paying a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Bayshore/Geneva intersection) were recommended to reduce the severity of Project-related impacts. However, due to uncertainty regarding implementation of mitigation measures, Impacts TR-3 through TR-8 were determined to remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation. The FIER also identified Impact TR-9, which described the project's less than significant impact to a number of other study intersections.

At a slightly larger scale, the EIR identified Impact TR-10, which describes the effect of Projectrelated traffic spilling over into nearby residential neighborhood streets. The EIR determined this impact to be significant, and referenced other mitigation measures described elsewhere in the EIR (including Mitigation Measure MM TR-2, the development and implementation of a TDM Plan) as appropriate strategies to reduce the severity of Impact TR-10. However, the EIR determined that the impact would remain significant and unavoidable with mitigation.

The EIR also identified a number of significant Project-related impacts to freeway facilities, including Impacts TR-11 through TR-15. No feasible mitigation measures were identified for Impacts TR-11 through TR-13 and these impacts would be significant and unavoidable. Mitigation Measures MM TR-14 and MM TR-15, which called for participation in the bi-county study and payment of a fair share contribution toward improvements near the Geneva Avenue / US 101 interchange area, were identified to reduce the severity of Impacts TR-14 and TR-15; however, since the implementation of these measures was uncertain, Impacts TR-14 and TR-15 would also remain significant and unavoidable.

Finally, the EIR identified Impact TR-16, a significant impact associated with the Project's contribution to traffic on Harney Way, which will be a primary access route for all modes between the Project site and regional transportation facilities (US 101, Bayshore Caltrain, Balboa Park BART, the Bay Trail, etc.). Mitigation Measure MM TR-16 called for the project to construct the initial phase of Harney Way at the outset of construction of the first major phase, which would reduce the Project's impact to less than significant.

The proposed land use revisions would likely result in localized changes to traffic volumes, because the change in traffic generation is relatively small compared to the project, and the relatively small increases would disperse relatively quickly farther away from the project. As a result, for the purpose of this analysis, a subset of 25 of the 60 EIR intersections was evaluated representing those

Exhibit M Page 6 of 21

intersections most likely to experience a measurable change to traffic volumes as a result of the proposed changes. Specifically, this analysis examined the following intersections (intersection numbers are consistent with the numbering from the EIR):

- 1. Third Street / 25th Street
- 2. Third Street / Cesar Chavez
- 3. Third Street / Cargo Way
- 4. Third Street / Evans Avenue
- 5. Third Street / Oakdale Avenue
- 6. Third Street / Palou Avenue
- 7. Third Street / Reverse Avenue
- 8. Third Street / Carroll Avenue
- 9. Third Street / Paul Avenue
- 10. Third Street / Ingerson Avenue
- 11. Third Street / Jamestown Avenue
- 12. Third Street / Le Conte / US 101 Northbound Off-Ramp
- 19. Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue
- 26. Tunnel Avenue / Blanken Avenue
- 27. Geneva Avenue / US 101 Southbound Ramps (Alana Way / Beatty Road)
- 28. Harney Way / US 101 Northbound Ramps (Alana Way / Harney Way / Thomas Mellon)
- 29. Harney Way / Jamestown Avenue
- 30. Crisp Road / Palou Avenue / Griffith Street
- 34. Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue
- 35. Amador Street / Cargo Way / Illinois Street
- 49. Bayshore Boulevard / Geneva Avenue
- 56. Third Street / Williams Avenue / Van Dyke Avenue
- 57. Third Street / Jerrold Avenue
- 59. Harney Way / Executive Park East
- 60. Harney Way / Thomas Mellon Drive

Weekday AM and PM peak hour intersection level of service (LOS) and delay are summarized in **Tables 3 and 4**, respectively. The tables compare the results for the 2030 No Project, 2030 Plus Project Variant 2A, and 2030 Plus revised Project. **Appendix A** summarizes intersection operations including delay, LOS, and volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios for the AM and PM peak hours. Additionally, Appendix A includes the critical movement's Project's contribution at intersections operating at LOS E or F.

WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)							
Textore estimat		No Project		Project – Variant 2A		Revised Project	
	Intersection		LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³
1.	Third Street / 25 th Street	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
2.	Third Street / Cesar Chavez	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
3.	Third Street / Cargo Way	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
4.	Third Street / Evans Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
5.	Third Street / Oakdale Avenue	21	С	24	С	23	С
6.	Third Street / Palou Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
7.	Third Street / Reverse Avenue	35	С	48	D	43	D
8.	Third Street / Carroll Avenue	12	В	18	В	18	В
9.	Third Street / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
10.	Third Street / Ingerson Avenue	5	А	6	А	6	А
11.	Third Street / Jamestown Avenue	29	С	53	D	51	D
12.	Third Street / Le Conte / US 101 Northbound Off-Ramp	50	D	50	D	48	D
19.	Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
26.	Tunnel Avenue / Blanken Avenue	43	D	>80	F	>80	F
27.	Geneva Avenue / US 101 Southbound Ramps (Alana Way / Beatty Road)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F
28.	Harney Way / US 101 Northbound Ramps (Alana Way / Harney Way / Thomas Mellon)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F

TABLE 3: INTERSECTION LOS WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT

TABLE 3: INTERSECTION LOS WEEKDAY AM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)									
Interneticul	No Project		Project – Variant 2A		Revised Project				
Intersection	Delay ²	LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³			
29. Harney Way / Jamestown Avenue ⁵	12	В	23	С	22	С			
30. Crisp Road / Palou Avenue / Griffith Street	57	E	46	D	45	D			
34. Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue ⁵	>50 (EB)	F	30	С	30	С			
35. Amador Street / Cargo Way / Illinois Street	65	E	61	E	57	E			
49. Bayshore Boulevard / Geneva Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F			
56. Third Street / Williams Avenue / Van Dyke Avenue	18	В	29	С	28	С			
57. Third Street / Jerrold Avenue	49	D	>80	F	>80	F			
59. Harney Way / Executive Park East	25	С	25	С	25	С			
60. Harney Way / Thomas Mellon Drive	30	С	34	С	33	С			

Notes:

1. Based on intersection numbers identified in the EIR.

2. Delay in seconds per vehicle.

3. Intersections operating at LOS E or LOS F conditions highlighted in bold.

4. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Executive Park Development or new Harney Interchange.

5. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Project.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

TABLE 4: INTERSECTION LOS WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)								
Intersection	Delay ²	LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³		
1. Third Street / 25 th Street	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
2. Third Street / Cesar Chavez	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
3. Third Street / Cargo Way	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
4. Third Street / Evans Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
5. Third Street / Oakdale Avenue	30	С	62	E	56	E		
6. Third Street / Palou Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
7. Third Street / Reverse Avenue	37	D	>80	F	>80	F		
8. Third Street / Carroll Avenue	14	В	63	E	62	E		
9. Third Street / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
10. Third Street / Ingerson Avenue	7	А	54	D	55	D		
11. Third Street / Jamestown Avenue	30	С	>80	F	>80	F		
12. Third Street / Le Conte / US 101 Northbound Off-Ramp	24	с	23	С	22	С		
19. Bayshore Boulevard / Paul Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
26. Tunnel Avenue / Blanken Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
27. Geneva Avenue / US 101 Southbound Ramps (Alana Way / Beatty Road)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
28. Harney Way / US 101 Northbound Ramps (Alana Way / Harney Way / Thomas Mellon)	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
29. Harney Way / Jamestown Avenue ⁵	40	E	44	D	42	D		

TABLE 4: INTERSECTION LOS WEEKDAY PM PEAK HOUR – 2030 CONDITIONS (NO ARENA EVENT)								
Textore estimul	No Project		Project – Variant 2A		Revised Project			
Intersection	Delay ²	LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³	Delay ²	LOS ³		
30. Crisp Road / Palou Avenue / Griffith Street	58	E	67	E	63	E		
34. Arelious Walker / Gilman Avenue ⁵	>50 (WB)	F	36	D	36	D		
35. Amador Street / Cargo Way / Illinois Street	60	E	66	E	62	E		
49. Bayshore Boulevard / Geneva Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
56. Third Street / Williams Avenue / Van Dyke Avenue	17	В	>80	F	>80	F		
57. Third Street / Jerrold Avenue	>80	F	>80	F	>80	F		
59. Harney Way / Executive Park East	25	С	26	С	26	С		
60. Harney Way / Thomas Mellon Drive	19	В	26	С	25	С		

Notes:

1. Based on intersection numbers identified in the EIR.

2. Delay in seconds per vehicle.

3. Intersections operating at LOS E or LOS F conditions highlighted in bold.

4. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Executive Park Development or new Harney Interchange.

5. Year 2030 analysis includes signalization as part of Project.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

As shown in Tables 3 and 4, with the addition of the movie theater, the study intersections will continue to operate at the same LOS compared to Project Variant 2A during the AM and PM peak hour. 19 of the 25 study intersections would continue to operate at LOS E or F during the weekday AM or PM peak hour and 18 of those intersections would continue to experience a significant project impact. One of the intersections operating at LOS E or F, Bayshore Boulevard / Hester Avenue, was not projected to experience a significant project impact in the original EIR because the Project would not significantly contribute² to the intersection; however, the revised Project's contribution would not significantly contribute to the intersection; however, the revised Project's revised Project would not cause any additional intersections operating acceptably under the no project condition to operate unacceptably beyond those identified in the EIR.

Further, the revised Project will not make a considerable contribution to critical movements operating unacceptably beyond those identified in the EIR. The revised Project's contribution would not substantially worsen the intersections operations, as shown in Appendix A, by the negligible change in volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratios and percent contribution to the critical movements.³

The revised Project will not create any new significant impacts compared to those identified in the EIR, nor would it substantially worsen the severity of those significant impacts that were identified in the EIR. Therefore, the results and conclusions from the EIR remain applicable to the Revised Project.

Traffic Analysis Results with Event

The revised Project includes a 4,400 seat arena in the Candlestick Hunters Point area, compared to the 10,000 seat arena approved in the EIR. The transportation analysis in the EIR assumed the worst-case scenario, in which a 10,000 person event is held on a weekday evening.

² An intersection was considered a significant contribution if with the Project, the intersection was operating at LOS E or F and the Project was to contribute greater than 5-percent of Project traffic to a critical movement operating at LOS E or F.

³ As shown in Appendix A, the revised Project would increase the Project's contribution by 1-percent or less at study intersections operating at LOS E or F during the AM and PM peak hour, except at 2 intersections. At Third Street / Carroll Avenue and Third Street / Paul Avenue, the revised Project would contribute an additional 15 and 30 trips, respectively, during the weekday PM peak hour. However, the intersection's v/c ratio would remain approximately the same as reported in the EIR. Therefore, the revised Project's contribution would not substantially worsen the intersection's operations.

Since the revised Project would result in congested traffic prior to an arena event, traffic impacts associated with the arena during arena events would be *significant*. However, as shown in Tables 2 and 3, the revised Project will generate less trips than the approved Project Variant 2A with a sold-out arena event. Therefore the impacts associated with an Arena Event in the revised Project scenario will be less than the impacts reported in the EIR. Furthermore, the results and conclusions stated in the EIR are applicable to the revised Project.

As described in the section above, the revised Project will decrease the Project travel demand during the AM peak hour and increase the Project travel demand during the PM peak hour under conditions with no arena event. However, based on the traffic analysis described above, the revisions to the Project would not result in any additional impacts as the results indicate similar intersection delay and levels of service to what was described in the EIR.

IMPACTS TR-17 THROUGH TR-30: IMPACTS TO LOCAL AND REGIONAL TRANSIT OPERATIONS AND CAPACITY

The EIR described the Project's impacts to transit in Impacts TR-17 through TR-30. Impacts TR-17 through TR-20 identified that, with implementation of the Project's Transit Operating Plan (identified as Mitigation Measure MM TR-17), the Project would provide adequate transit capacity locally, at the standard Downtown screenlines, and regionally to meet its projected demand. With implementation of MM TR-17, Impacts TR-17 through TR-20 were determined to be less than significant.

The EIR also identified Impacts TR-21 through TR-27, which describe impacts to transit travel time associated with Project-generated traffic congestion on specific corridors affecting specific transit lines. Mitigation Measures MM TR-21 through MM TR-27 were identified and consist of three parts:

- Transit travel times should be monitored throughout the course of project buildout to determine whether Project-generated traffic is decreasing transit travel speeds.
- If speeds are decreasing, travel time reduction measures should be implemented on the affected corridors. These measures typically involve dedication of transit-only lanes.
- If reduction measures are either infeasible or not effective at improving travel speeds, new vehicles should be purchased to allow SFMTA to maintain planned service frequencies.

However, because implementation of these measures requires substantial additional outreach and design, the feasibility of these measures is uncertain, and Impacts TR-21 through TR-27 were determined to be significant and unavoidable.⁴

The EIR also identifies Impact TR-28, a significant and unavoidable impact to SFMTA transit express routes using US 101 that may be slowed down by Project-generated freeway traffic for which no mitigation measures were identified. Impact TR-29 was identified as a less than significant impact to SFMTA transit express routes using I-280 because project-generated traffic on this route would not be as substantial. Impact TR-30 would be a significant and unavoidable impact to other regional transit routes (such as SamTrans express routes) using regional facilities to which the Project would contribute substantial amounts of traffic congestion.

Transit ridership is expected to slightly increase under the revised proposal compared to Project Variant 2A. However, the increase in transit ridership is less than one percent, and is not likely to result in a measurable change to ridership, as described in **Table 5** below.

TABLE 5: WEEKDAY AM AND PM PEAK HOUR TRANSIT PERSON TRIPS							
Scenario	AM Peak Hour	PM Peak Hour					
EIR	884	1,801					
Revised Project	878	1,818					
Delta	-6 (<-1%)	+17 (<+1%)					

Notes:

1. Office to retail land use change results in slight change in AM and PM peak hour vehicle trips then reported in the EIR.

2. Assumes no major event during the AM peak hour, however does account for arena employees.

Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

Additionally, the revised Project's impacts to traffic operations are expected to be similar to those described in the EIR, and the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to

⁴ Since the EIR was approved, TR-23 and TR-MM-23 were reviewed and a revised TR-MM-23 was proposed. The revised mitigation measure would result in better operations along Gilman Avenue than what was reported in the approved EIR, however, would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact. Detailed analysis and discussion are included in an addendum addressed to the SF Planning Department and Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure in August 2015, titled *Draft Analysis of Transportation Effects of Proposed Revisions to Configuration of Gilman Avenue in Candlestick Point – Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan.*

transit operations. Therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-17 through TR-30 in the EIR.

IMPACTS TR-31 AND TR-32: BICYCLE CIRCULATION

The EIR described impacts to bicycle circulation in Impacts TR-31 and TR-32. Impact TR-31 identified that through the implementation of the Project, bicycle facilities in the form of off-street Class I pathways, bicycle lanes (Class II facilities), or signed routes (Class III facilities) would be expanded to serve additional users, resulting in a beneficial impact of the Project or no impact. TR-31 concluded that the overall bicycle access and bicycling environment would improve within and in the vicinity of the Project and the proposed facilities would be adequate to meet the bicycle demand associated with the Project uses.

Impact TR-32 identified that the Project's proposed transit treatments and the increase in traffic volumes on Palou Avenue would result in impacts on bicycle travel between Griffith Street and Third Street (Bicycle Routes #70 and #170). Implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-32 (MM TR-32), determine the feasibility of relocating Bicycle Routes #70 and #170), would result in a significant and unavoidable impact because the feasibility of the relocation of the routes is uncertain at the time of the EIR. Since the EIR has been approved, SFMTA has studied possible alternatives, although the results of that study have yet to be determined; therefore TR-32 remains a significant and unavoidable impact.

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase bicycle travel within and adjacent to the Project area. The revised Project will not remove or add bicycle facilities to the proposed network. However, because the revised Project is only slightly changing the total peak hour traffic generation within the Project site and is not affecting the bicycle infrastructure proposed as part of the Project, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to bicycle circulation. Therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-31 and TR-32.

IMPACTS TR-33 AND TR-34: PEDESTRIAN CIRCULATION

The EIR described impacts of pedestrian circulation in TR-33 and TR-34. Similar to TR-31, the implementation of the Project would expand pedestrian facilities in the form of sidewalks and

Exhibit M Page 16 of 21

connecting the Project site to existing neighborhoods, resulting in a beneficial impact of the Project or no impact. TR-34 identified that implementation of the Project would result in an increase in traffic volumes in the Project vicinity that could increase pedestrian-vehicle and pedestrian-bicycle conflicts. However, the existing and proposed pedestrian facilities would be adequate to meet the pedestrian demand associated with the project land uses and the Project impacts on pedestrian circulation within and in the vicinity of the Project would be less than significant.

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase pedestrian travel within and adjacent to the Project area. However, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to pedestrian circulation; therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-33 and TR-34.

IMPACTS TR-35 AND TR-36: PARKING

The EIR identified Impacts TR-35 and TR-36, which determined that although the Project would result in a shortfall of parking spaces compared to its projected demand and would remove some existing on-street parking spaces, the Project's impacts to parking conditions would be less than significant. The EIR concluded there would be a range of between approximately 2,800 spaces and 20,000 spaces in the entire development area. The revised Project would include additional off-street parking supply in CP 02-03-04 as documented in **Table 6** below.

TABLE 6: SUMMARY OF PARKING SUPPLY COMPARISON IN CP 02-03-04 (ORIGNAL 2010 PLAN VS REVISED PROJECT)								
	Maximum Supply Rate	Origina	al 2010 Plan	Revised Project				
Land Use		Proposed Amount	Maximum Number of Spaces	Proposed Amount	Maximum Number of Spaces			
Office	1 space / ksf	150 ksf	150	134.5	135			
Regional Retail	2.7 space / ksf	635 ksf	1,715	635 ksf	1,715			
Local Serving Retail								
Grocery Store	2.7 space / ksf			35 ksf	95			
Other Local Serving Retail	1 space / ksf	125 ksf	125	96 ksf	96			
International African Market Place & CPSRA Welcome Center	1 space / 2 ksf			8 ksf	4			
Performance Venue	1 space / 15 seats	10,000 seats	667	4,400 seats	147			
Movie Theater	1 space / 8/10 seats ¹			1,200 seats	145			
Harney/Ingerson Housing	1 space / unit			265 units	265			
SFPD	1 space / 2 ksf			1 ksf	1			
Community Serving Uses	1 space / 2 ksf			41 ksf	21			
Residential Tower	1 space / unit	280 units	280	220 units	220			
Other Residential	1 space / unit	745 units	745	1,080 units	1,080			
Hotel	0.25 spaces / room	220 rooms	55	220 rooms	55			
	Lost On-Street Parking				-269			
	Grand Total		3,737		4,245			

Notes:

1. 1/8/10 seats = 1 parking space / 8 seats up to 1,000 seats + 1 parking space / 10 seats above 1,000 seats Source: Fehr & Peers, 2015

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase parking demand within and adjacent to the Project area. However, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to parking; therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-35 and TR-36.

IMPACT TR-37: LOADING

The EIR identified Impact TR-37 and determined that the Project would provide adequate loading supply and therefore concluded that impacts related to loading would be less than significant, and that no mitigation measures would be required.

The revised Project would include additional development within Candlestick Point with the addition of the movie theater and may increase daily and peak hour loading space demand within the Project area. However, the revised Project is not likely to result in any new significant impacts to loading; therefore, the revised Project is not expected to change the results of the impacts described in TR-37.

IMPACTS TR-38 THROUGH TR-50: STADIUM IMPACTS

The revised Project does not include construction of a new stadium. Furthermore, the existing stadium at Candlestick Point has already been demolished and the 49ers games are played elsewhere. Game day impacts for the revised Project are not applicable.

IMPACT TR-51 THROUGH TR-55: ARENA IMPACTS

The EIR included a 10,000 seat arena in the Candlestick Point area. As described in the section above, the revised Project would substantially reduce the capacity of the proposed event space from 10,000 seats to 4,400 seats. As shown in Table 2, above, the peak hour travel demand associated on conditions with an arena event would be lower with the revised Project compared to the project described in the EIR. Therefore, the implementation of the revised Project would not result in any new significant impacts and no new mitigation measures would be required.

Exhibit M Page 19 of 21

IMPACT TR-56: AIR TRAFFIC IMPACTS

The EIR determined that the Project would have a less than significant impact on air traffic. The revised Project would contain the same overall land uses and general development form and would not change the EIR's conclusion regarding air traffic. The revised Project would not create any new significant impacts with respect to air traffic and no additional mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT TR-57: HAZARDS DUE TO DESIGN FEATURES

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would be designed in accordance with City standards, and would be reviewed and approved by the City prior to construction. As a result the Project's impacts to hazards would be less than significant. The revised Project would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to design features have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

IMPACT TR-58: EMERGENCY ACCESS

The EIR determined that the Project's transportation infrastructure would adequately facilitate emergency access and be designed to City standards, which include provisions that address emergency vehicles. The revised Project would also be designed accordance with City standards and would be reviewed and approved by the City. Therefore, no new significant impacts to emergency access have been identified and no mitigation measures are required.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

As noted in the EIR, the discussion of cumulative impacts was included with the discussion of project-related impacts in Impacts TR-1 through TR-58 and no additional cumulative impact discussion is necessary. Similar to what is described above and in the EIR, since the revised design would generate similar levels of travel demand at buildout and would have a similar transportation infrastructure, the modified Project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be the same as what is described in the EIR.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the revised Project would not change or alter any of the EIR's findings with respect to transportation impacts. All impacts would remain less than significant, less than significant with mitigation, or significant and unavoidable, as previously identified, and no new mitigation measures would be required. Additionally, the EIR's transportation cumulative impact conclusions would not be altered.

For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Jehn

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

Attachments Appendix A – AM and PM Peak Hour Results Summary



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp





2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER



Exhibit N Page 1 of 18

Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp



Exhibit N Page 2 of 18

Proposed October 26 2010





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp





Exhibit N Page 3 of 18

Proposed June 03 2010





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

06 – NB 101 Harney Way Off-Ramp





Exhibit N Page 4 of 18



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney towards Candlestick



CPHPS PHASE II 2010 RESIDENTIAL TOWER 2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER

Exhibit N Page 5 of 18



Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 6 of 18

Proposed October 26, 2010





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 7 of 18



Exhibit N Page 8 of 18

Tower Design Scenario #1 - Tower G: East-West Orientation





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 9 of 18

Tower Design Scenario #2 - Tower G: North-South Orientation





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations September 2, 2015

09 – Open Space South of Harney Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 10 of 18



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER



Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 12 of 18

Proposed October 26 2010





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 13 of 18

Proposed June 03, 2015





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

11 – SRA Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 14 of 18



Keymap



Existing

Proposed - October 26 2010

Proposed - August 06 2015



Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick





- 2015 RESIDENTIAL TOWER



Exhibit N Page 15 of 18

Existing





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick



Exhibit N Page 16 of 18

Proposed October 26 2010





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick







Exhibit N Page 17 of 18

Proposed June 03, 2015





Candlestick Point EIR Visual Simulations August 10, 2015

17 – Mariner Village Towards Candlestick





Exhibit N Page 18 of 18



xhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo

700–1285 West Pender Street Vancouver BC V6E 4B1 Canada tel 604 683 8797 fax 604 683 0492 ibigroup.com

February 5, 2016

SHADOW STUDY OVERVIEW

Purpose

This shadow analysis has been prepared in order to identify the shadow impact from project changes at Candlestick Point on City parks outside of the Candlestick redevelopment project boundary. Specifically, these parks are Bayview Hill Park and Gilman Park. In addition, the analysis considers shadow impacts of the parks within the project boundary, including:

- Candlestick Point State Recreation Area (CPSRA), which is under State jurisdiction
- Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park (BGWDP)
- Mini-Wedge Community Park (MWCP)
- Jamestown Hillside Community Park (JHCP)

The project changes that require shadow analysis are:

- Revised locations of Towers G, J, and K
 - Revised building heights along Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue:
 - Mixed-use Residential from 65' max height to 80' max height
 - Film Arts Center from 85' max height to 120' max height

These changes are described in more detail in Addendum 4 to the Candlestick Point - Hunters Point Phase 2 Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

Process

The shadow impacts were measured at three times during the day on Winter Solstice (10 am, 12 pm and 3 pm), which is consistent with the Shadow Analysis in the FEIR.

Methodology

The shadows from both the 2010 layout and 2016 layout were generated in Google Sketchup. The topography within the model is based upon the survey of surrounding lands at 5 foot contour intervals, and the proposed topography within the site at 1 foot contour intervals.

Shadow differences have been measured by creating the shadows from the 2010 model in a different colour than those in the 2016 model, and using Photoshop to indicate areas where there is no overlap (i.e. there is a difference in shadow). Those areas that are consistent are not indicated, resulting in a clear picture that identifies shadow differences between the two models, seen by differing colors.

Two analyses are prepared as part of the analysis:

- 1. The first examines the shadow impact from all buildings at Candlestick. This analysis has been prepared to ensure there is clarity on the overall project shadow impact, beyond those that result from the design changes.
- 2. The second examines only the shadows from the building design changes. This analysis has been prepared to assist in the review of the impact based solely on the specific changes.

Results

The results of the analysis are based on a qualitative assessment of the shadow impact, focusing on the City parks outside of the project boundary, and the CPSRA and City parks noted above within the project boundary. The vast majority of increased shadow impact, especially in relation to the increased building height of the Mixed-use Residential buildings from 65' to 80', results in additional shadows cast on city streets at all three times analyzed (10am; 12pm; 3pm). Specific park related shadow impacts are discussed below.

City Parks outside Project Boundary

There are no shadow impacts on parks outside of the project boundary at any of the times analyzed when compared to the 2010 building layout.

IBI Group is a group of firms providing professional services. IBI Group Architects, formerly IBI/HB Architects, is a member of the IBI Group of firms. Principals in IBI Group Architects are: Martin G. B. Brückner, Architect AIBC, Ronald J. Eagleston, Architect AIBC, Tony S. Gill, Architect AIBC, Anita Leonoff, Architect AIBC, David M. Thom, Architect AIBC

Exhibit O Page 1 of 5

Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo

CPSRA

There are no changes to the shadow impact on the CPSRA at 10am or 12pm. At 3 pm, there is a change in impact based on the relocation of Tower J, which shifted south due to a revision of the overall streets and blocks pattern within CP South. The relocation of Tower J results in a slight increase in shadow on the CPSRA at 3 pm when examining the shadows cast from all buildings (~10,000 sq.ft / 0.2 ac of additional shadow); however, when considering the shadows from only those blocks that have resulted in changes in tower locations and/or building heights, there is a sight decrease of shadow. The discrepancy in shadowing is because, when considering only those blocks that have changed, the shift in location of the tower to the south results in a net decrease in shadow, as more shadow was cast by Tower J at the north side in 2010 than at the south side in 2016. However, when considering all buildings, most of the shadow at the north from the 2010 placement falls within the shadow cast from other towers within CP South, and is therefore cancelled out by the other tower shadows. As a result, when considering the shadow cast from all buildings, there is a net increase in shadow.

It is noted that there has always been modest shadow impacts on the CPSRA, generally in the late afternoon / early evening, as described in the FEIR, and the new Tower J shift results in a very small impact on these results (0.2% extra shadow across the entire CPSRA area).

City Parks within Project Boundary

The 2016 tower locations show both an increase and decrease in overall shadow impact, dependent on the park and the time of the day.

At 10am, there is a no significant change in shadow across the BGWDP. At JHCP, the shifting of Tower G southwest has resulted in a minor increase of shadowing; however, the shadows in 2016 fall upon a very steep section of the park, well away from any areas suitable for outdoor activity. There is no net impact of shadows across the MWCP.

At 12pm, the shifting of Tower J southwest has resulted in a minor increase in the shadowing on BGWDP. Despite the increase in shadowing, the shadow has shifted from the location of the proposed Bus Rapid Transit, which will be a high-pedestrian zone, to a different section of the park that is less likely to be as heavily used. The shifting of Tower K to the southeast and the increased height of mid-rise buildings along CP South block 8a results in an increase of shadowing across the western most portion of the BGWDP, representing a band that is ~15-18' wide by approximately 200' in length. This shadow lies in the central portion of the park, keeping the northern end out of shadow. At the MWCP, there is an insignificant increase in shadowing at the western tip of the Park due to the shifting of Tower J eastward.

At 3pm, there is an increase in shadow impact on the MWCP resulting from the shifting of Tower J to the southeast. This increased shadow results in the entirety of the park being shadowed; however, it should be noted that in the 2010 building locations, the vast majority of the park was shadowed.

Other Considerations

Finally, though not related to the shadow impact on City Parks or the CPSRA specifically, the shift in the location of tower G results in the following positive changes to the experience of users within the City Parks:

- Significantly increases the distance of the tower from Gilman Park, resulting in a less visible tower skyline and visual impact from the park; and
- Greatly improves the view to the Bay from the primary lookout point atop the Bayview Hill.

In addition, the shifting of Tower G results in less shadow across the primary pedestrian pathways within CP Center - the regional retail center - which will improve the pedestrian experience.

Gavin Blackstock, MCIP RPP

tebruary

Exhibit O Page 2 of 5
Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo SHADOW STUDY: DECEMBER 21 - 10AM

2010 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2010 D4D

- 1 CP State Recreation Area
- 2 Gilman Park (outside project)
- 3 Bayview Hill Park (outside project)
- 4 Yosemite Slough (outside project)

-	-	-
6	Mini-wedge Community	/ Park

5 Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park

- 7 Jamestown Hillside Community Park
- G Tower Name





2016 Tower Locations/ Building Heights





Project Boundary State Recreation Area Boundary

- City Park Boundary (outside project)
- City Park Boundary (inside project)
- Boundaries of Revised Blocks in 2016



- Analysis
- Hill Park) or the CPSRA.

Difference

• No impact to City Parks outside of the project boundary (Gilman Park and Bayview

• Tower J results in a minor increase in park shadowing across the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park (~10' wide shadow band).

· Tower G relocation results in a minor increase of shadow on the to Jamestown Hillside Community Park (~ 3%); however, the shadowing has shifted to the steepest portion of the park, which will not be usable due to grades.

Exhibit O Page 3 of 5

Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo SHADOW STUDY: DECEMBER 21 - 12PM

2010 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2010 D4D

- 1 CP State Recreation Area
- 2 Gilman Park (outside project)
- 3 Bayview Hill Park (outside project)
- 4 Yosemite Slough (outside project)

5 Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park

- 7 Jamestown Hillside Community Park
- G Tower Name



Candlestick Point Shadow Study В February 5, 2016





- Project Boundary State Recreation Area Boundary
- City Park Boundary (outside project)
- City Park Boundary (inside project)
- Boundaries of Revised Blocks in 2016



- Hill Park) or the CPSRA.
- east of Ingerson.
- the northwest end.
- length (~200').



• No impact to City Parks outside of the project boundary (Gilman Park and Bayview

• Shadowing from Tower J on the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park has shifted from the proposed BRT stop (Harney Way @ Ingerson) to a less activated portion of the park,

• Tower J results in an insignificant increase in shadowing to the Mini-wedge Park at

• Tower K and the midrise building along Harney Way (CP South Block 8a) result in an increase of shadowing to the Bayview Gardens Wedge Park of ~15-18' for one block

Exhibit O Page 4 of 5

Exhibit O: IBI Shadow Analysis and Memo SHADOW STUDY: DECEMBER 21 - 3 PM

2010 Tower Locations/ Building Heights



Shadow Study Based on Building Heights of 2010 D4D

- 1 CP State Recreation Area
- 2 Gilman Park (outside project)
- 3 Bayview Hill Park (outside project)
- 4 Yosemite Slough (outside project)

-		
6	Mini-wedge Community Par	ĸ

5 Bayview Gardens / Wedge Destination Park

- 7 Jamestown Hillside Community Park
- G Tower Name





2016 Tower Locations/ Building Heights





Project Boundary
State Recreation Area Boundary

- City Park Boundary (outside project)
- City Park Boundary (inside project)
 - Boundaries of Revised Blocks in 2016



Analysis

Hill Park).

Difference

- Park.

· No impact to City Parks outside of the project boundary (Gilman Park and Bayview

· Minor increase in shadow within the CPSRA based on shift in location of Tower J due to road realignment within CP South.

· Towers J relocation results in minor increase of shadow to Mini-wedge Park; however, the shadow impact results in virtually no solar access onto the entirety of the

Exhibit O Page 5 of 5

Via electronic mail

Joy Navarrete Senior Environmental Planner San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103 joy.navarrete@sfgov.org

RE: EVALUATION OF AIR QUALITY AND CLIMATE CHANGE IMPACTS OF PROPOSED PROJECT REVISIONS ASSOCIATED WITH DEVELOPMENT PLAN APPLICATION FOR CP SUB-PHASE 02-03-04, CANDLESTICK POINT/HUNTERS POINT SHIPYARD PHASE II PROJECT, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

Dear Ms. Navarrete:

The Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR (herein referred to as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission and the San Francisco Planning Commission in June 2010. We understand that the City and Office of Community Investment & Infrastructure are evaluating several Project Revisions associated with the development plan application for Sub-Phase 02-03-04 at Candlestick Point (CP). These Project Revisions include:

- 1. Relocation of three towers (Towers G, J and K);
- 2. Height increases for several locations in CP Center, specifically
 - (a) Increasing the height of buildings on both sides of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 65 feet to 80 feet;
 - (b) Increasing the height of the building at the corner of Harney Way and Ingerson Avenue from 85 feet to 120 feet; and
 - (c) Increasing the height for the building at the corner of Arelious Walker and Harney Way from65 feet to 80 feet.
- 3. Conversion of 15,500 square feet approved office space to 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail;
- 4. Relocation of on-street parking spaces to the CP Center garage;
- 5. Dividing the construction the first phase of Harney Way improvements into two phases; and
- 6. Revising the cross-section of Gilman Avenue to reduce travel lanes and provide larger sidewalks.

This memorandum evaluates whether the air quality and greenhouse gas (GHG) impacts disclosed in the EIR are affected by these changes.

1. Relocation of Towers

The relocation of three towers would not affect the analysis of criteria air pollutant (CAP) and GHG emissions in the EIR as the overall square footage of the Project would not be altered. This Project revision would also have a negligible effect on the health risk assessment (HRA) from construction emissions as the towers would be relocated within the same sub-phases as previously analyzed. The HRA analysis in the EIR assumes construction emissions are distributed throughout the sub-phase, so relocation of the towers within the respective sub-phases would not change the analysis.

2. Height Increases in CP Center

The increase in maximum building height for three locations in CP Center would not affect the analysis of CAP and GHG emissions in the EIR because the overall square footage of the Project would not be altered. We understand that this would change the massing of the buildings; however, not the overall floor space for entitlements. Because the models used in the EIR to estimate construction emissions are based on square footage and not overall area; there would not be a material difference in the way the emissions are estimated. Therefore, this overall emissions for the Project revision would not change and therefore the revised analysis would be identical to the analysis in the EIR. This Project revision would also have a negligible effect on the HRA because total construction emissions would be unchanged from the EIR.

3. Conversion Office Floor Space to Local-Serving Retail

This analysis evaluates the proposed conversion of office floor space to local-serving retail floor space. The analysis is structured to determine the necessary reduction in the amount of office square footage that would be required to allow a 6,000 square foot increase in Local-serving Retail without increasing any of the Project criteria air pollutant (CAP) and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions evaluated in the EIR. The detailed evaluation of operational criterial pollutant emission, operational GHG emissions, and construction emissions are discussed below.

3.1 Operational Criterial Pollutant Emissions

To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail without increasing the total Project operational criteria pollutant emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated 2030 criteria pollutant emissions associated with the proposed 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail using California Emission Estimator Model version 2013.2.2 (CalEEMod®).¹ The proposed local-serving retail is modeled as "Strip Mall", which is consistent with the land use category used for the Local-serving Retail in the EIR. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air Resources Board (ARB)'s EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default that was based on EMFAC2011. EMFAC2014 incorporates new vehicle emissions standards and rules and regulations (e.g., Advanced Clean Cars and Truck & Bus Rule).

¹ CalEEMod® is a statewide program designed to calculate both criteria and GHG emissions from development projects in California. It was developed in collaboration with California air districts led by South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) and is currently supported by several lead agencies for use in quantifying the emissions associated with development projects undergoing environmental review.



The Project criteria pollutant emissions presented in the EIR were previously modeled using URBEMIS 2007 version 9.2.4 for year 2030.² The minimum square footage of the previously approved office floor space entitlement that would be converted and its associated CAP emissions were scaled from the previous calculation presented Appendix H1 of the EIR by matching the worst case pollutant (i.e., NOx) of the local-serving retail emissions discussed above. The emission comparison is summarized in Table 1.

As presented in Table 1, adding 6,000 square feet local-serving retail development to the Project without increasing the emissions of any criteria pollutant previously estimated in the EIR would require a removal of at least 10,300 square feet of office.

The proposed local-serving retail development is designed to offer the community retail services (e.g., dry clean, barbershop, grocery and other businesses) within walking distance. The mobile source emissions in this analysis were evaluated using CalEEMod® default trip rates based on ITE Trip Generation, which does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the transit-oriented nature of the development plan. Therefore, the estimated emissions for the proposed local-serving retail uses are conservative. If a detailed site specific trip generation rate were available, it would be likely that less office space would need to be replaced due to lower emissions from mobile sources.

3.2 Operational Greenhouse Gas Emissions

To evaluate the minimum size of office land use to be converted to 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail without increasing the total Project operational GHG emissions, Ramboll Environ estimated the 2020 GHG emissions associated with proposed 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail using CalEEMod®. The mobile source emission factors generated using California Air ARB's EMFAC2014 model are used to replace the CalEEMod® default as discussed in the previous section. In addition, the GHG emissions associated with energy incorporate the 2013 California Building Energy Efficiency Standards (Title 24) and Pacific Gas and Electric's 2020 carbon intensity factor.

The Project GHG emissions presented in the 2009 EIR were previously calculated for year 2020. In this analysis, the minimum square footage of the previously approved office land use that would be converted and its associated GHG emissions are calculated using the same methodology presented in Appendix S (Climate Change Technical Report) and are summarized in Table 2.

As presented in Table 2, an addition of 6,000 square feet local-serving retail development to the Project without increasing the GHG emissions previously estimated would require a removal of at least 9,200 square feet of previously approved office land use.

As discussed earlier, the CalEEMod® default trip rates does not reflect low trip generation rate due to the nature of the development plan. Therefore, the estimated GHG emissions for the proposed local-serving retails are conservative.

3.3 Construction Emissions

The construction emissions presented in the EIR were calculated based on the Project specific construction schedule and equipment list. It is reasonable to assume the proposed local-serving retail

² URBEMIS was the land use emissions inventory model recommended used for the EIR. It was widely used before the development of CalEEMod®.

would be constructed over the same construction duration with the same equipment list. In addition, based on the operational criteria pollutant and GHG emission comparison discussed above, the equivalent local-serving retail would be smaller in size. Therefore, converting office into local-serving retail would not generate increased criteria pollutant emissions, GHG emissions, cancer risks, noncancer chronic hazard index (HI), or acute HI associated with the construction activities presented in the EIR.

3.4 Summary

Based on the results of the comparison, the proposed addition of 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail would require a reduction of office floor space of at least 10,300 square feet to avoid increasing criteria pollutant emissions, or 9,200 square feet to avoid increasing GHG emissions. Criteria pollutant emissions would be the limiting factor for determining the size of the converted office land use. Therefore, a minimum of 10,300 square feet of office evaluated in the EIR is recommended as a like-for-like replacement for the proposed addition of 6,000 square feet of local-serving retail. The developer is proposing to convert 15,500 square feet of office, which would not increase the Project air quality or GHG impacts anticipated in the EIR.

4. Relocation of on-street parking spaces

The developer is proposing to relocate on-street parking to the CP Center garage. This is expected to have negligible effect on construction activity because we understand that the overall building envelope of the CP Center garage will not change from the garage size anticipated in the EIR. As such, there would be no change in the overall CAP and GHG emissions from that evaluated in the EIR. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are unchanged from the EIR.

5. Dividing Harney Way improvements into two phases

We understand that this modification results from the need to bifurcate construction on Harney Way into two phases in order to harmonize phasing with other transportation improvements planned for this area. This would not change the overall work planned for the Harney Way improvements; it would merely mean the same amount of work spread over a longer time. As this revision only splits the Harney Way improvements into two phases and does not increase the amount of activity, there is no change in the overall CAP and GHG emissions. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are unchanged from the EIR.

6. Revising Gilman Avenue cross-section

We understand that this modification will result in less construction. The original cross-section proposed to widen the Gilman to accommodate two lanes in each direction, whereas under the revised proposal there will be one lane in each direction plus a left turn lane in the middle – the curb to curb width will be 49 feet 9 inches instead of 56 feet. As this revision reflects a reduction in the construction activity (i.e., building a smaller roadway), the construction activity will be lower than that which was analyzed in the EIR. As such, there would be no increase in the overall CAP and GHG emissions. This would also have a negligible effect on the HRA as total construction emissions are reduced from the EIR.

7. Conclusion

As discussed for each change above, the Project Revisions are not expected to materially change the results of the analyses conducted in support of the EIR.

If you have any questions about this analysis, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for the opportunity to assist you with this matter.

Yours sincerely

Michael Keinath, PE Principal

D +1 415 796 1934 kaizhao@ramboll.com

Kai Zhao Manager

mkeinath@ranboll.com

Attachments:

Tables

 Table 1. Conversion of Office to Local-serving Retail with Equivalent Worst Case

 Criterial

 Pollutant Emissions

 Table 2. Comparison of Office to Local-serving Retail with Equivalent CUC Emissions

Table 2. Conversion of Office to Local-serving Retail with Equivalent GHG Emissions

Exhibit P Page 5 of 8

TABLES

Exhibit P Page 6 of 8

Table 1

Conversion of Office to Local-Serving Retail with Equivalent Worst Case Criterial Pollutant Emissions Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan San Francisco, California

	Cine	Criteria Pollutant Emissions ⁴ (Ib/day)					
Land Use	Size (KSF)	ROG	NOx ³	со	SO ₂	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Local Retail ¹	6	0.27	0.32	1.6	0.008	0.88	0.24
Office (to be replaced) ^{2,3}	-10.3	-0.34	-0.32	-3.54	-0.010	-1.69	-0.32

Notes:

1. The criteria pollutant emissions associated with proposed local-serving retail land use are modeled for operation year 2030 using CalEEMod® with the incorporation of the mobile emissions factor generated using ARB's EMFAC 2014 model. The local-serving retail is modeled as a strip mall, which was consistent with the land used category for local-serving retail used in the EIR (see Appendix H1).

2. The criteria pollutant emissions associated with the office land use to be placed (presented as negative emissions) are scaled from the URBEMIS model output presented in Appendix H1 of the Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Project EIR by matching the emissions of the worst case pollutant (i.e., NOx) from the proposed local retail. The office land use was modeled as an office park in the URBEMIS model.

3. Based on the analysis, an addition of 6 KSF local-serving retail to the Project without exceeding the emissions of any criteria pollutant previously estimated in the EIR would require a removal of 10.3 KSF of previously approved office land use.

Abbreviations:

ARB: California Air Resources Board CalEEMod®: California Emissions Estimator Model CO: carbon monoxide EIR: Environmental impact Report KSF: thousand square feet lb: pound NOx: nitrogen oxides ROG: reactive organic gas SO₂: sulfur dioxide URBEMIS: Urban Emissions Model

References:

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and San Francisco Planning Commission. Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II EIR: Volume IV Appendix H1.

Available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=334



Table 2

Conversion of Office to Local-Serving Retail with Equivalent GHG Emissions Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan San Francisco, California

	GHG I (tonnes	GHG Emissions (tonnes CO ₂ e/year)		
Source	Local Retail ¹	Office (to be replaced) ²		
Energy	10.1	-41.3		
Mobile	137	-108		
Water	1.0	-0.9		
Area	0	0		
Waste	2.9	-0.5		
Total (annual emissions)	151	-151		
Size (KSF) ³	6	-9.2		

Notes:

1. The greenhouse gas emissions associated with proposed local-serving retail land use are modeled for year 2020 using CalEEMod® with the incorporation of the most recent carbon intensity factor published by PG&E, 2013 California Building Efficiency Standards (Title 24), and mobile emissions factor generated using ARB's EMFAC 2014 model. The local-serving retail is modeled as a strip mall, which was consistent with the land used category for local-serving retail used in the EIR.

2. The greenhouse gas emissions associated with the office land use to be replaced (presented as negative emissions) are calculated for year 2020 using the same methodology presented in Appendix S (Climate Change Technical Report).

3. Based on the comparison, an addition of 6 KSF local-serving retail to the Project without exceeding the greenhouse gas emissions previously estimated in the EIR would require a removal of 9.2 KSF of previously approved office land use.

Abbreviations:

ARB: California Air Resources Board CalEEMod®: California Emissions Estimator Model CO₂e: carbon dioxide equivalent EIR: Environmental impact Report KSF: thousand square feet Ib.: pound

References:

San Francisco Redevelopment Agency and San Francisco Planning Commission. Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II EIR: Volume IV Appendix S. Available at: http://www.sf-planning.org/modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=316



MEMORANDUM

- To: Joy Navarette Senior Environmental Planner San Francisco Planning Department
- From: B.H. Bronson Johnson Director of Land Development CP Development Co., LP
- Date: January 26, 2016
- Subject: Excavation Quantities at Candlestick Point

Per the request of the City Planning Department, we have prepared the following memorandum to provide an update on excavation quantities at the Candlestick Point Redevelopment Project ("CP") as they compare to the certified Candlestick Point-Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Development Plan Environmental Impact Report (the "EIR"). The design of the CP Retail Center ("CP Center"), which includes an underground parking structure, is still in schematic design and is subject to change prior to issuance of the final permit. Nonetheless, the information presented herein is based on the most recent design information we as the Master Developer, CP Development Co., LP have received from the CP Retail Center Developer.

EXCAVATION QUANTITY

There are currently 18 Sub-phases in the Candlestick Point Redevelopment Plan.

Page II-54 of the EIR presents Table II-12, *Summary of Project Site Grading Requirements*. At Candlestick Point, the estimated excavation quantity in Development Areas is 1,111,000 CY and the estimated excavation quantity in Open Space Areas is 156,000 CY. As an overall project analysis, we will compare the total estimated excavated quantity of 1,267,000 CY per the EIR, to the current estimated excavation quantities of each Sub-Phase of Development.

The current estimated quantities of excavation are shown in Table 1 below:

Table 1: Estimated quantities of Excavation at Candlestick Point.

Sub-Phase	Excavation Quantity	Construction Status
CP-01 Excavation	14,390 CY	Complete
CP-02 Pad Grading	571,000 CY	Approx. 30% Complete
CP-02 Soil Nail Wall Excavation	137,300 CY	Not Started
CP-02 Jamestown Re- Alignment	35,000 CY	Not Started
CP-05 Excavation	22,100 CY	Not Started
CP-08 Excavation	415,350 CY	Not Started
CP-09 Excavation	74,450 CY	Not Started
Total	1,269,590 CY	



LENNARURBAN.COM

Exhibit Q: CP Dev Co Excavation Quantities Memo

All other Sub-phases not listed in this table have only fill quantities associated with the grading plan and no additional excavation is proposed.

Based on these current design quantities, we are within 0.2% of the estimated quantities of excavation contemplated in the EIR.

EXCAVATION DEPTH

Page III.L-25 of the EIR presents Table III.L-5, *Grading and Fill Conditions for Candlestick Point Geotechnical Subparcels*. This Table shows that Geotech Subparcel K1 (Candlestick Point Center) was estimated to have cuts up to 40 ft. The current grading design for the CP Center includes cuts between 15 feet and 25 feet in depth on the majority of the site, and up to approximately 46 ft in select areas where the existing site grades had been built up around the western perimeter of the former football stadium to provide access.

It is not anticipated that this increased excavation depth in a centralized location at CP Center will result in any additional impacts beyond what was considered in the EIR. The increased depth will occur in an area that has the same San Franciscan rock formations present in other areas of excavation within the Project site, and no new soil type is anticipated to be encountered. Additionally, although the excavation depth at this localized area would have a minor increase over the EIR estimate, the overall excavation volume for the site has not increased, resulting in no new impacts due to excavation quantity. Moreover, the minor increase in excavation depth would not require any additional mitigation measures because all impacts associated with excavation would be addressed through the requirement for site specific geotechnical investigations and resulting requirements for excavation and structural protective measures.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, it is our opinion that the proposed excavation at Candlestick Point remains consistent with the approved EIR, will not generate any additional adverse environmental impacts nor necessitate any additional mitigation measures.



LENNARURBAN.COM

Exhibit Q Page 2 of 2

Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16) FEHR / PEERS

February 18, 2016

Ms. Joy Navarette San Francisco Planning Department 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103

Ms. Lila Hussain Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure One South Van Ness, 5th Floor San Francisco, CA 94103

Cc: Therese Brekke, Lennar Urban Chris O'Conner, Lennar Urban Maria Pracher, Sheppard Mullin

Subject: Candlestick Point – Office to Local Serving Retail Conversion

Dear Joy and Lila,

The *Candlestick Point/Hunters Point Shipyard Phase II Project Final EIR* (herein referred to simply as "EIR") was certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Commission in June 2010. Since that time, the Housing/R&D Variant (Variant 2A) has been advanced as the project. Variant 2A assumed the Candlestick Point site would include:

- 150,000 square feet of office
- 6,225 residential dwelling units (includes replacement of 256 then-existing units at Alice Griffith)
- 635,000 square feet of regional retail
- 125,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail
- 220 room hotel
- 50,000 square feet of community-serving uses
- 10,000-seat arena

Since the Project has been approved, the project sponsor has proposed to replace 15,500 square feet of office with 6,000 square feet of local serving retail and replace the 10,000 seat arena with a 4,400 seat performing arts venue and a 1,200 seat theater. This letter assesses the effects of converting a portion of the approved land uses as it relates to loading demand. **Table 1** summarizes the loading demand calculations for daily and peak hour truck trips and **Table 2** compares the daily truck trip generation and peak hour loading demand.

Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16)

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure February 18, 2016 Page 2 of 3

TABLE 1: CANDLESTICK POINT LOADING DEMAND Peak Hour **Daily Truck Trip Daily Truck** Land Use Size Loading Generation Rate¹ Trips Space 635 ksf 0.22 9 **Regional Retail** 140 2 0.22 131 ksf 29 Local Serving Retail Office 134.5 ksf 0.21 29 2 0.22 8 Performing Arts Venue² 4.400 seats 1 0.22 **Community Center** 50 ksf 11 1 County Park³ 0.00 0 0 97 acres Hotel⁴ 220 rooms 0.09 14 1 Residential Units⁵ 6,225 dwelling units 0.03 234 14 Movie Theater⁶ 1,200 seats 0.22 1 10 475 Total 31

Notes:

1. Daily Truck Trip Generation Rates based on rates determined in the SF Guidelines. Rates based on 1,000 gross square feet of use.

2. Performing Arts Venue: 4,400 seats = 33 ksf

3. It was assumed that the County Park would not generate daily truck trips; therefore, was not included in this analysis.

4. Hotel: 220 rooms = 150 ksf

5. Residential Units: 6,225 dwelling units = 7,800 ksf

6. Movie Theater: 1,200 seats = 42 ksf

Fehr & Peers, 2015

TABLE 2: PROJECT LOADING DEMAND COMPARISON IN CANDLESTICK POINT 1

Scenario	Daily Truck Trip Generation	Peak Hour Loading Space Demand
Project Proposal (2010) ¹	507	29
Project Variant 2A ²	448	25
Current Proposal	475	31

Notes:

1. Information based on EIR results presented in Table III.D-22 (2010).

2. Information based on Project Variant 2A Memorandum provided by LCW Consulting (March 2010).

Fehr & Peers, 2015

Exhibit R: Fehr & Peers Loading Letter (2/18/16)

Joy Navarette, San Francisco Planning Department Lila Hussain, Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure February 18, 2016 Page 3 of 3



Impact TR-37 of the EIR states that loading operations would not result in a significant impact associated with a lack of adequate supply. Additionally, the EIR states that if the loading demand is not met on site and could not be accommodated within on-street loading zones, trucks would temporarily double-park and partially block local streets while loading and unloading goods which would result in disruptions and impacts to traffic and transit operations, as well as bicycles and pedestrians. However, because any effects of unmet loading demand would be a temporary inconvenience, any excess demand would not be significant.

As shown in Table 2, the estimated daily truck trip generation will decrease from the total estimated in the EIR and increase from Project Variant 2A. The peak hour loading space demand would slightly increase from the EIR and Project Variant 2A by 2 and 6 loading spaces, respectively. Neither the EIR nor Project Variant 2A included the Arena as part of the Candlestick Point loading demand calculations because Arena loading estimates were provided separate from the rest of the Project. Therefore, the slight increase in peak hour demand is a result of the inclusion of the revised land uses in Candlestick Point. The peak loading demand will likely be met on site, although trucks may temporarily double park for convenience, which would be a short-term inconvenience and would not be significant. Therefore, the Project's impacts related to loading operations would continue to be less than significant.

For questions or comments please contact Chris Mitchell or Sarah Nadiranto.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

Chris Mitchell, PE Principal

Sarah Nadiranto, PE Transportation Engineer

SF08-0407

Exhibit R Page 3 of 3