SUMMARY

S.1 INTRODUCTION

This document is a draft environmental impact report (EIR) for the proposed Better Market Street Project (project or proposed project). This chapter is intended to highlight major areas of importance in the environmental analysis as required by section 15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. This chapter provides a summary of the proposed project, a summary of the anticipated environmental impacts of the proposed project and the identified mitigation measures, areas of controversy to be resolved, a summary of the project variant, a summary of alternatives to the proposed project, and an identification of the environmentally superior alternative.

S.2 PROJECT SUMMARY

The project sponsor, San Francisco Public Works (Public Works), in coordination with project partners (the Citywide Planning Division of the San Francisco Planning Department [planning department] and the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency [SFMTA]), proposes to implement the proposed project, which would provide various transportation and streetscape improvements to a 2.2-mile-long corridor.

The project corridor encompasses Market Street between Steuart Street and Octavia Boulevard. It includes portions of streets that intersect Market Street, four off-corridor intersections, and the entirety of Charles J. Brenham Place. The corridor also includes the portion of Valencia Street between Market Street and McCoppin Street. The project would introduce changes to the roadway configuration as well as private vehicle access, traffic signals, surface transit (including San Francisco Municipal Railway– (Muni-) only lanes, stop spacing and service, stop locations, stop characteristics, and infrastructure), bicycle facilities, pedestrian facilities, streetscapes, commercial and passenger loading, vehicular parking, and utilities. The project would also change traffic configurations on adjacent streets that intersect Market Street to both the north and the south.

In addition to the proposed project, the project sponsor is considering one project variant: the Western Variant. The variant would be located within a portion of the same corridor as the proposed project but would vary in terms of proposed improvements/regulations for discrete portions of the corridor. The Western Variant would include the approximately 0.6-mile portion of Market Street between Octavia Boulevard and a point approximately 300 feet east of the Hayes and Market Street intersection. The Western Variant seeks improvements beyond those of the proposed project related to pedestrian and bicyclist safety, comfort, and mobility through additional reductions to conflicts between different modes of transportation.

The project sponsor and project partners developed objectives for the proposed project related to creating a memorable and active identity for Market Street, optimizing mobility for all users of sustainable transportation modes, and ensuring that all improvements and plans are coordinated with surrounding land use development. The proposed project would be located along the boundary of or within several northeast quadrant neighborhoods of the city and county of San Francisco, specifically, the Western Addition, Mission, Downtown/Civic Center, SoMa, and Financial District neighborhoods.

S.3 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

A notice of preparation (NOP) of an EIR and notice of public scoping meeting were published on January 14, 2015. The notice of availability (NOA) of the initial study and the initial study prepared for the proposed project were published on March 30, 2016. These are available within Appendix 1 and 2, respectively. For each item on the initial study checklist, the evaluation considered the impacts of the proposed project both individually and cumulatively. A detailed checklist and discussion of each environmental factor was included in the initial study to identify the potential effects of the proposed project on the environment. The initial study found that the following environmental factors could result in significant impacts and therefore are discussed in the EIR:

- Cultural resources
- Transportation and circulation
- Noise and vibration
- Air quality
- Wind

This summary provides an overview of the analysis contained in Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting and Impacts*. The categories used to designate impact significance are:

- *No Impact (NI).* No adverse changes (or impacts) to the environment are expected.
- *Less than Significant (LTS).* An impact that would not involve an adverse physical change to the environment, would not exceed the defined significance criteria, or would be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations.
- *Less than Significant with Mitigation (LSM).* An impact that is reduced to a less-than-significant level though implementation of the identified mitigation measures.
- *Significant and Unavoidable with Mitigation (SUM).* An adverse physical environmental impact that would exceed the defined significance criteria and can be reduced through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations and/or implementation of all feasible mitigation measures but cannot be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

- *Significant and Unavoidable (SU).* An adverse physical environmental impact that exceeds the defined significance criteria and cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through compliance with existing local, state, and federal laws and regulations and for which there are no feasible mitigation measures.

SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS

All impacts of the proposed project, its variant, its alternatives, and the associated mitigation measures identified in this EIR are summarized in Table S-1, p. S-12. The impacts are listed in the same order as they appear in the text of Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting and Impacts*. The proposed project was determined to have the following significant and unavoidable impacts, even with implementation of feasible mitigation measures. These impacts (and feasible mitigation measures) are equally applicable to the project variant.

CULTURAL RESOURCES IMPACTS

- Impact CP-1.C. The proposed project and project variant would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District as a designed landscape associated with the Market Street Redevelopment Plan.
- Impact C-CP-1. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the city, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on the Market Street Cultural Landscape District but not on any other historic architectural resources.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION IMPACTS

- Impact TR-1. Construction of the proposed project and project variant could result in substantial interference with pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas, and could result in potentially hazardous conditions.
- Impact C-TR-1. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts.
- Impact C-TR-4. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts related to transit operations on the Muni 27 Bryant but would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts on other local and regional routes.

NOISE

- Impact C-NO-1. Construction activities for the proposed project and the project variant, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise or noise levels in excess of the applicable local standards.

S.4 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY AND ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

As noted above, a NOP of an EIR and notice of public scoping meeting were published on January 14, 2015. During the public scoping process and at the public scoping meeting (held on February 4, 2015), the planning department received comments from public agencies, organizations, and individuals regarding the scope and content of the EIR, including comments on the design of the proposed project and its environmental effects (see Appendix 1, *Scoping Report*).

Comments received during the scoping process on the proposed project and its environmental effects are addressed in this EIR. Although the project variant was not described in the NOP, the characteristics of the project variant are similar to or the same as the proposed project. On the basis of public comments submitted following publication of the NOP, it was determined that the potential areas of controversy and unresolved issues for the proposed project and the project variant include:

- Potential impacts of the proposed changes to Market Street on the capacity provided by the Central Freeway and local street system (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential impacts on the U.S. 101/Octavia Boulevard and U.S. 101/Mission Street off-ramps, including average daily traffic, a.m. and p.m. peak-hour volumes, and levels of service (LOS) on affected facilities under existing, existing-plus-project, cumulative, and cumulative-plus-project scenarios (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential impacts related to area traffic and degradation of existing and cumulative LOS and identification of mitigation measures (including fair share contribution, schedule, and implementation responsibilities) to reduce impacts, where feasible (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential impacts resulting from recent and proposed changes in the project area, including the closure of Annie Street and other changes proposed under the Central SoMa Plan (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential impacts of an alternative that considers transit operating in one lane in each direction on Market Street (Chapter 6, *Alternatives*)

- Potential impacts related to emergency access and operational functions regarding revenue collection and service vehicles (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential safety and level of service impacts related to changes to surface transit on Market Street (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential access impacts for private vehicles, including private vehicles exiting the garage at One Bush Street (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential impacts, including impacts related to safety, on state facilities for bicyclists/pedestrians, as well as their connections, as a result of the proposed project (e.g., the one-way streets near the U.S. 101 on- and off-ramps) (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential performance and quality of service impacts to bicyclists/pedestrians and transit (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential secondary impacts from implementation of identified mitigation measures (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential impacts resulting from increases in bicycle trips and changes to bicycle circulation on Market Street (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential loading impacts on commercial and passenger vehicles (Section 4.B, *Transportation and Circulation*)
- Potential impacts related to General Plan consistency (Chapter 3, *Plans and Policies*, and the initial study included in Appendix 2)

The issues listed above are discussed in this EIR.

S.5 SUMMARY OF THE PROJECT VARIANT

This EIR includes an environmental analysis of one variant to the proposed project: the Western Variant. Distinct from the project alternatives presented in Chapter 6, *Alternatives*, the project sponsor has identified one variant that would have similar changes as those proposed for the project, except within a subsegment of the project corridor where additional and/or different measures from the proposed project are potentially desirable. The inclusion of the project variant in this EIR provides decision makers with some flexibility regarding the final project to be approved.

Chapter 2, *Project Description*, includes variations proposed by the project sponsor and the description and analysis of the variant is equal in detail to those of the project. A variant is distinct from "alternatives" insofar as CEQA requires the consideration of alternatives to avoid or lessen significant effects of the proposed project.

Each technical section of this EIR (4.A through 4.E) provides analysis of the proposed project as well as the additive or different effects of the Western Variant. The Western Variant would include changes to the transportation and streetscape improvements proposed under the project within the project limits of the approximately 0.6-mile portion of Market Street between Octavia Boulevard and approximately 300 feet east of the Hayes and Market Street intersection. The Western Variant seeks changes beyond those of the proposed project related to pedestrian and bicyclists safety, comfort, and mobility though additional reductions to conflicts between different modes of transportation.

In sum, the project variant is a variation of the proposed project along the same project corridor, with the same objectives, background, and development controls, but with additions and changes from the proposed project, whose inclusion may or may not reduce environmental impacts. Therefore, this EIR describes and analyzes the associated environmental impacts for the project variant at the same level of detail as the proposed project.

S.6 SUMMARY OF ALTERNATIVES

In addition to the proposed project, this EIR analyzes the environmental impacts of five alternatives that were determined to represent a reasonable range of alternatives, as follows. For more detail than the summaries below, please see Chapter 6, *Alternatives*.

- **Alternative A: No Project Alternative.** In the No Project Alternative, the project corridor would generally remain in its current condition. The roadway configuration; access for private vehicles; traffic signals; surface transit, such as Muni service and infrastructure; bicycle facilities; pedestrian facilities; streetscapes; commercial and passenger loading; vehicular parking; and utilities would remain in their current conditions. Routinely scheduled maintenance activities for existing streetscape elements (such as tree trimming) and limited physical changes related to operational needs and emergency repairs of the existing transit infrastructure would continue to occur. In addition, the following planned/approved projects or activities would be implemented within, or would overlap a portion of the project corridor, resulting in some degree of physical change on Market Street.
    - Muni Forward
    - Van Ness Improvement Project
    - Geary Rapid Project
    - Electrification of the two existing track switches on Market Street at 11th Street
    - Replacement/repair of BART/Muni Metro ventilation grates
    - Addition of concrete protection to bike lanes

- Refreshing existing crosswalk and other pavement markings
- Minor signal timing changes to improve vehicle progression

- **Alternative B: Full Preservation Alternative**. The Full Preservation Alternative would avoid significant impacts to the Market Street Cultural Landscape Historic District by substantially reducing the scope of proposed project changes such that several priority 1 character-defining features of the landscape district would remain intact. Alternative B would omit many project-related alterations to physical features of Market Street. Accordingly, transit stop spacing and service, bicycle facilities, and commercial and passenger loading facilities would be similar to existing conditions. Similarly, Path of Gold light standards would remain as existing. Alternative B would retain all existing curblines as well as all brick sidewalks and plazas. Existing tree wells would be replanted with new trees to preserve the *Platanus* monoculture, selecting from one of two varieties,[1] similar in character to the trees that would be removed but with greater disease tolerance.[2] This alternative would include the same roadway access changes for private vehicles and changes to on-street parking as the proposed project.
- **Alternative C: Partial Preservation Alternative 1.** Alternative C would modify/replace key components of the proposed project with other components intended to preserve and/or complement character defining features of the Market Street Cultural Landscape Historic District, but less expansively so than Alternative B. Alternative C would include more alterations to Market Street than Alternative B, but different in number/character than those associated with the proposed project. Although Alternative C would incorporate features intended to reference/complement certain character defining features of the landscape district (sidewalk surfaces and trees), it would still result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the eligible landscape district as a whole. Similar to the proposed project, Alternative C would add a sidewalk-level bikeway for the entirety of Market Street between Octavia Boulevard and Steuart Street. Alternative C would also partially restore, reconstruct, and realign Path of Gold light standards (similar to the proposed project).
- **Alternative D: Partial Preservation Alternative 2.** Alternative D would modify/replace key components of the proposed project with the intent to preserve and/or complement character defining features of the Market Street Cultural Landscape Historic District. Alternative D would reduce impacts to the landscape district relative to the proposed project by reducing the scope of alterations/modifications to character defining features of the landscape district. Alternative D would generally retain streetscapes that would

---

[1] These varieties are 1) *Platanus x acerfolia* Bloodgood, Columbia, and Yarwood and 2) *Platanus x acerfolia* Liberty.

[2] HortScience, Inc., *Better Market Street Project Tree Inventory Report*, August 2016.

be similar to existing conditions where no modifications to center boarding islands or curbside transit stops would occur. In contrast, blocks of Market Street where modifications to center boarding island and/or curbside transit stops are needed would see streetscape improvements similar to the proposed project.

- **Alternative E: Core Elements Alternative.** Alternative E was developed in recognition that a substantial portion of project-related effects are not directly associated with core elements of the proposed project but with associated upgrades/replacements of major infrastructure that exists beneath the roadway and sidewalk which would be replaced/upgraded as part of the proposed project. The elements of this alternative associated with roadway configuration, transit facilities and operations, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities would be the same as the proposed project. However, Alternative E would not include the sub-surface "state of good repair"[3] infrastructure work proposed by the project. Removal of those elements would allow the core elements of the proposed project to proceed with lessened construction-related effects.

Section 21002 of the CEQA Statute[4] states that "public agencies should not approve projects as proposed if there are feasible alternatives or feasible mitigation measures available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects" of the project. This section of the CEQA statute adds that a lead agency may approve a project with significant environmental effects if the lead agency can demonstrate that specific economic, social or other conditions make such mitigation measures or alternatives infeasible.

Table S-2, p. S-43, compares the significant and unavoidable impacts of the proposed project (which are identical for the project variant) with the comparative impacts of the five alternatives.

S.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

CEQA requires that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the alternatives analyzed. The environmentally superior alternative is the alternative that avoids or substantially lessens some or all of the significant and unavoidable impacts of a project. If the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6).

Alternative A (No Project Alternative) would avoid two of the significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the proposed project and would not result in any other significant

[3] State of good repair is a term employed by the Federal Transit Administration relating to transit infrastructure; it is achieved by having well maintained, reliable transit infrastructure to provide safe, dependable and accessible transit service.

[4] California Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq.

impacts. Alternative A would be the environmentally superior alternative but for the provisions of section 15126.6 of the CEQA Guidelines, which requires the lead agency to identify another environmental superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Alternatives C and D would entail many similar components of the proposed project, and thus, as indicated in Table 6-4, would result in generally similar significant and unavoidable impacts to transportation (construction period operations) and the landscape district as the proposed project, although to a lesser degree.

Alternative E would omit the below-ground infrastructure replacement/upgrades associated with the proposed project. Notwithstanding, the construction duration is expected to be similar to that of the proposed project. Moreover, Alternative E would implement the same streetscape changes as the proposed project, and thus would (like the proposed project) result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the landscape district.

The remaining alternative, the Full Preservation Alternative (Alternative B), would avoid the significant and unavoidable project level and cumulative impacts to the landscape district because it would not adversely affect character-defining features of the landscape district.

However, because Alternative B would incorporate replacement/upgrades of utilities beneath the roadway portion of Market Street, Alternative B would still entail a substantial period of construction on Market Street and thus result in a lessened but still significant and unavoidable impact to transportation relative to the proposed project. Alternative B would also result in a considerable contribution to cumulative construction-related transportation impacts.

As set forth in Chapter 6, Section C, Alternative B entails a substantially reduced set of project-related improvements. It was developed as a preservation alternative in response to HPC Resolution 0746. However, as further detailed in Chapter 6, Section C, the omission of several proposed project elements, which was necessary to fully avoid the significant and unavoidable impact on the landscape district, would render Alternative B unable to fully meet any of the seven basic project objectives, although it would partially meet five of the seven basic objectives. Therefore, Alternative B would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid an impact on the landscape district.

Chapter 6, Section D includes further discussion of considerations regarding the identification of the environmentally superior alternative.

S.8 SUMMARY TABLES

Although the 2016 initial study prepared for the proposed project identified two significant archaeological resource impacts for which a mitigation measure was applied, the project definition has been refined, which has required a full assessment of impacts to archaeological resources in this EIR. As such, the archaeological resource impacts and mitigation measures presented in the initial study have been superseded by the information presented in this EIR.

Table S-1, page S-11, includes the impacts and mitigation measures identified in this EIR for the proposed project and the project variant. Table S-2, page S-44, includes a comparison of the impacts of the proposed project with the impacts of the project alternatives. It also determines if the project sponsor's objectives would be met by the proposed project and the alternatives.

The information in the tables is organized to correspond with environmental issues discussed in Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting and Impacts*. Table S-1, on the following page, is arranged in four columns: 1) environmental impacts, 2) level of significance before mitigation (if applicable), 3) mitigation measures (if applicable), and 4) level of significance after mitigation (if applicable). For a complete description of potential impacts and recommended mitigation measures, please refer to the topical sections in Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting and Impacts*, of the EIR.

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
Cultural Resources			
CP-1.A. The proposed project and project variant would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District as San Francisco's main circulation artery and facilitator of urban development.	LTS	None required	LTS
CP-1.B. The proposed project and project variant would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District as a venue for civic engagement in San Francisco.	LTS	None required	LTS
CP-1.C. The proposed project and project variant would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District as a designed landscape associated with the Market Street Redevelopment Plan.	S	**M-CP-1a: Prepare and Submit Additional Documentation for the Market Street Cultural Landscape District** The project sponsor shall prepare Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) documentation of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District to level 1 standards. The objective of the documentation shall be to record the extant character-defining cultural landscape features, spatial arrangement, and setting of the resource. The project sponsor shall retain a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Qualification Standards for Architectural Historian or Historian (36 CFR, Part 61) and a photographer with	SUM

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		demonstrated experience in HALS/Historic American Building Survey (HABS) photography to prepare written and photographic documentation for the Market Street Cultural Landscape District. The HALS documentation package for the Market Street Cultural Landscape District shall be reviewed and approved by the planning department's preservation staff prior to issuance of an excavation permit for the proposed project or commencement of construction. The documentation shall consist of the following: • HALS-level Photographs:* HALS standard large-format photography shall be used to document the Market Street Cultural Landscape District and surrounding context. The scope of the photographs shall be reviewed and approved by the planning department's preservation staff for concurrence, and all photography shall be conducted according to the current National Park Service HALS standards. Photographs for the dataset shall include: (a) contextual views of existing settings for the Market Street Cultural Landscape District in order to document the resource's overall spatial organization, circulation patterns, and physical features in relation to the surrounding built environment of downtown San Francisco; (b) general landscape and detailed views of all plazas within the Market Street Cultural Landscape District; and (c) detailed views of the resource's priority 1, priority 2, and priority 3 character-defining structures/ objects, circulation patterns,	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		and vegetation. The photograph set shall include distant/elevated views to capture the extent and context of the resource. o All views shall be referenced on a key map of the property, including each photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view. o Draft photograph contact sheets and the key map shall be provided to the planning department's preservation staff for review to determine the final number and views for inclusion in the final dataset. o Historic photographs identified in previous studies shall also be collected, scanned as high-resolution digital files, and reproduced in the dataset. • Written HALS Narrative Report: A written historical narrative, using the outline format, shall be prepared in accordance with the HALS Historical Report Guidelines. • Measured Drawings: A set of measured drawings shall be prepared to document the overall design, dimensions, location of character-defining features, circulation patterns, and spatial arrangement of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District. Original design drawings of the resource, if available, shall be digitized and incorporated into the measured drawings set. The planning department's preservation staff shall assist the consultant in determining the appropriate level of measured drawings.	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• Print-On-Demand Booklet: Following preparation of the HALS photography, narrative report, and drawings sets, a print-on-demand softcover book shall be produced for the resource that compiles the documentation and historical photographs. The print-on-demand book shall be made available to the public for distribution. • Format of Final Dataset:* o The project sponsor shall submit a final/archival version of photographs, historical photographs, narrative report, drawings sets, and booklet to the Library of Congress as an official submittal through the HALS program. o The project sponsor shall contact the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library; Northwest Information Center; California Historical Society; Environmental Design Archives at the University of California, Berkeley; the San Francisco Planning Department; and the Architectural Archives at the University of Pennsylvania to inquire whether the research repositories would like to receive a hard or digital copy of the final dataset. Labeled hard copies and/or digital copies of the final book, containing the photograph sets, narrative report, and measured drawings, shall be provided to these repositories in their preferred format.	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		o The project sponsor shall prepare documentation for review and approval by the planning department's preservation staff, along with the final HALS dataset, that outlines the outreach, response, and actions taken with regard to the repositories listed above. The documentation shall also include any research conducted to identify additional interested groups and the results of that outreach. The project sponsor shall make digital copies of the final dataset, which shall be made available to additional interested organizations, if requested. **M-CP-1b: Develop and Implement an Interpretive Program** The project sponsor shall develop an interpretive program that commemorates the history of Market Street, focusing on its significant association with the Market Street Redevelopment Plan design of architects John Carl Warnecke and Mario Ciampi and landscape architect Lawrence Halprin. To contextualize the Market Street Redevelopment Plan design, interpretive materials shall also include context themes related to the Market Street Cultural Landscape District's additional reasons for significance (e.g., Market Street's role as San Francisco's main circulation artery and facilitator of urban development, Market Street's role as a venue for civic engagement in San Francisco). Interpretive materials shall also be informed by historic context studies of the design work of architects John Carl Warnecke and Mario Ciampi and landscape architect Lawrence Halprin. The	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		content of the studies shall include, but not be limited to, the respective designer's biography, design process, and overall body of work (with a focus on Bay Area projects) as well as the social and cultural context of post–World War II San Francisco Bay Area that influenced the designer's career in relationship to this district. The context studies shall also include a list of known projects in the Bay Area (buildings and/or landscapes) designed by the respective designer. The project sponsor shall retain a qualified consultant meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural History or History to develop an interpretive program that conveys the historic context themes listed above. The selected consultant preparing the context study of Lawrence Halprin shall have a demonstrated specialization in landscape design history. In consultation with the project sponsor and the planning department, the qualified consultant shall prepare an interpretive plan that describes the general format, locations, materials, and content of the full interpretive program. The interpretive plan shall be reviewed and approved by the planning department's preservation staff prior to the issuance of an excavation permit for the proposed project or commencement of construction. The interpretive plan shall include, at a minimum, the following interpretive projects, methods, and materials:	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• Temporary Public Exhibition:* The project sponsor shall hire a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards and a professional exhibition designer to prepare an exhibition for public display in venues physically proximate to Market Street, such as the San Francisco Public Library; California Historical Society; San Francisco Bay Area Planning and Urban Research Association; American Institute of Architects, San Francisco; or a similar space within an educational or civic organization. The qualified historian(s), working in cooperation with professional exhibit designer(s), shall craft a public exhibition about the significant history of the resource using, at a minimum, the HALS documentation identified above and the existing Better Market Street CLE. In consultation with the planning department, the project sponsor and consultants shall identify a minimum of one publicly accessible location for installation of the exhibition and work with the selected venue(s) to secure a commitment to house the display for an agreed upon length of time; the interpretive plan shall include documentation of this commitment and be submitted for review and approval to the planning department's preservation staff prior to the issuance of an excavation permit for the proposed project or commencement of construction. If the required documentation shows that a	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		good-faith effort was put forward by the project sponsor to locate an appropriate display location but no commitment could be procured, then the project sponsor shall consult with the planning department's preservation staff and the qualified consultants mentioned above to discuss an alternative temporary installation of the exhibition at the project site where it shall be visible and accessible to the public and maintained for the duration of the construction process. • Educational Website:* The project sponsor shall hire a qualified architectural historian or historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, working in cooperation with professional website designers, to prepare a Better Market Street educational webpage about the significant history of the resource using, at a minimum, the HALS documentation identified above and the existing Better Market Street CLE. The project sponsor shall house and maintain the webpage in perpetuity on the project sponsor's website (http://www.sfpublicworks.org/projects), with links to the HALS documentation and other interpretive materials outlined in the project mitigations. A template webpage for the project website shall be reviewed and approved by the planning department's preservation staff prior to the issuance of any site or construction permits.	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• Interpretive Signage:* The project sponsor shall incorporate between six and 10 permanent interpretive markers or signs into the design of the proposed project that interpret the significant history of the resource. The markers shall be located within the project footprint (on Market Street between Steuart Street and Octavia Boulevard), and the content shall relate to the specific locations of the markers/signs within the corridor. The project sponsor shall work with qualified architectural historians or historians who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards, professional graphic designers, and signage fabricators to determine the designs, placement locations, and fabrication specifications of the interpretive signage within the project corridor. The project sponsor shall submit for review and approval an outline of the proposed permanent interpretive signage to the planning department's preservation staff as part of the interpretive plan before issuance of any site or construction permits for the proposed project. * Following approval of the interpretive plan by the planning department, and working with the project sponsor and technical professionals identified above, the qualified historians shall then develop detailed interpretive content and applicable design specifications for the public exhibition, educational website, and interpretive signage. The planning department's preservation staff shall review	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		and approve the text, images, and applicable design specifications prior to the production and installation of the interpretive materials and prior to substantial completion of the proposed project. Implementation of the interpretive plan can occur after construction has commenced but must be fully implemented within 2 years of final completion. **M-CP-1c: Hold Public Commemorative and Educational Program Series** The project sponsor shall develop and implement a public educational event series to engage community members and pay tribute to the Market Street Redevelopment Plan design. The program series shall be developed in collaboration with a qualified consultant meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards for Architectural Historian or Historian and a professional public arts programmer or partner arts institution. The selected arts programmer or partner institution shall have experience developing concepts for, promoting, and implementing large-scale and site-specific public events. The program series shall include three to five public programs to tell the story of development of the Market Street Redevelopment Plan. Programs may include panel discussions and lectures with scholars and designers; collaborative artistic performances, such as re-enactment of Lawrence and Anna Halprin's RSVP cycles; walking tours; parades; and related activities on Market Street. The planning department's preservation staff	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		shall review and approve a preliminary schedule of the program series before the content and participants are finalized. The program series must occur prior to issuance of an excavation permit for the proposed project or commencement of construction. All programs held as part of the program series shall be recorded by a professional videographer, and the recordings shall be made available on the educational website specified under M-CP-1b.	
CP-2. The proposed project and project variant would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historic district considered to be a historical resource, as defined in section 15065.5.	LTS	None required	LTS
CP-3. The proposed project and project variant would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a building, structure, or object considered to be a historical resource, as defined in section 15064.5.	LTS	None required	LTS
CP-4. The proposed project and project variant's vibration impacts on built resources caused by construction activities would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in section 15064.5.	LTS	None required	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
CP-5. The proposed project and project variant would not result in vibration impacts on built resources caused by operations resulting in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, as defined in section 15064.5.	LTS	None required	LTS
CP-6. The proposed project and project variant would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource, as defined in section 15064.5.	LTS	None required	LTS
CP-7. The proposed project and project variant would not disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	LTS	None required	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
CP-8. The proposed project and project variant would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a Tribal Cultural Resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074.	LSM	**Mitigation Measure M-CP-4: Tribal Cultural Resources Interpretive Program** If the Environmental Review Officer (ERO) determines that a significant archeological resource is present and, in consultation with the affiliated Native American tribal representatives, the ERO determines that the resource constitutes a tribal cultural resource (TCR) that could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the proposed project shall be redesigned so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant TCR, if feasible. If the ERO determines that preservation in place is both feasible and effective for the TCR, then the archeological consultant shall prepare an archeological resource preservation plan (ARPP). Implementation of the approved ARPP by the archeological consultant shall be required when feasible. If the ERO, in consultation with the affiliated Native American tribal representatives and the project sponsor, determines that preservation in place for the TCR is not a sufficient or feasible option, the project sponsor shall implement an interpretive program for the TCR in consultation with affiliated tribal representatives. An interpretive plan produced in consultation with the ERO and affiliated tribal representatives, at a minimum, would be required to guide the interpretive program. The plan	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		shall identify, as appropriate, proposed locations for installations or displays, the proposed content and materials for those displays or installations, the producers or artists of the displays or installations, and a long- term maintenance program. The interpretive program may include artist installations, preferably by local Native American artists; oral histories with local Native Americans; artifacts, displays, and interpretation; and educational panels or other informational displays.	
C-CP-1. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the city, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on the Market Street Cultural Landscape District but not on any other historic architectural resources.	S	See Mitigation Measures M-CP-1a through M-CP-1c above. These measures would lessen the project's contribution but the contribution would remain cumulatively considerable.	SUM
C-CP-2. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the city, would not result in a significant cumulative impact on archaeological resources.	LTS	None required	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
C-CP-3. Construction-related vibration caused by the proposed project and project variants, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the city, would not result in a cumulative impact on historic architectural resources.	LTS	None required	LTS
Transportation and Circulation			
TR-1. Construction of the proposed project and project variant could result in substantial interference with pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas, and could result in potentially hazardous conditions.	S	**Mitigation Measure M-TR-1: Construction Management Plan – Additional Measures** As part of the proposed project's construction management plan, the project sponsor shall require additional measures to further minimize disruptions to transit, bicyclists, and pedestrians during project construction. The additional measures shall include, but not be limited to, the following: • *Establish Temporary Transit-only Lanes and Extend Bus Zones on Mission Street during Detours* – When detours are implemented, SFMTA shall implement additional transit priority features, such as all-day transit-only lanes and extended bus zones on Mission Street, to accommodate the increased level of bus service on streets adjacent and parallel to Market Street during construction.	SUM

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• *Active Monitoring of Detours* – When detours are implemented, SFMTA shall require that police officers or parking control officers monitor critical locations along the detour to promote unobstructed travel by vehicular traffic, transit, and people walking and bicycling. • *Coordinated Construction Management Plan* – If construction of the proposed project is determined to overlap with any nearby project(s) involving temporary travel lane closures or temporary sidewalk closures and/or using the same truck access routes in the project vicinity, the SFMTA shall require that construction contractor(s) consult with various city departments, as deemed necessary by the SFMTA, Public Works, and the Planning Department, to develop a Coordinated Construction Management Plan and minimize the severity of any disruptions of access to land uses and transportation facilities. • *Emergency Access Response Plan* – SFMTA shall require that contractor(s) submit a segment-specific emergency access response plan as part of compliance with bid specifications. This plan shall include fire department and emergency service access to construction areas and maintainability of emergency services such as fire hydrants.	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• *Carpool, Bicycle, Walk and Transit Access for Construction Workers* – The construction contractor(s) shall include methods to encourage carpooling, bicycling, walking, and transit access to the project corridor by construction workers (such as providing secure bicycle parking spaces, participating in free-to-employee and employer ride matching program from www.511.org, participating in emergency ride home program through the City of San Francisco [www.sferh.org], and providing transit information to construction workers). • *Construction Coordination with Adjacent Businesses* – During construction of the proposed project, access to all abutting businesses shall be maintained either through the existing or a reduced sidewalk area or via temporary access ramps. Signs shall be installed indicating that the businesses are "open during construction." All temporary access ramps shall be in compliance with the ADA. • *Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Businesses and Residents* – To minimize construction impacts on access for nearby institutions and businesses, the project sponsor shall provide adjacent and nearby businesses and residents with regularly-updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities, travel lane closures, and lane closures. At regular intervals to be defined in the construction management plan, a regular	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		email notice shall be distributed by the project sponsor that shall provide current construction information of interest to neighbors, as well as contact information for specific construction inquiries or concerns.	
TR-2. The proposed project and project variant would not cause substantial additional VMT or induced automobile travel.	LTS	None required	LTS
TR-3. The proposed project and project variant would not create major traffic hazards.	LTS	None required	LTS
TR-4. The proposed project and project variant would not result in a substantial increase in delays or operating costs such that significant adverse impacts on local or regional transit would occur.	LTS	None required	LTS
TR-5. The proposed project and project variant would not create hazardous conditions for people walking, or otherwise interfere with accessibility for people walking to the site or adjoining areas.	LTS	None required	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
TR-6. The proposed project and project variant would not result in potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists, or otherwise interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site or adjacent areas.	LTS	None required	LTS
TR-7. The proposed project and project variant would not result in a reduction in on-street commercial and passenger loading supply such that loading demand during the peak hour of loading activities would not be accommodated with the loading supply.	LTS	None required	LTS
TR-8. The proposed project and project variant would not result in a reduction in on-street parking supply such that a substantial parking deficit would occur.	LTS	None required	LTS
TR-9. The proposed project and project variant would not result in inadequate emergency vehicle access.	LTS	None required	LTS
C-TR-1. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts.	S	See **Mitigation Measure M-TR-1** above. This measure would lessen the project's contribution but the contribution would remain cumulatively considerable.	SUM

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
C-TR-2. The proposed project and variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative impacts related to VMT	LTS	None required.	LTS
C-TR-3. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to major traffic hazards.	LTS	None required.	LTS
C-TR-4. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts related to transit operations on the Muni 27 Bryant but would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts on other local and regional routes.	S	No feasible mitigation identified. However, the SFMTA is currently investigating possible changes to the Muni 27 Bryant route as part of the 27 Bryant Transit Reliability Project and the planned improvements to Fifth Street to enhance this route's operations.	SUM
C-TR-5. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts on people walking.	LTS	None required.	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
C-TR-6. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative bicycle impacts.	LTS	.None required.	LTS
C-TR-7. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not contribute considerably to significant cumulative loading impacts.	LTS	None required.	LTS
C-TR-8. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to parking.	LTS	None required.	LTS
C-TR-9. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative emergency access impacts.	LTS	None required.	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
Noise and Vibration			
NO-1. Construction of the proposed project and project variant would generate noise levels in excess of standards or result in substantial temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	S	**Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Prepare and Implement a Construction Noise Control Plan to Reduce Construction Noise at Noise-Sensitive Land Uses** The project sponsor shall develop a noise control plan to reduce construction noise to levels at or below the 90 dBA L_{eq} combined noise standard during daytime hours and reduce noise increases over ambient from construction activity to 10 dB or less at noise-sensitive receptor locations. The noise control plan shall also address measures to minimize sleep disturbance at adjacent residential uses where nighttime work is required such that noise levels do not exceed 80 dBA L_{eq} during nighttime hours at residential uses. Implementation of these measures will reduce noise by maximizing the distance between construction sources and receptors, providing shielding between sources and receptors, and limiting when noise-generating construction activity will occur. The noise control plan shall require the following: • Construction contractors shall specify noise-reducing construction practices that will be employed to reduce construction noise from construction activities. The measures shall be reviewed and approved by Public Works prior to the issuance of construction permits. Measures that can be used to limit noise include, but are not limited to, those listed below.	LSM

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• Locate construction equipment as far as feasible from noise-sensitive uses. • Require that all construction equipment powered by gasoline or diesel engines have sound control devices that are at least as effective as those originally provided by the manufacturer and that all equipment be operated and maintained to minimize noise generation. • Idling of inactive construction equipment for prolonged periods shall be prohibited (i.e., more than 2 minutes). • Prohibit gasoline or diesel engines from having unmuffled exhaust systems. • Equipment and trucks used for project construction utilize the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds) wherever feasible. • Monitor the effectiveness of noise attenuation measures by taking noise measurements. A plan for noise monitoring shall be provided to the City for review prior to the commencement of each construction stage. • Prohibit pavement breaking during nighttime hours (between 10 p.m. and 7 a.m.). • Minimize equipment noise during nighttime hours within 100 feet of the nearest residential use.	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• Use noise-reducing enclosures or curtains around equipment that has the potential to disturb nearby land uses. • Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, rock drills) used for project construction shall be "quiet" gasoline-powered compressors or electrically powered compressors, and electric rather than gasoline- or diesel-powered engines shall be used to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. However, where the use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used; which could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter equipment shall be used when feasible, such as drills rather than impact equipment. • Construction contractors shall be required to use "quiet" gasoline-powered compressors or electrically powered compressors and electric rather than gasoline- or diesel-powered forklifts for small lifting. • Stationary noise sources, such as temporary generators, shall be located as far from nearby receptors as possible; they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary enclosures and shielded by barriers, which could reduce construction noise by as much as 5 dB, or other measures, to the extent feasible.	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		• Prior to the issuance of the construction permit, along with the submission of construction documents, the project sponsor shall submit to the Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection a list of measures for responding to and tracking complaints pertaining to construction noise. These measures shall include: o Identification of measures that will be implemented to control construction noise. o A procedure and phone numbers for notifying the Department of Building Inspection, the Department of Public Health, or the Police Department of complaints (during regular construction hours and off hours). o A sign posted onsite describing noise complaint procedures and a complaint hotline number that shall be answered at all times during construction. o Designation of an onsite construction complaint and enforcement manager for the project. o A plan for notification of neighboring residents and nonresidential building managers within 200 feet of the project construction area at least 30 days in advance of extreme noise-generating activities (defined as activities that generate noise levels of 90 dBA or greater) about the estimated duration of the activity and the associated control measures that will be implemented to reduce noise levels.	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
NO-2. Operation of the proposed project and project variant would not result in the exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance or a substantial temporary, periodic, or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the project.	LTS	None required	LTS
NO-3. Construction of the proposed project and project variant would expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels related to annoyance but would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels related to damage to buildings.	S	**Mitigation Measure M-NO-3: Nighttime Construction Vibration Control Measures – Annoyance** Prior to issuance of a construction permit, a detailed pre-construction vibration assessment and monitoring plan shall be prepared for all construction activities conducted between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. This plan shall evaluate and select the smallest feasible equipment that can be used during this construction period and shall recommend specific location of equipment within the construction area to maximize the distance between the vibration-generating sources and vibration-sensitive receptors. This plan shall also require that vibration levels at vibration-sensitive receptors along the project corridor do not exceed a PPV vibration level of the strongly perceptible level of 0.10 in/sec for continuous sources and 0.90 in/sec for transient sources.	LSM

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		The project contractor shall: • Retain the services of a qualified professional to prepare a pre-construction assessment and vibration monitoring plan. This assessment and vibration monitoring plan shall identify all vibration-sensitive receptors adjacent to the project corridor which could be exposed to vibration from nighttime construction activities exceeding a PPV vibration level of 0.10 in/sec for continuous sources and 0.90 in/sec for transient sources. The qualified professional shall submit the plan to Public Works for review and approval prior to issuance of a construction permit. • Inform vibration-sensitive receptors of upcoming construction activities that may generate high levels of vibration a minimum of one week in advance of such construction activities. Method of notification shall include mailed notices as well as notifications hand-posted on doorways. The notification shall include the name and contact information for a person that can be reached during nighttime construction hours. • Perform real-time vibration monitoring during all construction activities conducted between the hours of 8 p.m. and 7 a.m. at a location representative of the nearest vibration sensitive receptor. If vibration levels exceed a PPV vibration level of 0.10 in/sec for continuous sources and 0.90 in/sec for transient sources, the vibration monitor	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		shall immediately alert the construction manager, who shall immediately cease construction activity. Construction activity shall resume only after the vibration-generating equipment is adjusted or relocated such that the PPV vibration level no longer exceeds 0.10 in/sec for continuous sources and 0.90 in/sec for transient sources, or such activity is otherwise conducted between the hours of 7 a.m. and 8 p.m.	
NO-4. Operation of the proposed project and project variant would not expose persons to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels related to annoyance. Operation of the project would not generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels related to damage to buildings.	LTS	None required	LTS
C-NO-1. Construction activities for the proposed project and project variant, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise or noise levels in excess of the applicable local standards.	S	See **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1** above	SUM

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
C-NO-2. Operation of the proposed project and project variant, in combination with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the city, would not result in the exposure of persons to noise in excess of the applicable local standards or a substantial permanent ambient noise level increase in the project vicinity.	LTS	None required	LTS
C-NO-3. Construction and operation of the proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts related to vibration.	LTS	None required	LTS
Air Quality			
AQ-1. Construction of the proposed project and project variant would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants but would not violate an air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or project air quality violation.	S	**Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1: Off-Road Construction Equipment Emissions Minimization** A. Equipment Requirements a. All off-road equipment with engines (greater than or equal to 90 horsepower) shall meet EPA or California Air Resources Board Tier 4 final off-road emissions standards, while equipment with smaller engines (less than 90 horsepower) shall meet or exceed Tier 3 off-road emissions standards.	LSM

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		B. Waivers a. The planning department's environmental review officer (ERO) or designee may waive the requirement for an alternative source of power from subsection (A) if an alternative source of power is limited or infeasible at the project site. If the ERO grants the waiver, the contractor must submit documentation that the equipment used for onsite power generation meets the requirements of subsection (A). b. The ERO may waive the equipment requirements of subsection (A) if use of a particular piece of off-road equipment with a Tier 4 final or Tier 3 compliant engine is not feasible or reasonable, the equipment would not produce the desired emissions reductions because of the expected operating modes, installation of the equipment would create a safety hazard or impair visibility for the operator, or a compelling emergency exists that would require the use of off-road equipment that is not Tier 4 final or Tier 3 compliant. If seeking an exception, the project sponsor shall demonstrate to the ERO's satisfaction that the resulting construction emissions would not exceed the NOx threshold of significance, as identified within the EIR under Impact AQ-1. If the ERO grants the waiver, the contractor must use the next-cleanest piece of available off-road equipment, according to the table below:	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
		Compliance Alternative / **Engine Emission Standard** 1 — Tier 4 Interim 2 — Tier 3 with California Air Resources Board Level 3 VDECs 3 — Tier 3 4 — Tier 2 with California Air Resources Board Level 3 VDECs Notes: If the environmental review officer (ERO) or designee determines that the equipment requirements cannot be met, then the contractor shall meet Compliance Alternative 1. If the ERO or designee determines that the contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 1, then the contractor shall meet Compliance Alternative 2. If the ERO or designee determines that the contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 2, then the contractor shall meet Compliance Alternative 3. If the ERO or designee determines that the contractor cannot supply off-road equipment meeting Compliance Alternative 3, then the contractor shall meet Compliance Alternative 4. VDECs = Verified Diesel Emission Controls	

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
AQ-2. Operation of the proposed project and project variant would not result in emissions of criteria pollutants at levels that would violate an air quality standard or contribute to an existing air quality violation.	LTS	None required	LTS
AQ-3. Construction and operation of the proposed project and project variant would generate TACs, including DPM, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.	S	See **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** above	LSM
AQ-4. The proposed project and project variant would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2017 Clean Air Plan.	S	See **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** above	LSM
C-AQ-1. The proposed project and project variant's construction, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects, would not contribute to cumulative regional air quality impacts.	S	See **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** above	LSM
C-AQ-2. The proposed project and project variant's operation, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects, would not contribute to cumulative regional air quality impacts.	LTS	None required.	LTS

TABLE S-1. SUMMARY OF IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT AND THE PROJECT VARIANT IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR

Environmental Impacts	Level of Significance before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance after Mitigation
Legend: NI = No Impact; LSM: Less than significant after mitigation; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact; no mitigation required; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable			
C-AQ-3. Construction and operation of the proposed project and project variant, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects, would generate TACs, including DPM, but would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations.	S	See **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** above	LSM
C-AQ-4. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects, would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2017 Clean Air Plan.	S	See **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-1** above	LSM
Wind			
WS-1. The proposed project and project variant would not alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas.	LTS	None required	LTS
C-WS-1. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, could alter wind in a manner that would substantially affect public areas. However, the proposed project's contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.	LTS	None required	LTS
Source: ICF 2018.			

TABLE S-2. COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF PROPOSED PROJECT WITH IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Impact of Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Full Preservation Alternative	Alternative C: Partial Preservation Alternative 1	Alternative D: Partial Preservation Alternative 2	Alternative E: Core Elements Alternative
Legend: NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; LSM = Less than significant after mitigation; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable					
Cultural Resources					
Impact CP-1.C. The proposed project and project variant would cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the Market Street Cultural Landscape District as a designed landscape associated with the Market Street Redevelopment Plan. (SUM)	Less than project (LTS)	Less than project (LTS)	Less than project but still SUM	Less than project but still SUM	Similar to project, SUM
Impact C-CP-1. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects in the city, would result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on the Market Street Cultural Landscape District but not on any other historic architectural resources. (SUM)	Less than project (not cumulatively considerable)	Less than project (not cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)

TABLE S-2. COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF PROPOSED PROJECT WITH IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Impact of Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Full Preservation Alternative	Alternative C: Partial Preservation Alternative 1	Alternative D: Partial Preservation Alternative 2	Alternative E: Core Elements Alternative
Legend: NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; LSM = Less than significant after mitigation; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable					
Transportation and Circulation					
Impact TR-1. Construction of the proposed project and project variant could result in substantial interference with pedestrian, bicycle, or vehicle circulation and accessibility to adjoining areas, as well as potentially hazardous conditions. (SUM)	Less than project (LTS)	Less than project (but still SUM)	Less than project but still SUM	Less than project but still SUM	Less than project but still SUM
Impact C-TR-1. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts. (cumulatively considerable)	Less than project (not cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)
Impact C-TR-4. The proposed project and project variant, in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects, would contribute considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts related to transit operations on the Muni 27 Bryant but would not contribute	Less than project (not cumulatively considerable for any transit route)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable for the 27 Bryant, not cumulatively considerable for any other route)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable for the 27 Bryant, not cumulatively considerable for any other route)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable for the 27 Bryant, not cumulatively considerable for any other route)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable for the 27 Bryant, not cumulatively considerable for any other route)

TABLE S-2. COMPARISON OF SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS OF PROPOSED PROJECT WITH IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES

Impact of Proposed Project	Alternative A: No Project Alternative	Alternative B: Full Preservation Alternative	Alternative C: Partial Preservation Alternative 1	Alternative D: Partial Preservation Alternative 2	Alternative E: Core Elements Alternative
Legend: NI = No Impact; LTS = Less than significant or negligible impact, no mitigation required; LSM = Less than significant after mitigation; S = Significant; SM = Significant but mitigable; SU = Significant and unavoidable adverse impact, no feasible mitigation; SUM = Significant and unavoidable impact after mitigation; NA = Not Applicable					
considerably to significant cumulative transit impacts on other local and regional routes. (cumulatively considerable for 27 Bryant)					
Impact C-NO-1. Construction activities for the proposed project and the project variant, in combination with other past, present, and reasonable future projects in the city, would result in a substantial temporary increase in noise or noise levels in excess of the applicable local standards.	Less than project (not cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)	Similar to project (cumulatively considerable)