

**APPENDIX E**

**PROGRAM EIR ANALYSIS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE**



## APPENDIX E PROGRAM EIR ANALYSIS INCORPORATED BY REFERENCE

### INTRODUCTION

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15150 states that an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) may incorporate by reference all or portions of another document. Where an EIR uses incorporation by reference, the incorporated part of the referenced document shall be briefly summarized, and the relationship between the incorporated part of the referenced document and the EIR should be described. CEQA also requires that the incorporated document be a matter of public record and/or generally available. For the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Sections 1500.4, 1502.21) state that agencies may incorporate material by reference when the effect will be to reduce bulk without impeding agency and public review of the project alternatives. The CEQ NEPA regulations also require federal agencies to cooperate with state and local agencies “to the fullest extent possible to reduce duplication between NEPA and State and local requirements” (40 CFR § 1506.2[b]; see also, *Laguna Greenbelt, Inc. v. U.S. Department of Transportation* [9th Cir. 1994] 42 F.3d 517, 524 [holding that Federal Highway Administration may use evaluation in prior EIR to narrow evaluation of alternatives in subsequent Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)]).

The purpose of the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project is to support the existing and future planned water transit services operated by Water Emergency Transportation Authority (WETA) on San Francisco Bay, as established by WETA in its Implementation and Operations Plan (IOP), adopted in 2003. The IOP is a comprehensive Plan for the development and expansion of water transit service in San Francisco Bay. It includes plans for the development of new routes and facility improvements to support the expansion of the regional system. A Program EIR, certified in 2003, was prepared for the IOP. The “Proposed Project” in the Program EIR was adopted by WETA as its IOP.

The Program EIR is available on WETA’s website (<http://watertransit.org/newsInformation/eir.aspx>), in 19 local libraries (as listed on the website), and can also be accessed at WETA’s Office, Pier 9, Suite 111, The Embarcadero, San Francisco.

The Program EIR assumes that WETA would prepare subsequent site-specific environmental evaluations for activities that implement the IOP. All of the new routes envisioned in the IOP would provide service to San Francisco (destination terminal); therefore, the proposed project that is the subject of this EIS/EIR, the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project, is a facility improvement project—the facility improvements that would be required at the Ferry Building to accommodate the level of service described in WETA’s IOP.

Portions of the Program EIR analysis that are relevant to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project are incorporated by reference and summarized here. The relevant portions of the Program EIR incorporated by reference include the alternatives considered, and a summary of impacts and mitigation identified for the Program. The relationship of the Program impacts to this project is indicated in Table E-1.

## ALTERNATIVES

The primary purpose of the Program EIR and WETA's IOP is to increase regional mobility and transportation options by providing new and expanded water transit services and ground transportation terminal access in the San Francisco Bay Area (Bay Area).<sup>1</sup>

The Draft Program EIR fully evaluated four program alternatives (i.e., the No Project Alternative, Alternative 1, Alternative 2, and Alternative 3), representing a range of service expansion options. Partly as a result of public comment and review, the Program Draft EIR was revised and recirculated to include another alternative (a reduced version of Alternative 2). The Final Program EIR for WETA's IOP analyzed three alternatives in detail: the Proposed Project (formerly the reduced version of Alternative 2), Alternative 3, and the No Project Alternative. Based on public comment and technical information, Alternative 1 and the original Alternative 2 were deemed not feasible.

In addition, the Program EIR describes six other alternatives that were considered but eliminated from further consideration, based on considerations that included cost, feasibility, and environmental effects.

A summary of each alternative considered is provided below.

### ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE PROGRAM EIR

**Proposed Project.** The Proposed Project provides expanded ferry service and associated land-side improvements to be implemented in phases over an approximately 10-year period. Although the IOP does not represent a precisely fixed set of routes and terminal sites, the Proposed Project is based on the anticipated routes and terminals that would result from implementation of the IOP, including expansion of existing services and development of seven new routes. The Proposed Project included improvements to the existing services between San Francisco and Oakland, Alameda, Harbor Bay, Vallejo, Larkspur, Sausalito, and Tiburon, as well as development of new routes between San Francisco and Berkeley, Richmond, Treasure Island, Antioch/Pittsburg, Martinez, Hercules/Rodeo, South San Francisco, and Redwood City. Additional details of the Proposed Project, including descriptions of how the new routes would be selected, terminal design considerations, system navigation, and safety are described in WETA's IOP (WETA, 2003).

**Alternative 3 (Enhanced Existing Service Alternative).** Alternative 3 would focus on limited expansion of the six water transit routes in the existing system. This alternative would increase and improve service along these routes by adding or substituting new vessels to increase the number of trips and decrease the time (headways) between trips. Existing single routes with more than one destination (e.g., San Francisco to Jack London Square and Alameda) may be divided into two separate routes to improve travel time and performance. Improvements may also be made to existing passenger terminal facilities. This alternative represents the lowest investment of new capital and operating costs, other than the No Project Alternative.

**No Program Alternative.** This alternative consists of existing ferry service with minimal improvements. Ferry service would continue to operate on existing routes at about the same frequency, as determined by each service provider. Funding for changes or improvements to service would continue to be allocated through the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC).

---

<sup>1</sup> Through the enabling legislation that created WETA, the Legislature directed the Authority to increase regional mobility through the development and operation of a comprehensive water transit system and its associated landside facilities and adjunct services (California Government Code Section 66540.24).

## ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

**Alternative 1 (Augmented Blue Ribbon System [Comprehensive] Alternative).** This alternative represents the potential buildout system, as developed by the Bay Area Council. This alternative comprises the largest conceptual improvement of the Bay Area's ferry system. It includes the routes recommended by the Blue Ribbon Task Force, which developed the Bay Area Water Transit Initiative Action Plan, plus additional routes identified by local entities and early project scoping. This alternative would not reduce or avoid significant project impacts; would require more extensive systems than the Proposed Project; and would have more severe impacts than the Proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative was not carried forward for further consideration.

**Alternative 2 (Expanded System Alternative).** This alternative includes potentially feasible routes that emerged from the Water Transit Initiative and the MTC ferry studies that could be implemented within a 10-year horizon. It also includes expansion of service on existing routes, and a wide range of ferry service corridors throughout the Bay Area. These corridors would serve a number of passenger service markets, including commuter transit, recreation, Bay Area special events, and regional airport connections. The goal for service frequencies would be designed to provide convenient and dependable service for passengers. This alternative would not reduce or avoid significant project impacts; would require more extensive systems than the Proposed Project; and would have more severe impacts than the Proposed Project. Therefore, this alternative was not carried forward for further consideration.

**Express Bus Alternative.** This alternative would provide express and/or additional bus service for origin and destination points similar to those ferry routes planned under the IOP. This Alternative would offer similar mass transit opportunities to catchment areas served by the Proposed Project, but in the mode of bus, rather than ferry trips. The Express Bus Alternative would result in approximately one-third of the transit ridership associated with the Proposed Project, and would provide less benefit in terms of total daily vehicle-miles-traveled reduction. This alternative does provide a similar cost effectiveness to ferry expansion; however, this alternative would not meet the basic project objectives. Therefore, the Express Bus Alternative was not carried forward for further evaluation.

**Express Bus, High-Occupancy Vehicle, and Operational Improvements Alternative.** This alternative includes the implementation of expanded express bus service, carpool lane extensions, and operational improvements in the Bay Bridge, San Mateo Bridge, and Dumbarton Bridge corridors. Similar to the Express Bus alternative, this alternative would attempt to provide travel opportunities comparable to the Proposed Project, but in modes other than ferry service. This alternative includes 16 operational improvements related to express bus, high-occupancy vehicle, and to the existing transbay corridors (Interstate 80, State Route 92, and State Route 84) and their approach facilities. In addition, this alternative involves the purchase and use of three-door Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) cars and the addition of three additional trains per hour on the transbay routes. The Express Bus, High-Occupancy Vehicle, and Operational Improvements Alternative would result in less than one-half the transit riders provided by the Proposed Project. The cost per rider is estimated to be greater than that of the Proposed Project. In addition, this alternative would not meet the basic project objectives. Therefore, this alternative was not carried forward for additional analysis.

**BART Crossing Alternative.** The BART Crossing Alternative includes the phased implementation of new BART service in San Francisco, followed by a new transbay BART tunnel connecting the East Bay with San Francisco. This alternative would attempt to provide transit opportunities comparable to the Proposed Project, but through the BART system rather than ferry service. This alternative would provide approximately one-half the ridership of the Proposed Project, and would require a substantial capital investment for implementation. In addition, this alternative does not meet the basic project objectives, and therefore was not carried forward for further evaluation.

**Dumbarton Rail Alternative.** This alternative includes commuter rail service connecting Union City with San Jose and Millbrae, as well as additional service from Tracy to San Jose and Millbrae, and potentially San Francisco/Milpitas service. This alternative would attempt to provide mass transit opportunities comparable to the Proposed Project, but in the mode of enhanced rail service rather than ferry service. The Dumbarton Rail Alternative would generally serve a different catchment area than that of the Proposed Project. Mobility benefits of the Dumbarton Rail project are expected to be limited to the southern portion of the nine-county Bay Area. This alternative would serve less than one-tenth of the Proposed Project riders, with a greater cost per rider. In addition, this alternative does not meet the basic project objectives, and therefore was not carried forward for additional analysis.

**Transportation System Management Alternative.** This alternative includes a set of projects intended to address existing corridor mobility issues. This alternative was developed by MTC during preparation of the 2000 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) and the environmental analysis of the RTP. This alternative emphasizes the application of available funds in ways that would improve the operational efficiency of the existing transportation system. At the time of the Program EIR, the total cost of implementing this alternative was estimated to be \$511 million. This alternative involves innovative strategies, some of which are not available for immediate implementation. Full implementation of this alternative would also require further coordination among, and approval by, the various affected jurisdictions and stakeholders in the transportation community. In addition, because this alternative does not meet the basic project objectives, this alternative was not carried forward for further evaluation.

**Smart Growth Alternative.** This alternative would use a set of public policies and other incentives to encourage compact, mixed-use, and mixed-income development along transit corridors, near public transit stations, and in town centers. Development of the Smart Growth project is led by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), along with four other regional planning agencies in the Bay Area. These policies and incentives are intended to result in development patterns that would provide some of the traffic congestion relief that is an objective of the Proposed Project. Because this alternative does not involve direct expenditures for transit, cost and ridership comparisons to the other project alternatives are not applicable. Because this alternative does not meet the basic project objectives, and because implementation efforts under the leadership of ABAG are voluntary rather than mandatory (making any determination of their effectiveness speculative), this alternative not carried forward for additional analysis.

## **SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**

### **RELATIONSHIP OF THE IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES IN THE PROGRAM EIR TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT**

The Program EIR analyzed the collective impacts that could result from the expansion of water transit services on San Francisco Bay. WETA identified measures to mitigate impacts identified in the Program EIR that would be implemented at the Program level (e.g., measures pertaining to vessel navigation, vessel technology, or operations plans), and/or as a part of specific projects that implement the IOP as determined in the project-level analysis (e.g., measures pertaining to resources that could be impacted at the future terminal locations). WETA adopted the mitigation measures identified in the Program EIR, and is implementing the measures as a part of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Program EIR.

The impact analysis presented in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR is consistent with the Program EIR.

Table E-1 includes the summary of impacts and mitigations identified in the Program EIR, and the relationship of each impact to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Project. As shown below and described in this EIS/EIR, the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project is a facility improvement project at an existing facility. The project would not result in new water transit routes or increases in vessel traffic on San Francisco Bay. Therefore, the project would not contribute to some of the impacts identified in the Program EIR. However, because the facility improvements at the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal would accommodate vessels consistent with the IOP, the local impacts from the vessel use at the Ferry Terminal were analyzed in the EIS/EIR. Table E-1 describes whether Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Project would contribute to the impacts identified in the Program EIR. If the project would contribute, the section of the EIS/EIR where the local impacts were analyzed in this EIS/EIR is provided.

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>D-1</b>	Dredging of new channels and maintenance dredging would add to the total annual volume of dredged materials in the Bay.	L	No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.	Project would contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources; and Section 3.11, Hydrology and Water Quality).
<b>D-2</b>	Dredging of new channels could locally reduce water quality by exposing and suspending contaminated sediment.	L	<b>D-2.1:</b> Sample potential dredge locations and test for contamination. Minimize dredging. Develop and require specifications and allocation responsibility to the entities implementing new dredging to adopt the techniques and Best Management Practices (BMPs). Comply with DMMO and RWQCB directives.	Project would contribute to the impact. Coordination with the DMMO on dredging activities is part of the project description for the project.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.9, Biological Resources; and Section 3.11, Hydrology and Water Quality).
<b>D-3</b>	Dredging new channels could remove bottom sediments that could result in a salinity intrusion into groundwater basins.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project would not contribute to the impact due to its scope. No new channel dredging is required at the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal.	n/a
<b>D-4</b>	Dredging could adversely impact threatened, endangered, or protected species.	L	D-4.1: Implement Mitigation D-2.1. Use BMPs (such as silt curtains) and appropriate dredging techniques in accordance with DMMO recommendations. D-4.2: In consultation with resource agencies, identify suitable practices such as use of physical barriers and/or restriction of dredging in shallow waters to certain seasonal periods.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>D-5</b>	Dredging for construction of access channels to new ferry terminals could result in loss or disturbance of jurisdictional wetlands.	L	Implement Mitigation Measure B-1.1 and B-1.2.	Project would not contribute to the impact. No new channel dredging is required at the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal and no jurisdictional wetlands are present in the project area.	n/a
<b>NAV-1</b>	With expansion of water transit service there is a potential for an increase in incidents such as collisions, allisions, and groundings.	PS	<b>NAV-1.1:</b> Implement ABS (2002) best practices to minimize navigation-related risks.	Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project. Vessel navigation safety was considered in the development of the project description.	n/a
<b>NAV-2</b>	Increased numbers of ferry transits in the Bay may increase the risk of incidents (such as collision and near misses) between windsurfers and ferries.	PS	<b>NAV-2.1:</b> Train ferry crew regarding hazards at new terminals near windsurfing launch sites. <b>NAV-2.2:</b> Designate specific ferry employees to stand watch on select routes.	Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project. Vessel navigation safety was considered in the development of the project description.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<p><b>NAV-3</b> Increased ferry transits may lead to an increased risk of collision between recreational boaters and ferries.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>NAV-3.1:</b> Work with Harbor Safety Committees and potentially fund or sponsor new education and advisory training programs regarding boater safety.</p> <p><b>NAV-3.2:</b> Designate ferry employees to stand watch for navigational hazards.</p>	<p>Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.</p> <p>Vessel navigation safety was considered in the development of the project description.</p>	<p>n/a</p>
<p><b>WW-1</b> Increased frequency of ferry trips across the Bay could increase the wake energy at some shorelines, causing increased erosion. Service to new areas of the Bay could lead to shoreline impacts from increased wave heights.</p>	<p>L</p>	<p><b>WW-1.1:</b> 1) Maintain route alignments more than 1,500 m from sensitive shorelines; 2) Operate vessels to maintain maximum wake wave heights at 16 cm; 3) Operate vessels to maintain wake waves at shorelines at 50 percent of average sustained wind wave height.</p> <p><b>WW-1.2:</b> Modify ferry routes to redirect wave energy away from sensitive habitats.</p> <p><b>WW-1.3:</b> Use low-wake vessel technology, such as existing lighter-weight vessels.</p> <p><b>WW-1.4:</b> Implement operational adjustments such as slowing of vessels near sensitive habitat. If speed limits are set, the mitigation shall include monitoring and enforcement to ensure compliance.</p>	<p>Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.</p> <p>In addition, shorelines sensitive to wake wash are not present in the project area.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

	<b>Impact for the Program</b>	<b>Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)</b>	<b>Mitigation Measures for the Program</b>	<b>Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project</b>	<b>Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR</b>
<b>WW-2</b>	Increased ferry service could impact surrounding marinas, potentially damaging moored vessels and interfering with recreational users.	L	<b>WW-2.1:</b> Implement Mitigations WW-1.1 through WW-1.4.	Local impacts from interference with recreational users and other vessels in the project area were analyzed in the EIS/EIR.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.4, Parklands and Recreation).
<b>WW-3</b>	Wake wash impacts from increased ferry service could have an adverse effect on California clapper rail, a listed species, by inundating nests.	PS	<p><b>WW-3.1:</b> Conduct habitat surveys of shoreline within 50 m of the marshland edge along proposed routes. If habitat is potential nesting habitat, perform site-specific measurements of wake attenuation. For nesting sites or suitable nesting habitat more than 50 m from the edge of a marshland, no significant impacts or need for mitigation are anticipated.</p> <p><b>WW-3.2:</b> Use existing low-wake vessel technology to reduce both the total wake wash energy and height of individual waves.</p> <p><b>WW-3.3:</b> Adjust routes to redirect energy away from sensitive habitat or to reduce or eliminate increased wake energy.</p> <p><b>WW-3.4:</b> Adjust operations (e.g., slow vessel near sensitive areas).</p>	Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Clapper rail not present in the project area.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<p><b>WW-4</b> Wake wash impacts from increased ferry service could have an adverse effect on Pacific harbor seals at haul-out sites.</p>	L	<p><b>WW-4.1:</b> Refer to Apply Mitigation B-14.1, which is to avoid marine mammal areas by 100 to 250 m.</p>	<p>Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Haul out sites not present in the project area.</p>	n/a
<p><b>W-1</b> Construction and operation of terminal facilities, including parking lots, access roads, and buildings, would increase the amount of impervious surface area, causing increased storm water runoff. If runoff contained pollutants or eroded disturbed soil, discharge could impact receiving water quality.</p>	L	<p><b>W-1.1:</b> Adopt measures for construction to prevent, minimize, and clean up spills and leaks. Require containment measures for equipment that could potentially release fuels. <b>W-1.2:</b> Design new terminals to control storm water runoff and discharge. Develop and apply BMPs.</p>	<p>Project could contribute to the impact. However, project includes improvements at an existing facility.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.11, Hydrology and Water Quality).</p>
<p><b>W-2</b> Some areas where terminals may be planned could be within 100-year floodplains. Construction of new terminal facilities within a 100-year floodplain could expose people and terminal facilities to flood hazard.</p>	N	<p><b>W-2.1:</b> Verify base flood elevations in the areas where new terminals are proposed. If 100-year floodplain cannot be avoided, design facilities to minimize flooding hazards, post flood hazard warnings, and develop flood evacuation plans. No mitigation required for the Proposed Project.</p>	<p>Although project includes improvements at an existing facility, project could contribute to the impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.11, Hydrology).</p>

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<p><b>W-3</b> Increased ferry transits could increase the potential for fuel spills and water quality degradation in the Bay. Although the probability of a spill is low, it still has the potential to occur.</p>	L	<p><b>W-3.1:</b> Incorporate safety issues identified by the Harbor Safety Committee into the annual review of the Harbor Safety Plan.</p> <p><b>W-3.2:</b> Assist or prompt ferry operators to update contingency plans and reviews of emergency response services. Review contingency plans, conduct drill exercises, and review emergency response agreements. Review spill response equipment availability.</p> <p><b>W-3.3:</b> Develop a program for training on fueling methods to minimize spills.</p> <p><b>W-3.4:</b> Require review of new vessels to include technological features to minimize spills.</p> <p><b>W-3.5:</b> Adopt applicable measures recommended by the Ferry Safety Plan (ABS, 2002).</p>	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.11, Hydrology; and Section 3.12, Hazards and Hazardous Materials).
<p><b>B-1</b> Loss of jurisdictional wetland habitat could occur as a result of dredging and construction of terminal facilities.</p>	PS	<p><b>B-1.1:</b> Impacts to wetlands shall be avoided if possible.</p> <p><b>B-1.2:</b> In the event that impacts are unavoidable, mitigation measures would be developed for specific projects.</p>	Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Wetlands are not present in the project area.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>B-2</b>	Construction of terminals could result in increased potential for the spread of invasive nonnative plant species in disturbed habitats.	L	<b>B-2.1:</b> Surveys shall be conducted to identify and map areas of cordgrass, and nonnative species shall be removed.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).
<b>B-3</b>	Project construction could result in the disturbance of "Special Aquatic Sites," including eelgrass beds, mudflats, and wetlands.	PS	<b>B-3.1:</b> Disturbance of eelgrass beds and mudflats shall be avoided in the design of project features and routes. Site-specific sidescan sonar surveys would be required prior to implementation of new routes or construction of new terminals to verify that eelgrass is not present. <b>B-3.2:</b> Define specific areas of eelgrass beds and mudflats. If unavoidable, provide enhanced functions and values at equivalent sites. <b>B-3.3:</b> Avoid indirect impacts through the use of silt curtains or methods to protect from disturbance.	Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Sensitive habitat is not present in the project area.	n/a
<b>B-4</b>	Turbidity caused by dredging would reduce light penetration in the water column and could locally reduce phytoplankton production.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).
<b>B-5</b>	Disturbance of benthic habitat from dredging could result in the loss of benthic (bottom dwelling) organisms.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>B-6</b>	Disturbance of habitat from dredging may result in the spread of nonnative benthic invertebrate species.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).
<b>B-7</b>	Dredging could adversely affect fish species near the construction activities.	L	<b>B-7.1:</b> Implement Mitigations D-4.1 and D-4.2.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).
<b>B-8</b>	Dredging and associated turbidity could affect spawning by Pacific herring.	L	<b>B-8.1:</b> Avoid dredging in known herring spawning grounds during spawning season. If dredging must occur during this period, monitors would be necessary, and activities might be halted. <b>B-8.2:</b> Use silt curtains while dredging to reduce turbidity, on a site-by-site basis. No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).
<b>B-9</b>	Underwater noise from pile driving and other construction activities could affect nearby fish.	L	<b>B-9.1:</b> Mitigation will be evaluated on a site-specific basis. Measures to reduce sound pressure levels in surrounding waters could be deployed.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>B-10</b>	Construction could result in loss of habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds and other birds.	L	<b>B-10.1:</b> Implement Mitigations B-1.1 and B-3.1 through B-3.3.	Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Waterfowl habitat is not present in the project area.	n/a
<b>B-11</b>	Ferry traffic could disturb roosting, rafting, and foraging waterfowl in shallow areas.	L	<b>B-11.1:</b> Consolidate ferry routes to leave as much undisturbed shallow open water as possible. <b>B-11.2:</b> Response of waterfowl to new ferry routes in shallow North and South Bay roosting, rafting, and foraging habitat shall be evaluated. Evaluation could include observations of ferry operations and waterfowl responses by an authority such as the Point Reyes Bird Observatory (PRBO).	Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Waterfowl habitat is not present in the project area.	n/a
<b>B-12</b>	Increased turbidity and activity from dredging operations could affect marine mammal foraging.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).
<b>B-13</b>	Underwater pile driving noise could disturb marine mammals.	L	<b>B-13.1:</b> Incidental harassment permit may be required from NMFS. As appropriate, conduct preconstruction surveys for presence of mammals, conduct monitoring, and establish safety zones.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>B-14</b>	Transiting ferries could disturb marine mammals resting at haul-out sites.	L	<b>B-14.1:</b> Avoid marine mammal areas by at least 100 to 250 m, which exceeds recommended NMFS guidelines.	Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Haul-out sites not present in the project area.	n/a
<b>B-15</b>	High-speed ferries could potentially strike gray whales.	PS	<b>B-15.1:</b> Ferry operators shall be aware of potential for whales and know how to spot whales at the surface. Operators shall receive USCG whale sighting reports and exercise due diligence. WTA shall implement a program of informing ferry operators of sightings, and reminders made during seasonal presence. Dedicated lookouts could be warranted. <b>B-15.2:</b> Ferries could be equipped with whale-detection systems.	Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project. Gray whales not present in the project area.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<p><b>B-16</b> Project construction and/or operation could result in the “take” of state or federally listed species or loss or degradation of these species’ habitat.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>B-16.1:</b> Review project construction sites for potential presence of species and institute measures to avoid sites with presence. Consultation with federal and state agencies shall be initiated and recommended measures followed.</p> <p><b>B-16.2:</b> Fully protected species that may be affected by this project include salt marsh harvest mouse, California clapper rail and California black rail. Proposed terminals and routes would be designed or located to avoid take of these species.</p>	<p>Project could contribute to the impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).</p>
<p><b>B-17</b> Construction and operation of terminal facilities could increase stormwater pollutant discharges and affect receiving water quality, which could in turn, affect local biological resources.</p>	<p>L</p>	<p><b>B-17.1:</b> Implement Mitigations W-1.1 and W-1.2.</p>	<p>Project could contribute to the impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources; and Section 3.11, Hydrology and Water Quality).</p>
<p><b>B-18</b> Contaminated sediments could potentially become resuspended during construction and dredging operations and could potentially cause toxicity to Bay organisms.</p>	<p>L</p>	<p><b>B-18.1:</b> Implement Mitigation D-2.1.</p>	<p>Project could contribute to the impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).</p>

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>B-19</b>	Increased numbers of ferry transits could bring an increased potential for fuel spills and water quality degradation in the Bay.	L	<b>B-19.1:</b> Implement Mitigations W-3.1 through W-3.5.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.11, Hydrology; and Section 3.12, Hazards and Hazardous Materials).
<b>B-20</b>	Vessel wakes could potentially cause erosion and loss of wetland habitats, potentially impact special status species such as the clapper rail and salt marsh harvest mouse, and potentially impact marine mammals through disturbance at seal haul-out sites.	PS	<b>B-20.1:</b> Refer to potential impacts and mitigations under Section 3.3, Wake Analysis.	Project would not contribute to the impact because the resource is not present. Sensitive habitat is not present in the project area.	n/a
<b>B-21</b>	Wildlife behavior and susceptibility to predation may be adversely influenced by an increase in lighting from terminal facilities and associated vehicle parking areas.	L	<b>B-21.1:</b> New lighting shall be directed on intended project areas and avoid surrounding wildlife habitat.	Project could contribute to the impact. Minimizing lighting effects considered in the development of the project description.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.9, Biological Resources).
<b>A-1</b>	Regional cumulative emissions of NO <sub>x</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , CO, SO <sub>2</sub> , CO <sub>2</sub> , and ROG could increase as a result of the implementation of the Proposed Project.	S		Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.6, Air Quality and Global Climate Change).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>A-2</b>	Motor vehicles leaving ferry terminals during the evening commute period would produce cold-start emissions that could lead to localized violations of the short-term carbon monoxide standard.	PS	<b>A-2.1:</b> Cold-start emissions shall be reduced by encouraging non-drive access at the ferry terminals. Techniques for encouraging non-drive access include fees for parking, provision of preferential parking for carpools and vanpools, comprehensive shuttle access, land use scenarios that encourage non-drive access, and encouraging bicycle and pedestrian access. In addition, feeder shuttle buses could be equipped with zero emission or ultra-low emission engines.	Project would not contribute to the impact due to its scope. No parking would be developed as a part of the project.	n/a
<b>A-3</b>	Ferries would emit toxic pollutants in the exhaust in the form of particulate matter from the combustion of diesel fuel.	L	<b>A-3.1:</b> Eliminate routes with low ridership and utilize PM traps and SCRs. No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.6, Air Quality and Global Climate Change).
<b>A-4</b>	Air pollutants would be deposited in the Bay, which could increase the levels of nitrates and sulfates in the water.	PS	<b>A-4.1:</b> Use of a fuel technology that lowers SO <sub>2</sub> emissions would reduce sulfate emissions and subsequent deposition.	Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>A-5</b>	Construction of ferry terminals could create emissions of fugitive dust from excavation and grading, and emissions of ROG, NO <sub>x</sub> , CO, SO <sub>2</sub> , and PM <sub>10</sub> from construction equipment exhaust.	L	<p><b>A-5.1:</b> Follow BAAQMD Guidelines to control fugitive dust emissions from construction activities. Measures include activities such as watering and covering exposed soil surfaces to minimize dust emissions.</p> <p><b>A-5.2:</b> Measures to reduce emissions from vehicles and heavy equipment could include: 1) Use alternative fueled construction equipment when possible; 2) Minimize idling time; 3) Properly maintain equipment; and 4) Limit the hours of operation of heavy-duty equipment and/or the amount of equipment in use.</p>	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.6, Air Quality and Global Climate Change).
<b>A-6</b>	Local concentrations of nitrogen dioxide and particulate matter could exceed state and federal standards at the Ferry Building.	L	<p><b>A-6.1:</b> Locate engine exhaust pipes at least 20 feet above the waterline.</p> <p><b>A-6.2:</b> Minimize dockside idling time at the Ferry Building.</p>	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.6, Air Quality and Global Climate Change).
<b>A-7</b>	Increased ferry service could result in increases of pollutants from ferry exhaust deposited directly into the Bay.	L	<b>A-7.1:</b> Implement Mitigation A-6.1.	Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<p><b>A-8</b> Dredging for increased ferry service would emit criteria air pollutants. These emissions would exceed the significance thresholds of 80 pounds per day for NO<sub>x</sub>, ROG, and PM<sub>10</sub> listed in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines. Exceedances would occur for approximately 12 days every 3 to 6 years.</p>	L	<p><b>A-8.1:</b> Minimize required dredging for construction and maintenance, both in terms of dredge volume and maintenance dredging interval. <b>A-8.2:</b> Utilize dredging contractors with the best available emission controls on their equipment.</p>	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.6, Air Quality and Global Climate Change).
<p><b>LU-1</b> Increased ferry service could include terminal locations in developed urban areas that do not currently have ferry terminal facilities. Development of new ferry terminals could result in the displacement of existing land uses.</p>	L	<p><b>LU-1.1:</b> Projects shall consider alternatives to avoid displacement of homes or businesses. Displacement impacts shall be addressed in the site selection process and avoided through design measures. If displacement is unavoidable, project proponents must execute a relocation assistance plan or its equivalent.</p>	Project would not contribute to the impact due to its scope. Project is located at an existing Ferry Terminal.	n/a
<p><b>LU-2</b> Installation of new ferry terminals could disrupt or divide established neighborhoods. This impact has the potential to be significantly negative or positive, depending on how much the community supports or opposes the location of the terminal.</p>	L	<p><b>LU-2.1:</b> Local agencies desiring ferry service shall identify parcels along waterfronts for potential ferry terminal planning, considering surrounding land use compatibility. Project design elements that improve accessibility and maintain community cohesion shall be incorporated.</p>	Project would not contribute to the impact due to its scope. Project is located at an existing Ferry Terminal.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<p><b>LU-3</b> Increased ferry service could result in disproportionate adverse impacts to low-income and minority communities. These impacts would occur primarily as a result of the displacement of homes or businesses in low-income and minority communities, or substantial disruption of those neighborhoods.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>LU-3.1:</b> Site-specific evaluation is necessary to avoid these potential impacts. <b>LU-3.2:</b> Implement Mitigations LU-1.1 and LU-2.1.</p>	<p>The project could contribute to this impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.16, Socioeconomics; and Section 3.17, Environmental Justice).</p>
<p><b>LU-4</b> New or modified ferry terminals would be located along the shoreline, and could affect and/or enhance existing public use and access to and along the Bay shoreline.</p>	<p>L</p>	<p><b>LU-4.1:</b> Incorporate public access to and/or along the Bay shoreline in the planning for terminal locations or expansion. This may include trails, parking set aside for shoreline users, viewpoints, disabled access, etc. <b>LU-4.2:</b> Incorporate the shoreline access guidelines described in: <i>Terminal Architecture and Engineering – Terminal Design Guidelines</i> prepared for the WTA (Parsons Brinckerhoff, 2002). The guidelines include Shoreline Access for pedestrians and bicycles, and viewpoints to provide views of the shore, bay, and the loading/unloading of the ferries.</p>	<p>Project could contribute to the impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.3, Land Use and Land Use Planning; and Section 3.4, Parklands and Recreation).</p>

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<p><b>V-1</b> The construction and operation of new and enhanced ferry terminals along the Bay shoreline could potentially impact land and water views of San Francisco Bay or degrade the visual character of the Bay.</p>	<p>PS</p>	<p><b>V-1.1:</b> When feasible, the following shall be included in ferry terminal design:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locate terminal facilities so as not to obstruct or detract from views of the Bay from nearby public thoroughfares;</li> <li>• Design terminals and layout to integrate with the surrounding landscape and historical structures to preserve, and take advantage of, existing views of the Bay and shoreline;</li> <li>• Design terminal facilities to provide new or enhanced point access areas or view areas such as piers, platforms and walkways;</li> <li>• Design and site terminals so as to maintain and enhance the visual quality of the shoreline and visual public access to the Bay;</li> <li>• Vessels shall be standardized to support system-wide operations and to work interchangeably at all terminals. Vessel berthing shall be configured so as to allow maximum feasible visual access to the Bay.</li> <li>• <b>V-1.2:</b> WTA-established Intermodal and Architectural Guidelines shall be considered for the planning and design of new and enhanced ferry terminals (WTA, 2002). Design objectives shall focus on use by pedestrians, bicycles, and other transit modes.</li> </ul>	<p>Project could contribute to the impact.</p>	<p>Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.10, Aesthetics and Visual Resources).</p>

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>V-2</b>	An increase in the number of ferries operating on the Bay could impact views or degrade the visual character of waterfront areas.	L	<b>V-2.1:</b> This impact is partially minimized by the concentration of routes along some common alignments. No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.10, Aesthetics and Visual Resources).
<b>V-3</b>	Increased ferry operations could increase the amount of visible exhaust.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.10, Aesthetics and Visual Resources).
<b>V-4</b>	Expanded ferry service, including new terminals and additional ferries, would not impact scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway.	N	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.10, Aesthetics and Visual Resources).
<b>V-5</b>	Expanded ferry service, including new terminals and additional ferries, could result in light and glare impacts.	PS	<b>V-5.1:</b> Ferry terminal designs will require site-specific lighting plans. Outdoor lighting design and placement shall be directed to the specific location to be shielded.	Shielded lighting was incorporated into the project description of the project. Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.10, Aesthetics and Visual Resources).
<b>CUL-1</b>	Dredging of new channels, maintenance dredging, dredging for pier retrofit or installation, or dredging/related activities for buoy placement could impact submerged and sub-bottom cultural resources in the Bay.	PS	<b>CUL-1.1:</b> Site-specific projects would have to be evaluated for presence and significance of resources, and avoidance procedures in compliance with established procedures. Identified resources that cannot be avoided would be subject to further recordation and or data recovery.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.8, Cultural and Paleontological Resources).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>CUL-2</b>	Deposition of dredge spoils for upland reuse or wetland restoration could impact submerged or terrestrial cultural resources.	L	<b>CUL-2.1:</b> Implement Mitigation CUL-1.1. <b>CUL-2.2:</b> Avoid the disposal site.	Coordination with the DMMO on dredging activities is part of the project description for the project. Under this process, disposal of dredge materials would occur at approved disposal sites for which environmental review has been completed.	n/a
<b>CUL-3</b>	Project actions such as retrofitting, expansion, or improvement of existing facilities, or construction of new facilities, could impact terrestrial historic and prehistoric cultural resources, and historic built environment resources.	L	<b>CUL-3.1:</b> Implement Mitigation CUL-1.1.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.8, Cultural and Paleontological Resources).
<b>CUL-4</b>	Project actions such as construction and related activities could impact previously unknown resources.	PS	<b>CUL-4.1:</b> Implement Mitigation CUL-1.1.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse with the implementation of project-specific mitigation measures (Section 3.8, Cultural and Paleontological Resources).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>G-1</b>	Potential new terminals and facilities could be exposed to surface faulting. There is a potential for substantial damage and risk of injury or loss of life at facilities located on or near active faults.	L	<p><b>G-1.1:</b> Significant risk of exposure to surface faulting for Alternative 1 can be avoided if the Half Moon Bay terminal location is dropped from further consideration.</p> <p><b>G-1.2:</b> Any potential development at Half Moon Bay would have to be carried out in accordance with the regulations detailed in the Alquist-Priolo Act.</p> <p>No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.</p>	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity).
<b>G-2</b>	Potential new terminals and other facilities could be exposed to strong ground shaking. There is a potential for substantial damage to facilities and risk of injury or loss of life at incorrectly designed or constructed facilities.	L	<p><b>G-2.1:</b> New facilities would be designed and constructed to seismic requirements and code. Site-specific ground motion studies shall be completed for proposed project sites.</p>	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity).
<b>G-3</b>	Potential new terminals are in areas of potentially liquefiable soils. There is a potential risk for destruction of structures.	L	<p><b>G-3.1:</b> Exploratory investigations shall be performed to determine susceptibility to liquefaction, and potential locations removed or engineered to reduce this risk.</p>	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>G-4</b>	Subsidence is ongoing in portions of the Bay Area. The potential geohazard presented by subsidence to potential new terminals is low to moderate.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity).
<b>G-5</b>	Expansive soil behavior is associated with wetting and drying of soils containing mixed-layer clays. Expansive soils can lead to structural damage.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity).
<b>G-6</b>	Slope movements have the potential to cause a range of impacts from minor structural damage (building impacts from rock fall) to major damage and injury/loss of life from building collapse.	L	<b>G-6.1:</b> The hazard from mass wasting could be reduced by siting facilities away from steep and unstable slopes. For sites located adjacent to areas of steep topography, site-specific geologic and geotechnical investigations and laboratory testing will determine the stability of slopes and their parent material. Using these data, appropriate slope strengthening and stabilizing designs could be developed.  No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity).
<b>G-7</b>	Erosion due to wind and water action could lead to the deterioration of terminal structures.	L	<b>G-7.1:</b> Determine erosion potential at each site through site-specific studies, and adopt recommended measures to reduce or avoid this impact.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>G-8</b>	Tsunami- and seiche-generated waves have the potential to inundate shoreline sites and damage terminal facilities. This potential impact would range from potentially significant at oceanside terminals (Half Moon Bay) to low or not significant at most of the Bay terminals.	L	<b>G-8.1:</b> Potential impacts of tsunamis could be lessened or mitigated by appropriate engineering design. Detailed hydrodynamic modeling could be necessary for coastal locations to determine the potential extent of inundation.  No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.11, Hydrology and Water Quality).
<b>G-9</b>	The WTA ferry expansion program could potentially impact the geologic environment, including energy or mineral resources.	L	<b>G-9.1:</b> The presence of geologic, energy, or mineral resources would be identified in the course of site investigations for specific projects. Mitigations would be defined at that time.  No mitigation is required for the Proposed Project.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.13, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity; and Section 3.14, Energy Consumption).
<b>NOI-1</b>	Passengers and crew would be exposed to shipboard noise from proposed en route ferry operations.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.	n/a
<b>NOI-2</b>	Noise-sensitive human receptors could be exposed to significant noise from proposed en route ferry operations.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>NOI-3</b>	Noise-sensitive human receptors could be exposed to significant increases in ambient noise from proposed ferry terminal operations.	L	<b>NOI-3.1:</b> Compliance of existing and proposed ferry terminals with zoning ordinances and local requirements.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.7, Noise and Vibration).
<b>NOI-4</b>	Wildlife could be exposed to noise from proposed ferry operations.	PS	<b>NOI-4.1:</b> The exact routes from San Francisco to Treasure Island and to Redwood City shall be determined in consultation with federal and state resource agencies. These agencies may require site-specific studies to determine whether impacts to the seals at the nearby haul-outs or to other wildlife (birds and fish), could be significant.	Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.	n/a
<b>T-1</b>	At a regional level, expansion of the ferry service would result in a decrease of the total automobile VMT. At the local level, expansion of the ferry service could facilitate changes in traffic patterns at new and existing ferry terminals. This could potentially result in localized increases in traffic in the vicinity of the terminals.	PS	<b>T-1.1:</b> Traffic mitigation measures would depend on local, site-specific conditions. Determination of appropriate mitigation measures would be performed at the time site-specific projects are proposed.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Local traffic impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.2, Transportation and Circulation).

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program		Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>T-2</b>	Additional car access to terminals would require parking. This could result in potential localized parking problems and conflicts in the vicinity of the terminals.	PS	<b>T-2.1:</b> WTA and terminal authorities/planners should study and develop terminal-specific plans in conjunction with local and regional transit agencies. Determination of appropriate mitigation measures would be performed at the time site-specific projects are proposed. <b>T-2.2:</b> Non-drive access could be encouraged through measures such as charging fees for parking, provision of preferential parking for carpools and vanpools, comprehensive shuttle access, land use scenarios that encourage non-drive access, and encouraging bicycle and pedestrian access.	Project would not contribute to the impact due to its scope. Proposed project does not include parking.	n/a
<b>E-1</b>	The Proposed Project could result in more transportation-related energy consumed.	L	No mitigation is required.	Project could contribute to portion of the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.14, Energy Consumption).
<b>E-2</b>	The Proposed Project could result in higher energy per passenger miles traveled value than other transit modes.	PS	<b>E-2.1:</b> Continue to investigate the feasibility and applicability of using energy sources other than fossil fuels and different engine technologies. Incorporate alternative energy sources and engine technologies as they become feasible.	Project would not contribute to the impact. Project would not add new water transit services. Project is a facility improvement project.	n/a

**Table E-1  
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation from the Program EIR  
and Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project (Continued)**

Impact for the Program	Level of Significance for the Program (after Mitigation)	Mitigation Measures for the Program	Relationship to the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project	Determination Made in the Downtown San Francisco Ferry Terminal Expansion Project EIS/EIR
<b>GRO-1</b> The Proposed Project includes expanded ferry service at existing terminals and addition of new ferry terminals primarily at already developed waterfront areas. The Proposed Project is not expected to be growth inducing at a regional level.	L	<b>GRO-1.1:</b> Implement Mitigation LU-1.1.	Project could contribute to the impact.	Impacts would be less than significant and not adverse (Section 3.18, Regional Growth).

Notes:

Impacts and Mitigation Measures shown in columns 1 through 4 are from the IOP Program EIR. Additional detail can be accessed in the Program EIR, which can be accessed on WETA's website at <http://watertransit.org/newsInformation/eir.aspx>.

ABS = ABS Consulting  
 BAAQMD = Bay Area Air Quality Management District  
 BMP = best management practice  
 CEQA = California Environmental Quality Act  
 cm = centimeter  
 CO = carbon monoxide  
 CO<sub>2</sub> = carbon dioxide  
 DMMO = Dredged Material Management Office  
 EIR = Environmental Impact Report  
 EIS = Environmental Impact Statement  
 IOP = Implementation and Operations Plan  
 L = Less than Significant  
 m = meter  
 N = No Impact  
 n/a = not applicable

NMFS = National Marine Fisheries Service  
 NO<sub>x</sub> = oxides of nitrogen  
 PM = particulate matter  
 PM<sub>10</sub> = particulate matter less than or equal to 10 microns in diameter  
 PRBO = Point Reyes Bird Observatory  
 PS = Potentially Significant  
 ROG = reactive organic gas  
 RWQCB = Regional Water Quality Control Board  
 SCR = Selective Catalytic Reduction  
 SO<sub>2</sub> = sulfur dioxide  
 USCG = United States Coast Guard  
 VMT = vehicle miles traveled  
 WETA = Water Emergency Transportation Authority  
 WTA = Water Transit Authority