

---

---

## CHAPTER 4 Other CEQA and NEPA Considerations

---

---

Section 15126 of the *California Environmental Quality Act* (CEQA) Guidelines and 40 CFR 1508.8 require that all aspects of a project must be considered when evaluating its impact on the environment, including planning, acquisition, development, and operation. As part of this analysis, the EIR/EA must also identify (1) significant environmental effects of the project, (2) significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented, (3) significant irreversible environmental changes that would result from implementation of the project, (4) growth-inducing impacts of the project, (5) mitigation measures proposed to minimize significant effects, (6) cumulative environmental impacts of the project, and (7) alternatives to the project.

### 4.1 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF THE PROJECT

Table ES-1 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures), which is contained in the Executive Summary of this EIR/EA, and Sections 3.1 through 3.15 of this EIR/EA provide a comprehensive identification of the project's environmental effects, including the severity both before and after mitigation.

### 4.2 SIGNIFICANT ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE AVOIDED IF THE PROJECT IS IMPLEMENTED

Section 15126.2(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR describe any significant impacts that cannot be avoided, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures. Development of the project would not result in any adverse and unavoidable project-related impacts.

Many project-related impacts resulting from implementation of the project can be mitigated to a less-than-significant level; however, cumulative impacts would result from implementation of the proposed project in combination with the development of related projects in the area and projected regional growth. The project would not result in significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts.

### 4.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the project. Specifically, Section 15126.2(c) states:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible, since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irretrievable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if any of the following would occur:

- The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses
- The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources
- The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project
- The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy)

Development of the project would result in the continued commitment of the City of South San Francisco to ferry terminal uses, thereby precluding any other uses for the lifespan of the project. South San Francisco has identified in its General Plan Transportation Element that providing or reserving a site for a ferry terminal in the Oyster Point Marina Park (Marina) area would be feasible and should be explored as part of any revision to the Oyster Point Marina Specific Plan (Implementing Policy 4.4-1-5). Although the project would commit the project site for ferry terminal uses for future generations, the project does not represent a change in commitment from existing and planned marina uses for the site. Further, the project is essentially urban infill and would not represent conversion of previously undeveloped land to developed uses.

Resources that will be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels; however, the amount and rate of consumption of these resources would not result in significant environmental impacts or the unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. The ferry terminal would be a benefit as it increases non-vehicle uses. In addition, construction activities related to the project would result in the irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil), natural gas, and gasoline construction equipment.

With respect to operational activities, compliance with all applicable building codes, as well as project mitigation measures, would ensure that all natural resources are conserved or recycled to the maximum extent feasible. It is also possible that new technologies or systems will emerge, or will become more cost-effective or user-friendly, that will further reduce the site's reliance upon nonrenewable natural resources; however, even with implementation of conservation measures, consumption of natural resources would generally increase with implementation of the project.

In addition, a long-term increase in the demand for electrical resources would occur. However, the project would not involve a wasteful or unjustifiable use of energy or other resources, and energy conservation efforts could also occur with new construction. In addition, the project will be constructed and operated in accordance with specifications contained in Title 24 of the CCR. Therefore, the use of energy on site would occur in an efficient manner.

---

---

## 4.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must include a discussion of the ways in which the proposed project could directly or indirectly foster economic development or population growth, or the construction of additional housing and how that growth would, in turn, affect the surrounding environment (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d)). NEPA also states that federal agencies preparing an EA must consider indirect effects of the proposed action, including growth-inducing affects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density, or growth rate (40 C.F.R. 1508.8) . Growth can be induced in a number of ways, including the elimination of obstacles to growth, or through the stimulation of economic activity within the region. The discussion of removal of obstacles to growth relates directly to the removal of infrastructure limitations or regulatory constraints that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval. Under CEQA, induced growth is not considered necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

In general, a project may foster spatial, economic or population growth in a geographic area if it meets any one of the criteria identified below:

- The project removes an impediment to growth (e.g., the establishment of an essential public service, or the provision of new access to an area)
- The project results in the urbanization of land in a remote location (leapfrog development)
- The project establishes a precedent-setting action (e.g., a change in zoning or general plan amendment approval)
- Economic expansion or growth occurs in an area in response to the project (e.g., changes in revenue base, employment expansion, etc.)

If a project meets any one of these criteria, it may be considered growth inducing. Generally, growth-inducing projects are either located in isolated, undeveloped, or underdeveloped areas, necessitating the extension of major infrastructure such as sewer and water facilities or roadways, or encourage premature or unplanned growth.

### 4.4.1 REMOVE AN IMPEDIMENT TO GROWTH

The establishment of an essential public service usually refers to installation of infrastructures (e.g., utilities) and/or provisions of new public services (e.g., police protection, fire protection) while providing new access to areas is usually defined as new roads. An essential public service also could be defined as provision of new transit service. The project is intended to relieve existing congestion on Bay Area roadways and bridges. In addition, the 2001 South San Francisco General Plan Amendment assumes that total buildout in the area east of US 101 will grow from 12.82 million square feet (sf) in 2001 to 23.31 million sf in 2020 due mainly to the increase in office and R&D development. As the project is intended to relieve existing conditions, and provide for planned growth, the project would not be growth-inducing as a result of removing an impediment to growth.

#### 4.4.2 URBANIZATION OF LAND IN A REMOTE LOCATION

Implementation of the project would not encourage growth through the urbanization of land in remote locations, resulting in “leapfrog” development. The project is located in developed area that is served by an existing network of electricity, water, sewer, storm drain, communications, roadways, and other infrastructure sized to accommodate or allow existing and planned growth. No growth-inducing impacts would occur as a result of development of the project site.

#### 4.4.3 PRECEDENT SETTING ACTION

The project would generally be consistent with the existing designations for marina and park land uses. Existing designations within the East of 101 Area call for locating a ferry terminal in Oyster Point and existing zoning also allows for marina and park uses. The project would be consistent with existing on-site and surrounding development. Therefore, the project would not be growth inducing as a result of establishing a precedent-setting action.

#### 4.4.4 ECONOMIC EXPANSION OR GROWTH

Implementation of the project would not encourage growth through new economic expansion or growth. The SMHD does not anticipate an increase in employees to support maintenance and/or operational functions of the proposed ferry terminal. New positions that could be created with implementation of the project would include additional ferry operators, and on-board and landside support for operation, passenger assistance, ticketing, maintenance, etc. These employees would likely be people currently residing within the region and any job opportunities that are created as a result of the proposed ferry terminal would be expected to occur incrementally. There could be an increase in population attributed to patrons of the water transit service and potential new jobs created by the establishment of new ferry services, however, population increases as a result of either of these would not likely be significant relative to the number of people projected to move to the City and County (see 3.14 Population, Employment, Housing, Table 2).

### 4.5 MITIGATION MEASURES PROPOSED TO MINIMIZE SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Table ES-1 (Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures), which is contained in the Executive Summary of this EIR/EA, provides a comprehensive identification of the proposed project’s environmental effects and proposed mitigation measures.

### 4.6 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Cumulative impacts refer to the combined effect of project impacts with the impacts of other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects. Both CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that cumulative

impacts be analyzed in an EIR. As set forth in CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, §15130(b), the discussion of cumulative impacts must reflect the severity of the impacts, as well as the likelihood of their occurrence; however, the discussion need not be as detailed as the discussion of environmental impacts attributable to the project alone. As stated in CEQA, Public Resources Code (CRC), Title 14, §21083(b), “a project may have a significant effect on the environment if the possible effects of a project are individually limited but cumulatively considerable.”

According to the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, §15355:

“Cumulative impacts” refer to two or more individual effects which, when considered together, are considerable and which compound or increase other environmental impacts:

- (a) The individual effects may be changes resulting from a single project or a number of separate projects.
- (b) The cumulative impact from several projects is the change in the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the project when added to other closely related past, present, and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant projects taking place over a period of time.

In addition, as stated in CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations (CCR), Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, §15064(i)(5), it should be noted that:

The mere existence of significant cumulative impacts caused by other projects alone shall not constitute substantial evidence that the proposed project’s incremental effects are cumulatively considerable.

In addition, NEPA states that federal agencies preparing an EA must consider the cumulative effects that result from incremental impacts of a proposed action and other actions. A five step process for the analysis of cumulative impacts in EAs identifies the following criteria:

- The area in which the effects of the proposed action will occur
- The impacts that are expected in that area from the proposed action
- Other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions that have or are expected to have impacts in the area
- The impacts or expected impacts from these actions
- The overall impact that can be expected if the individual impacts are allowed to accumulate

As previously stated, and as set forth in §15064(i)(5) of the CEQA Guidelines, related projects consist of, “closely related past, present, and reasonable foreseeable probable future projects that would likely result in similar impacts and are located in the same geographic area.” Specific projects proposed or currently under development were identified from the City of South San Francisco Major Development Projects 2001–2005 list. These related projects are listed in Table 4-1.

<b>Table 4-1 Related Projects</b>			
<i>Area/ Application Date</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Proposed Use gross sf)</i>	<i>Current Status</i>
Gateway/2000	Stuhlmuller Property Co. (approved)	Office: 5 stories, 105,000 sf Garage: 4 stories, 2.35-acre site	Approved 01/02 and counted in 2001 Traffic Fee Study. Project not constructed.
	Stuhlmuller Property Co. (revised project)	70,000 sf building and surface parking	Approved. Project not constructed.
Gateway/2000	Malcolm Office Building (approved)	Office: 6 stories, 155,000 sf Garage: 4 stories, 3.54-acre site	Approved 1/02, and counted in 2001 Traffic Fee Study. Project not constructed.
	Malcolm Office Building (proposed revised project)	19,200 sf single-story Kaiser Medical Building. Potential to build a 55,000 sf office building on the remainder parcel.	Use Permit and parcel map application is under review. Approved. Project not constructed.
Area Z/2001	Britannia East Grand (Master Planned R&D campus with Development Agreement)	Office/R&D: 785,000 sf Childcare: 8,000 sf Fitness Center: 5,000 sf Residential/Retail: 8,000 sf, two 5/7-level garages	Approved. Project under construction.
Area Z/2001	Sand Hill Property Company	210,000 sf, 2 floors, 6-level garage Conversion of Existing Bldg: 5.76 arcs	Approved 4/02, Not constructed. Site purchased by Genentech in 2005.
Area U/2002	Bayside Area Development, LLC	Two R&D bldgs: 203,488 sf, 3-level garage, 6.067 acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bldg 1: three stories, 77,507 sf</li> <li>▪ Bldg 2: four stories, 125,981 sf</li> </ul>	Approved 6/03. Not constructed..
Area U/2004	249 East Grand Avenue	Four R&D/Office Buildings, totaling 500,000 sf and a parking garage.	Under Review.
Area R/2004	333 Oyster Point Boulevard R&D/Office project	The 8.84-acre site contains an existing warehouse building (approximately 400,000 sf). Use Permit to construct a phased development consisting of three office/R&D buildings totaling approximately 314,440 sf, and an 880-car parking structure. The site is located within an area designated by the General Plan for up to approximately 385,000 sf of Business Commercial use. An existing warehouse that occupies about 80% of the site will be demolished and replaced by the proposed office/R&D buildings and garage.	Approved.
Area Z/2002	Alexandria Real Estate Equities	Two R&D bldgs: 133,000 sf, 6.13 acres <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Bldg 1: two stories over parking level, 57,700 sf</li> <li>▪ Bldg 2: three stories, 75,300 sf</li> </ul>	Approved 11/02. Not constructed.

<b>Table 4-1 Related Projects</b>			
<i>Area/ Application Date</i>	<i>Project Name</i>	<i>Proposed Use gross sf)</i>	<i>Current Status</i>
Gateway/2002	611 & 681 Gateway	Office: 611 Gateway, eleven stories (265,081 sf) R&D: 681 Gateway: four stories (121,098 sf), 6-level parking garage, 8.2-acre site	611 Gateway: complete. Garage: complete. 681 Gateway not constructed. Alexandria currently revising the approved project.
	900 Dubuque Avenue	101,272 sf Home Depot store with a 24,522 sf garden center	Under Review.
	600-700 Dubuque Avenue	124,000 sf Lowe's Hardware Store with a 24,698 sf garden center	Under Review.
<b>Genentech R&amp;D Overlay District</b>			
Genentech/2004	Genentech Building 33	Office: five-story bldg (bldg 33) 127,000 sf	Approved February 2004; Estimated Construction period 2004–2006.
Genentech/2002	Genentech Building B32	Office: five-story bldg (bldg 32) 125,000 sf	Completed December 2003.
Genentech/2004	Genentech Building 31	152,000 sf Office: five-story bldg	Under Review.
Genentech/2005	Genentech Corporate Facilities Master Plan	Expansion of the Genentech Overlay District from 97.3 acres to approximately 120 acres.	Approved.
Genentech/2005	Building B51 Fill Facility	37,500 sf Fill Line Facility	Approved.
<b>Bay West Cove</b>			
Bay West Cove/2000	Bay West Cove (Overall Specific Plan Buildout with Development Agreements)	Planning Area 1: 600,000 sf Office/R&D: 20,000 sf Restaurant/Retail: 350 Hotel Rooms or 200,000 sf additional office	Specific Plan / Amendments / Approved 11/00.
		Planning Area 2/3: 564,000 sf Office/R&D: 10,000 sf Restaurant/Retail, Childcare (80–100 children)	Not constructed. Genentech acquired the site from Hines in 2004.
	Oyster Point Marriott	350-room, twenty-story, full-service hotel, 4.0-acre site	Approved 3/01. Not constructed.

#### 4.6.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The context for this cumulative discussion is the San Francisco Bay as a whole. Estimates of the Bay's size range from 1,036 to 4,144 square-kilometers (400 to 1,600 square-miles) depending on which sub-bays are included. The following cumulative analysis is based on the conceptual design of the ferry terminal, upland development, and Bay fill and dredging requirements associated with this conceptual design. The floating docks to be installed as part of the project will cover essentially the same area 0.154 ha (0.38 acres) as the ones being removed 0.149 (0.37 acres) thereby preventing the project from contributing to the overall fill (as defined by any of the responsible permitting agencies) of the Bay.

**Cumulative Impacts from the Introduction or Substantial Spread of Invasive Nonnative Plants or Wildlife.** Because the proposed project is to be located within an existing marina, it will not have any long-term operational effects on biological resources. The project does not result in removal or alteration of any critical habitat, threatened, endangered, or commercially important species, or cause introduction or spread of invasive species. No structures will be created that will contribute to the fragmentation of habitat within the Bay. Consolidation of travel routes with other ferry services and shipping activities will minimize disturbance to waterfowl resting on the surface of the Bay. Operation of the ferry terminal could result in re-suspension of Bay mud within the marina (CHE 2005), but most of this material would settle out within the marina and not affect the surrounding Bay.

Operation of the project would not result in the spread of cordgrass or other species. However, propagation of invasive species is a cumulative concern in the Bay shoreline. While the project would not contribute considerably to this impact, implementation of construction measures (i.e., cleaning of equipment and vehicles) would reduce cumulative impacts related to distribution of cordgrass into other areas of the Bay.

**Cumulative Impacts from Vessel Maneuvering.** The wake generation analysis conducted for this project indicates that the ferry-generated wake typically will be less than existing wind waves but that over the long-term, operations could result in the movement of sediment in areas considered sensitive habitats (CHE 2005), but the movement would not be substantial. The generation of wakes from this project would not amount to a considerable contribution to overall ferry wakes anticipated with expansion of ferry service in the Bay Area.

The long-term dredging and disposal needs for the Bay as a whole is estimated at about 300 million cubic-yards (mcy) over a 50-year period or an average of 6.0 mcy per year (Corps 2001). The amount of material that may be dredged from the Oyster Point Marina to create sufficient operational depth required by this project is about 16,989 cubic-yards. This amounts to about 0.28 percent of the average annual dredge total for the entire Bay. This amount is not a considerable contribution to the overall dredge or disposal volumes.

**Cumulative Impacts from Construction or Operation Levels that Exceed NOAA Fisheries Guidelines for the Protection of Marine Mammals.** The project could result in pile driving that results in sound pressure waves outside the Marina that exceed the 180 decibel threshold, and could injure nearby marine mammals and sensitive fish species. Cumulative development could result in projects that affect marine mammals and sensitive fish species; the project would not contribute considerably to this cumulative impact. Cumulative impacts could be addressed by the project mitigation which specifies monitoring site-specific conditions during pile driving to ensure that aquatic species would not be impacted and that sound pressure measured outside of the Marina during pile driving would not exceed the 180 dB threshold.

## 4.6.2 WATER RESOURCES

The context for the analysis of cumulative water resources impacts is the City of South San Francisco, including all cumulative growth therein, as represented by present and probable future projects as shown in

Table 4-1. The project, in combination with other concurrent and foreseeable development in the City, could increase impervious surfaces, such as structural cover and surface paving, and vehicular activity throughout the City, and as a result, affect stormwater, drainage, water quality, and flooding. Because future projects would be implemented land-side, no potentially adverse cumulative impacts related to dredging, wake wash, and navigation and safety are anticipated.

**Cumulative Impacts from Dredging Resulting in Impacts on Water Quality from Dredging or that Would Hinder Achievement of the Long Term Management Strategy (LTMS) Goals.**

The project would not have a potentially adverse effect from associated dredging activities as WTA would be required to secure a DMMO permit, which would be consistent with the goals of the LTMS. Additional development within the project vicinity is limited to land-side alterations and would therefore not require any additional dredging; however, standard Marina maintenance operations would require periodic dredging. It is expected that maintenance dredging would be subject to similar or more stringent permit conditions as the project would be. Consequently, there would be no potentially adverse cumulative impact on water quality related to dredging operations associated with either the project or general maintenance. Furthermore, the project's contribution to cumulative dredging impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

**Cumulative Impacts from Wake Wash or Jet Wash.** Operation of the project would generate waves and wakes that would not create adverse effects on adjacent shorelines, biological resources, other vessels, and structures. Continued development within the project vicinity would not contribute to the generation of additional waves or wakes; all additional development would occur on the land surface and not within the Marina or Bay. Therefore, there would be no potentially adverse cumulative impacts on adjacent shorelines, other vessels, and structures.

**Cumulative Navigational Impacts.** Potentially adverse project effects on navigation and safety would be minimized with compliance with MM 3.2-4(a) and MM 3.2-4(b). Additional development within the City would have no effect on navigation and safety since all development will be implemented land-side and not contribute to additional vessel traffic or impediments to water travel. Consequently, potentially adverse cumulative impacts would not occur.

**Cumulative Impacts from Storm Water Discharges.** Cumulative development in the City could generate increased storm water flows during storm events and possibly increase erosion potential, particularly during construction. Similarly, site preparation and development at the project site and others throughout the City could create temporary and/or permanent ground surface changes that could affect erosion rates or patterns of runoff. These impacts could reach significant levels if City, STOPPP, and RWQCB requirements are not enforced. However, because the project would not increase impervious surface area, the project's contribution to stormwater runoff is not expected to be cumulatively considerable, and is not a potentially adverse cumulative impact. In addition, future development must also comply with the aforementioned local and State regulations, which would ensure that the impact of cumulative development on hydrology and water quality is not potentially adverse.

**Cumulative Impacts on Water Quality.** As discussed in Section 3.2 (Water Resources), the project's overall effects on Marina and Bay water quality would not be potentially adverse because of compliance with existing regulations and implementation of MM 3.2-13. However, cumulative development throughout the City could have a potentially adverse effect on water quality by creating conditions that would result in increased leaching through underlying landfills and alteration of the amount and type of pollutants in stormwater runoff. Some of the potential pollutants contributed by development of hotel, light industrial, and research and development facilities could impair the attainment of Bay beneficial uses and may be subject to TMDL limitation. However, all new development would be subject to existing NPDES and City permit requirements regulating and controlling the discharge of pollutants and excess stormwater to receiving water bodies. Implementation of construction and post-construction water quality BMPs would be required and would be implemented to reduce potential water quality degradation and hydrograph modification impacts to minimal levels. Therefore, potentially adverse cumulative impacts on TMDL compliance would not occur, and the project's contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable. Cumulative pollutants loads would not be significantly greater than existing conditions and the project would not contribute substantially to cumulative impacts. Potential water quality degradation from cumulative effects would be minimal and project contributions to these cumulative impacts would not be substantial.

**Cumulative Impacts from Flooding.** Neither the project nor cumulative development throughout the City is expected to increase the likelihood of flooding or alter the location of the FEMA 100-year floodplain. Site preparation and grading for future projects are not expected to substantially alter the topography of the City to such a degree that would relocate the existing floodplain. In addition, stormwater runoff would be controlled by State and local regulations, as discussed above. Therefore, no potentially adverse cumulative impacts related to flooding would result from cumulative development. With implementation of MM 3.2-12 at the project site, potentially adverse flooding impacts would be minimized. Also, because the Marina is at the shoreline of the City and relatively isolated, localized flooding would not affect areas outside the Marina's floodplain. As such, the project's contribution to Citywide flooding impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

### 4.6.3 AIR QUALITY AND HEALTH RISK

The context for the analysis is future development in the South San Francisco area for the year 2025, as represented in the traffic study used for this EA/EIR. The proposed development shown in Table 4-1 above would require the construction of office, R&D, and parking structures.

**Cumulative Impacts from Violations of Air Quality Standards.** The construction activities would include demolition, construction, grading, or other activities which could lead to a violation in PM<sub>10</sub> emissions. Assuming that all proposed projects would be required to implement all appropriate dust control measures recommended by the BAAQMD, the *BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines* deem the construction-related air quality impact of cumulative development to be minimized such that there would not be an adverse impact. In the case of the proposed project, MM 3.3-1 includes the dust control measures recommended by the

*BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines*. With this mitigation, the construction-related air quality impacts of the proposed project would not be cumulatively considerable in regards to violations of air quality standards.

**Cumulative Impacts from Substantial Pollutant Concentrations.** The analysis for CO concentrations included the cumulative development in the future baseline. As there were no violations of the ambient air quality standards for CO at the study intersections or at the nearby sensitive receptor due to the project traffic in combination with the cumulative concentration, there would not be an adverse impact associated with cumulative CO.

Cumulative development would not be expected to expose sensitive receptors to substantial toxic pollutant concentrations. Cumulative development in the area around the proposed project area would include primarily office, R&D, and commercial facilities. Facilities that are generally associated with substantial toxic pollutant concentrations are high traffic freeways and roads, distribution centers, rail yards, ports, refineries, chrome plating facilities, dry cleaners, and large gas dispensing facilities. These facilities are not included in the development projects near the site. Therefore, this would not have an adverse impact. In addition, regulations and laws relating to toxic air pollutants would also protect sensitive receptors from substantial concentrations.

Cumulative development does not include any development that is commonly associated with odors such as wastewater treatment plant, landfills, refineries, chemical manufacturing, and painting and coating operations. Therefore the proposed project would not have a cumulatively considerable impact from odor.

#### 4.6.4 NOISE AND VIBRATION

The context for the analysis is future development in the South San Francisco area for the year 2025, as represented in the traffic study used for this EA/EIR.

**Cumulative Impacts from a Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels in the Project Vicinity.** The primary noise source identified for the project was the ferry boat which would increase the ambient noise levels at the marina. The noise increase from the ferry boats was not shown to have impacts outside of the marina, and would therefore not be a cumulatively considerable increase when combined with the any cumulative development noise sources. There would be an increase in traffic to the project site; however, in comparison to the increase in baseline from the cumulative development, the traffic increase from the project would be minimal. As the project would not have a cumulatively considerable increase in traffic, the noise increase from traffic increases would also not be cumulatively considerable.

**Cumulative Impacts from a Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels in the Project Vicinity.** The project would also include construction activities with equipment and vehicles which would cause a temporary increase in the ambient noise level. The construction of pilings at the marina would have noise impacts outside the marina and could potentially be cumulatively considerable should the construction timing coincide with any other future developments. The pile driving activities of the project would have noise levels above 60 dBA for more than 5000 feet away from the project site. The construction noise would

combine with construction and operational noise sources from other projects. This would result in an adverse and cumulatively considerable impact.

**Impacts to Wildlife from Exposure to Noise Levels Above Established Levels.** Impacts to wildlife would occur if the cumulative development would increase the ambient noise level above 60 dBA at the habitat line. As the project's contribution to the ambient noise level at the shoreline due to operation would be less than the ambient noise level of 53 dBA, the project would not be cumulatively considerable to the noise exposure of terrestrial wildlife. Also, as the other cumulative projects are land based, there would not be a cumulatively considerable increase to underwater sound levels.

#### 4.6.5 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the City of South San Francisco. This analysis accounts for all anticipated cumulative growth within the City and the proposed project's contribution to a cumulative impact on geology and soils.

**Cumulative Impacts Related to Strong Seismic Groundshaking or Seismic Ground Failure, Including Liquefaction.** Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to soil or other conditions occur at individual building sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. Buildings and facilities in the City of South San Francisco would be sited and designed in accordance with appropriate geotechnical and seismic guidelines and recommendations consistent with the requirements of the City Building Code. Adherence to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety, and the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Such adherence would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding seismic groundshaking and ground failure, and, therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts Related to Exposing People to Risk of Loss, Injury, or Death Involving Landslides, Fault Rupture, Subsidence, Uplift, Erosion, Expansive Soils, Tsunami, or Seiche.** Impacts associated with potential geologic hazards related to the above occur at individual sites. These effects are site-specific, and impacts would not be compounded by additional development. As discussed previously in this section, the likelihood for landslides to occur as a result of the project, or affecting the project, are considered remote. Because development in the City of South San Francisco would be required to be sited and designed in accordance with appropriate geotechnical and seismic guidelines and recommendations consistent with the standards of the City Building Code, the cumulative impact would be less than significant. Adherence by the project to all relevant plans, codes, and regulations with respect to project design and construction would provide adequate levels of safety, which would ensure that the proposed project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to cumulative impacts regarding landslides and/or slope instability, and, therefore, the cumulative impact of the project would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts Related to Substantial Soil Erosion or the Loss of Topsoil.** Impacts from erosion and loss of topsoil from site development and operation can be cumulative in effect within a watershed. The east bay including the City of South San Francisco forms the geographic context of cumulative erosion impacts.

Development throughout San Mateo County and the City of South San Francisco is subject to state and local runoff, erosion, and sedimentation prevention requirements, including the applicable provisions of the general construction permit, BMPs, and Phases I and II of the NPDES permit process, as well as implementation of fugitive dust control measures in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 403. These requirements would be implemented as conditions of approval of project development and subject to continuing enforcement.

Implementation of the proposed project would modify soil and topographic conditions at the site to accommodate development and to provide a stable and safe physical environment. Development of other cumulative projects in the vicinity of the project site could expose soil surfaces, and further alter soil conditions, subjecting soils to erosional processes during construction. To minimize the potential for cumulative impacts that could cause erosion, the proposed project and cumulative projects in the adjacent area are required to be developed in conformance with the provisions of applicable federal, state, County, and City laws and ordinances. As a result, it is anticipated that cumulative impacts on the East Bay, San Mateo County caused by runoff and erosion from cumulative development activity would be less than significant. With adherence to the federal, state, and local requirements, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts regarding erosion and loss of topsoil would not be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts Related to Unstable Geologic Units.** As with seismic groundshaking impacts, the geographic context for analysis of impacts on development from unstable soil conditions including landslides, liquefaction, subsidence, collapse, or expansive soil generally is site-specific. Because all development within CBC Seismic Hazard Zone 4, which includes the City of South San Francisco, is required to undergo analysis of geological and soil conditions applicable to the project site in question, and because restrictions on development would be applied in the event that geological or soil conditions posed a risk to safety, it is anticipated that cumulative impacts from development on soils subject to instability, liquefaction, subsidence, collapse, and/or expansive soil would be less than significant. With adherence to the applicable requirements, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, would be considered less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts Related to Preventing Future Access to Geologic Features and Resources of Economic or Scientific Value.** As with seismic groundshaking impacts, the geologic context for analysis of impacts related to preventing access to geologic features is site-specific. The project site has been determined not to prevent access to resources of economic or scientific value as shown in Chapter 3.05 Geology and Soils. Area projects would not have the ability to alter this conclusion due to the location of the project site on the end of a point and in an enclosed marina in the San Francisco Bay. The resources located within the project site are affected by the proposed project only. Therefore the project's

contribution to cumulative impacts would not be cumulatively considerable and, therefore, would be considered less than significant.

#### 4.6.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the Marina. The Marina overlies a closed landfill that was historically used for disposal of municipal and industrial liquid wastes, with the exception of a thin strip along Oyster Point Boulevard and Gull Drive. The Marina site is developed with a marina, a boat launching ramp, a fuel dock, a fishing pier, a park, parking areas, and a sandy beach. The fourteen on-site buildings consist of: two office buildings, an inn, a guard station, the Boat and Motor Mart, a bait and tackle shop, the Harbor Master's office, and five restroom buildings.

**Cumulative Impacts from Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials.** As discussed in Section 3.6 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), the project would not have a potentially adverse impact on the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, as no hazardous materials transport, use or disposal would be associated with the terminal operations. Fueling and maintenance would occur off site.

Cumulative development within the East of 101 Area, specifically office, research and development, hotel and commercial uses could result in cumulative impacts on routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials by increasing the amount of research and development uses. However, the proposed project would not contribute to this potentially significant cumulative impact.

**Cumulative Impacts from Accidental Release of Hazardous Materials.** Development on the project site requires compliance with RWQCB Order No. 00-046 and California Code of Regulations Title 27, which promulgates standards for protection of public health and the environment with respect to releases from disposal sites. The order requires that each new development on the landfill submit a Development or Redevelopment Proposal to the RWQCB prior to construction. This report presents general engineering design guidelines to be incorporated into future developments at the site. Compliance with this order would ensure that no impacts related to the accidental release of hazardous materials occur with implementation of the project.

Similarly, cumulative development on the marina site would be subject to the same order and regulations. No cumulative impact related to the accidental release of hazardous materials would occur.

**Cumulative Impacts from Contaminants in the Soil, Groundwater, or Structures.** As discussed in Section 3.6 (Hazards and Hazardous Materials), the proposed project could result in impacts related to potential settlement-induced leachate, dangerous concentrations of methane and VOCs, presence of asbestos-containing materials, and non-compliant landfill capping.

Similarly, development of cumulative projects could result in impacts related to potential settlement-induced leachate, dangerous concentrations of methane and VOCs, presence of asbestos-containing materials, and non-compliant landfill capping. While the project would result in a considerable contribution to this cumulative impact, implementation of MM 3.6-3(a) and 3.6-3(b) would address this cumulative impact by monitoring soil gas levels and potential excess loading of the waste and requiring infiltration reduction and compliance with applicable laws and regulations, such that the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would also be less than significant.

#### 4.6.7 ENERGY

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other related development within north San Mateo County, the service region for PG&E, the power provider for the project site. This analysis assesses the effect that the project would have on cumulative impacts to the regional energy supply (the combination of energy derived from petroleum fuels and electrical energy).

**Cumulative Impacts from Increased Demand on Regional Energy Supplies.** Although implementation of the project could place increased demand on the regional energy supply compared to current demand, energy consumption data for ferries, presented in Section 3.7 (Energy), shows that the increase would not be substantial. The proposed program expansion would result in a 0.41 percent increase over the current situation (No Project) in energy consumption per passenger mile traveled for all transit modes in the Bay Area, and this would be primarily applied during the peak hours when operation is highest.

Cumulative development in north San Mateo County will increase the intensity of land uses in the area and create an increase in the demand of energy supplied to the region. As demonstrated in Section 3.7 (Energy), there is an increasing demand for electricity in California, which is exacerbated by the increase in population which is projected to grow approximately 15 percent by the year 2025 in both the City and San Mateo County from the current year 2005. However, because PG&E is implementing the San Mateo-Martin Transmission Line upgrade project and the Jefferson-Martin T/L project, which would increase PG&E capacity to serve the growth projection in northern San Mateo County, cumulative impacts on energy would not be substantial. Further, even if there would be a cumulative impact on energy supply, the project's contribution to a cumulative impact would not be considerable.

**Cumulative Impacts from Wasteful, Inefficient, and Unnecessary Usage of Energy.** The project would not lead to a wasteful, inefficient, and unnecessary usage of energy. The ferry boats are considered clean energy consumers because they emit very low levels of pollutants and consume efficient amounts of fuel. Both the ferries and their support buses, the two main energy consumers involved with the project, burn clean fuels and would also be using displaced petroleum, otherwise going for private automobiles, to support their consumption, thus not directly or substantially drawing upon vital energy resources. Cumulative development in north San Mateo County could result in cumulative impacts related to wasteful or inefficient use of energy. However, the project would consume efficient amounts and fuel, and would not contribute to a cumulative impact related to wasteful or inefficient use of energy.

#### 4.6.8 TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the vicinity of the project in the City of South San Francisco. The analysis accounts for all anticipated cumulative growth within the project area.

**Impacts Related to Level of Service Standards.** The traffic analysis presented in the impact analysis and impact statements in the Traffic and Circulation section (for intersections and freeway segments in the project study area) includes the forecasted year 2025 cumulative impacts of general area-wide growth and traffic that would be generated by other proposed specific plans within the project area. Therefore, the cumulative traffic impacts and the proposed project's contribution to the cumulative traffic impacts have been addressed and quantified in the impact discussions. As noted in the traffic impact analysis, cumulative traffic would be added to the project area and would affect already deficient intersections and freeway segments, however this contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. Thus, the project would not have cumulative significant traffic impacts.

Traffic impacts during project construction (e.g., construction employee vehicle trips, truck trips for delivery of supplies and materials) could potentially be exacerbated by the cumulative effects of other construction projects in the project area if the construction schedules were to overlap. Due to the anticipated phasing of construction of the project and cumulative future development projects in the area, as well as the distance between the project site and anticipated cumulative development, cumulative impacts related to construction-generated traffic would be less than significant.

**Impacts Related to Hazards Due to Design.** In consideration of the project's compatibility with surrounding uses and the incorporation of design features to ensure traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle safety, the project would have less than significant impacts upon traffic and circulation hazards. Due to the fact that no other development is proposed in the immediate vicinity of the project site that would alter or substantially affect traffic, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities in the Marina, less than significant cumulative impacts to traffic and circulation hazards would occur, and the project's contribution to the cumulative impacts would also be less than significant.

**Impacts Related to Parking Capacity.** As described above, project-related parking impacts at the Oyster Point Marina site would be less than significant. Due to the fact that no other development is proposed in the immediate vicinity of the project site that would require the use of Marina parking facilities, less than significant cumulative impacts to parking would occur at the project site, and the project's contribution to the cumulative onsite parking impacts would also be less than significant.

The implementation of 2003 WTA PEIR mitigation measures T-2.1 and T-2.2 would ensure that cumulative impacts to East Bay ferry terminal parking demand would be less than significant, due to the fact that the mitigation measures were designed to address the entire Bay Area ferry service expansion proposal as a whole. With the provisions of the mitigation measures, the cumulative impacts upon East Bay ferry

terminal parking demand would be reduced to a less than significant and the project's contribution to the cumulative parking impacts would be less than significant.

**Impacts Related to Transit.** In consideration of the fact that the project would be designed to accommodate and encourage bicycle and pedestrian connections and access/use at the ferry terminal site, the project would result in a less than significant effect upon these alternative transportation modes. Due to the fact that no other development is proposed in the immediate vicinity of the project site that would alter or substantially affect pedestrian and bicycle facilities in the Marina, less than significant cumulative impacts to pedestrian and bicycle modes of transportation would occur, and the project's contribution to the cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

Project-related transit impacts would be less-than-significant. Future cumulative development occurring throughout the City and the region would result in additional transit use in the project area and the cumulative impacts to transit demand are considered significant. However, the project and the expansion of ferry service for the entire Bay Area is proposed to reduce that demand. As such, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on transit demand.

#### 4.6.9 LAND USE, PLANS, AND POLICY

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development in the East of 101 Area of South San Francisco, and with regard to shoreline development, considers all of BCDC's service area (i.e., the San Francisco Bay).

**Cumulative Impact on Community Displacement.** As indicated in Section 3.9 Land Use and Planning, the proposed project would not cause displacement of existing businesses within the project site or area, or create land uses that are in conflict with existing businesses; or impede circulation access to existing businesses or reduce the parking capacity that serve these businesses. The project would result in the removal of approximately 124 berths within the existing Marina including seven live-aboard vessels. The seven live-aboard vessels would be relocated to berths in the West Basin away from the proposed ferry terminal. With mitigation identified in other sections (i.e., Noise and Vibration, Air Quality), no project community displacement impacts would occur.

Development of cumulative projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, the majority of which propose office, R&D, and hotel uses, could cause the displacement or relocation of existing businesses. However, proposed development would be consistent with the General Plan land use designations for the area, and compatible with existing adjacent land uses, consisting of mostly bioscience, office, and hotel uses. (No residential communities exist in the East of 101 Area and as such would not be displaced.) Cumulative development would intensify the land uses in the area east of US 101; however, the intensification is consistent with General Plan projections for the area, and development would be subject to current design and development review by the City, and potential environmental affects would be mitigated. As a result, cumulative impacts from community displacement would not be substantial. The project would not contribute to any potential impact from community displacement.

**Cumulative Impact from Division of Established Communities.** The project would not affect an established community as the project would be compatible with marina uses. The project would result in the relocation of live-aboard vessels; however, residents residing in such vessels would not be physically divided by the project site. None of the live-aboard vessels would be located directly adjacent to the proposed terminal and/or bus stops. Therefore, the proposed project would not create physical or psychological barriers for an existing community or affect neighborhood cohesiveness. The proposed project would not change or alter existing population densities or impede circulation access or access to services, nor significantly alter or impact existing land use patterns. The project would not result in an impact from division of established communities.

The East of 101 Area is an established industrial and light industrial neighborhood. No other proposed development in the vicinity of the project would affect this established community, as similar light industrial, research and development, office, and commercial development would occur in the East of 101 Area. Therefore, cumulative impacts on established communities would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Impacts on Low-Income or Minority Communities.** The project would not result in disproportionate physical impacts to low-income or minority communities. According to the census data presented in Table 3.13-2, the residents of the project area are not considered a low-income or impoverished population, nor does the project site have a concentration of minority residents.

Cumulative development within the vicinity of the project would also have no adverse impact on low-income or minority communities, as there are no residential land uses, other than the live-aboard vessels in the Marina, east of US 101. Therefore, cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

**Cumulative Plan Consistency.** As required by Section 15125(d) of the CEQA Guidelines, Section 3.9 (Land Use) discusses any inconsistencies between the proposed project and applicable regional and local plans. The project was found to be consistent with all relevant plans and policies. The project involves minimal filling, would not impede access to shoreline parks, the Bay trail and other access areas; and would increase access to bayfront resources by providing a terminal waiting area open throughout the day that provides a new place for people to enjoy the waterfront. The project would undergo an extensive permitting and approval process, including design review by BCDC and the City. The project would be consistent with plans and policies.

Cumulative development within the East of 101 Area could have a potentially significant impact on the environment by conflicting with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. Specifically, the cumulative projects include a total of 2,920,022 square feet of office/R&D uses, 21,000 square feet of residential/retail (including fitness center and childcare), 225,272 square feet of retail, a 350-room hotel, and a 37,500 square foot Fill Line Facility, plus several other projects which have not yet been quantified. These projects are in line with existing plans that call for transforming the East of 101 Area to a more dense office and research and development center. Therefore, cumulative development would be consistent with existing plans and policies.

#### 4.6.10 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL QUALITY

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the vicinity of the project in the East of 101 Area in the City of South San Francisco. The area east of US 101 is an appropriate geographic context for cumulative impacts on visual quality because this area is a distinct development area, isolated from the rest of the City by US 101 to the west and bounded by the Bay to the east.

**Cumulative Impacts on Scenic Vista.** The project would not result in a substantial adverse effect on scenic vistas of San Bruno Mountain, the waterfront, or the Marina. The new ferry terminal, although 20-30 feet to the top of the canopy, would not block views as it would be lower in height than the taller office buildings between the project site and San Bruno Mountain. Views towards the waterfront, or of the boats and marina, would not be obstructed. Cumulative development in the area would not include other waterfront development. While the scale of existing development in the vicinity ranges from one to five stories, additional projects proposed in the area include buildings primarily ranging from one to seven stories, with one 20-story hotel proposed to the northwest of the project which could have a potentially adverse impact on long-range views of the mountains and Bay from various vantage points. However, the proposed hotel is compatible with the other numerous hotels and land uses in the vicinity, is consistent with the City's General Plan and East of 101 Area Plan, and would be subject to the City's Zoning Code and Design Review Boards. Considering combined visual impacts from the hotel and the proposed project, cumulative impacts on scenic vistas would not be adverse. As there would be no cumulative impact on scenic vistas, the project would not contribute to a cumulative effect.

**Cumulative Impacts on Visual Character.** As stated in Section 3.10 (Aesthetics and Visual Quality), the project would not result in impact on visual character. The project is entirely compatible with the existing marina character, including boat docks and slips, and would comply with established design policies contained in the BCDC Bay Plan. The addition of ferryboats is also expected to be unnoticeable and would not result in an impact on visual character. There are no plans for other development along the waterfront. No cumulative impacts related to visual character would occur. Therefore, the project would not contribute to cumulative impacts on visual character.

The project would result in an impact on visual character during construction. Other development in the East of 101 Area could result in adverse impacts on visual character during the construction period. The adverse impacts on the visual character or quality of the site and vicinity due to the project's construction (i.e. construction equipment, fencing, and debris) could exacerbate construction period visual character impacts of other projects. Thus, the project could contribute to a cumulative impact on visual character during the construction period.

**Cumulative Impacts on Scenic Resources or Historic Buildings.** The project would not affect scenic resources or historic buildings on a scenic highway as the closest scenic highway is I-280 which is more than 5 miles to the west of Oyster Point. Cumulative development in the East of 101 Area would be

similarly distant from I-280 and would not have an impact on scenic resources or historic buildings within a state scenic highway.

**Cumulative Light and Glare.** The project would not noticeably affect daytime or nighttime views in the area, or create a substantial source of new nighttime lighting or daytime glare. Additional development in the East of 101 Area, such as the proposed hotel and multi-story office and R&D buildings, would increase daytime and nighttime lighting and could contribute to a diminishment in nighttime sky in the waterfront area. However, all uses in the East of 101 Area primarily consist of office and R&D development, and would not be considered light-sensitive land uses. Therefore, no impacts from light and glare would result from cumulative development.

#### 4.6.11 CULTURAL RESOURCES

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the City of South San Francisco.

**Cumulative Impacts on Historic Resources.** The project would not affect a significant historical resource. The project site is currently comprised of non-historic structures. The project would not require demolition of a structure or structures which are potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or California Register of Historic Resources. Although there were no previously identified historic structures located within a quarter mile of the project site (see Section 3.11 Cultural Resources), as development occurs throughout the City, historical structures may be demolished or modified to allow for such development. Although such projects would require CEQA analysis and mitigation of the potential impacts to historic resources, these buildings may still be demolished or otherwise adversely modified, and cumulative impacts would occur. Given that there were no previously identified historic structures located within the project site, the proposed project would not contribute to a cumulative impact on historic resources.

**Cumulative Impacts on Archaeological Resources.** Implementation of the project would have potentially adverse impact because the project may disturb unknown resources, such as a possible shipwreck offshore of the project site and cultural material discarded into the near shore waters.

As discussed in Section 3.11, Cultural Resources, archaeological resources have been found in numerous locations around the shoreline of San Francisco Bay in the form of shellmounds. Like the project, related projects would result in ground disturbance associated with grading, excavating, and trenching, which could damage or destroy previously unidentified, significant archaeological resources that may be present on individual project sites, particularly in areas closer to the Bay. Cumulative impacts within the bayside City of South San Francisco would thus be potentially adverse.

Because the project would occupy a considerable, 12-acre portion of the shoreline, where unknown resources could occur, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be considerable. Implementation of MM 3.11-2.1, involving consultation with a qualified archaeologist in the event that

unknown resources are discovered, would reduce the project's contribution to less than cumulatively considerable.

**Cumulative Impacts on Paleontological Resources.** The project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature. No previously identified unique paleontological or unique geologic features are located at the project site. The site and immediate surrounding area are composed of bay fill and landfill materials that typically do not preserve paleontological resources. Therefore, the project would have no potential to contribute to a cumulative impact on unique paleontological resources.

**Cumulative Impacts on Unknown Human Remains.** The proposed project could have a potentially adverse effect on unknown human remains. Although the project site is not known to be located within a human burial ground and no known human burial sites were identified within the project site or its immediate vicinity, previously unidentified human remains could be encountered during ground disturbing activities associated with construction. Human burials, in addition to being considered archaeological resources, are subject to specific regulatory protection, and their treatment is governed by provisions of the Public Resources Code. Disturbing human remains could violate the health code, as well as destroy the resource, causing a potentially significant impact.

As discussed in Section 3.11, Cultural Resources, unidentified human remains could be encountered during ground disturbing activities associated with construction. Like the project, related projects would result in ground disturbance associated with grading, excavating, and trenching, which could damage or destroy previously unknown human remains that may be present on individual project sites. Cumulative impacts within the City of South San Francisco would thus be potentially adverse.

Because the project would occupy and potentially affect an area where unknown resources could occur, the project's contribution to cumulative impacts would be considerable. Implementation of MM 3.11-4.1, would reduce impacts should human remains be discovered at the project site. Because appropriate treatment of these resources is required by law, no significant cumulative impacts to human burials are anticipated to occur as a result of development within the City. Therefore, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact would be less than cumulatively considerable.

#### 4.6.12 POPULATION, EMPLOYMENT, AND HOUSING

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the City of South San Francisco. This analysis accounts for all anticipated cumulative growth within the City and the proposed project's contribution to the cumulative impacts on population, employment, and housing.

**Cumulative Impacts from Population Growth in the Project Site Either Directly or Indirectly.** The proposed project would not induce population growth to the project site either directly or indirectly. The proposed project includes the construction and operation of a ferry terminal that would

bring water transit service to the area that does not currently exist. The project would not introduce residential uses or encourage the increase in the amount of live-aboard vessels residing at the marina, resulting in a subsequent direct or indirect increase in population; nor would the resulting ferry terminal increase the number of employees on site. Bus service to and from the proposed ferry terminal would be provided by local employer shuttle services and/or other transit providers. The project would thus have no potential to contribute to a cumulative impact due to population, employment, or housing growth.

### 4.6.13 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

This cumulative impact analysis considers development of the proposed project, in conjunction with other development within the City of South San Francisco. This analysis accounts for all anticipated cumulative growth within the City and the proposed project's contribution to a cumulative impact on public services and utilities.

**Cumulative Impacts Related to New Government Facilities.** As identified in Section 3.15 Public Services and Utilities, the construction and operation of the ferry terminal would increase use of the Marina by approximately 936 ferry riders during both the a.m. and p.m. daily commute period and would constitute a negligible increase in the City's overall population and would not lead to a change in response times and/or requirement for construction of new police, fire, or emergency facilities.

Cumulative development in the project area could have a potentially adverse physical impact associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police, fire, or emergency services. With the proposed addition of office, R&D, hotel, and related uses in the area, an increased demand for these services would result. This could result in potentially adverse impacts related to new building construction or expansion of service. However, the project would not represent a considerable contribution to the cumulative impact on police, fire, and emergency services.

In the event of a water-based emergency associated with ferry use, the project could affect emergency services. Implementation of Improvement Measure 3.15-2 would ensure adequate emergency response is in place during construction and/or operation of the ferry terminal such that the project would not adversely affect the provision of emergency services. Cumulative development in the project area is not likely to include other shoreline facilities, and would not result in potential cumulative impact on provision of water-based emergency services. Therefore, the project would not contribute to a cumulative impact on provision of water-based emergency services.

**Cumulative Impacts on Water Supply and Wastewater Treatment.** As identified in Section 3.15 (Public Services and Utilities), the anticipated demand for water and associated generation of wastewater that would result with the maintenance and operation of the ferry vessels would be minimal, as maintenance and operation would primarily occur off site. Cumulative development in the area could have substantial effects on the supply of water and treatment of wastewater as substantial new development is anticipated in

the East of 101 Area. Specifically, the cumulative projects include a total of 2,920,022 square feet of office/R&D uses, 21,000 square feet of residential/retail (including fitness center and childcare), 225,272 square feet of retail, a 350-room hotel, and a 37,500 square foot Fill Line Facility, plus several other projects which have not yet been quantified. Since this area was traditionally a low density development area, increases in office, research and development, and other uses could result in cumulative impacts on the supply of water and treatment of wastewater. While cumulative impacts related to water supply and treatment of wastewater would occur, the project would not contribute, and would not considerably contribute, to these cumulative impacts.

**Cumulative Impacts on Stormwater Systems.** With implementation of the project, the project site's existing impervious surfaces would be repaved for the bus terminal and the parking lot. The proposed project would not add any impervious surfaces and would improve the existing drainage systems on site. The anticipated stormwater runoff would be collected in existing or improved drainages and released to either percolate or drain into the Bay per existing drainage systems. Improvements to existing drainage facilities would be implemented, through use of filtered drains or other measures to ensure that the discharge of stormwater drainage into the Bay would not lead to degradation of water quality (see 3.2, Water Resources for discussion of hydrology and water quality impacts). Cumulative development in the vicinity of the project could result in the need for the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or the expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. As the proposed ferry terminal would not result in adverse effects on the City's stormwater drainage facilities or require the expansion of existing facilities, the project would not contribute to this cumulative impact on stormwater drainage.

## 4.7 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

Alternatives to the project are presented in Chapter 5 (Alternatives Analysis) of this Draft EIR/EA.