The EIR analyzes a range of alternatives which would meet most of the project’s basic objectives and would avoid or lessen significant impacts. Six alternatives are evaluated in the EIR, including a “no-project” alternative, several preservation alternatives, and a code-conforming alternative, each described in this document.

Alternative A
Would involve no physical or use changes at the site; existing conditions would continue.

Alternative B (full preservation, office alternative)
Would provide 167 residential units, 406,459 square feet of office space, and no retail. It would retain the existing office building and build a one-level office addition. New construction would be limited to the northern portion of the site adjacent to California Street. This alternative would retain all the character-defining features of the existing building and most of the site and landscape features. Most prominent view of the project site would be retained with minimal change.

Alternative C (full preservation, residential alternative)
Would provide 534 residential units, no office space, and 44,306 square feet of retail. It would retain most of the existing office building and build a one-level residential addition. New construction would be limited to the northern and western portions of the site adjacent to California Street and Laurel Street/Mayfair Drive. This alternative would retain most of the character-defining features of the existing building, site, and landscape. Most prominent view of the project site would be retained with minimal change.

Alternative D (partial preservation, office alternative)
Would provide 456 residential units, 402,404 square feet of office space, and 44,306 square feet of retail. While this alternative would retain most of the existing office building and build a two-level office addition, the office building setting would be altered by new construction along the northern and western portions of the site. As a partial preservation alternative to the project, this alternative would retain most of the building and retain the landscape design on the south and east sides of the site such that views from those directions would be preserved. However, the site would be altered such that it would no longer retain integrity.
Laurel Heights Improvement Association
The Laurel Heights Improvement Association (“LHIA”), a neighborhood organization, submitted an alternative and variant to be included in the EIR. LHIA stated that their alternative’s variant could provide the same 744 residential units as the project, provide 460 on-site parking spaces, require substantially less excavation, and could be constructed within approximately four years.

San Francisco Public Works’ Bureau of Architecture assessed the LHIA alternative and concluded that it could not be not constructed as stated. Their analysis found that the LHIA alternative could only provide up to approximately 576 units, rather than 744, approximately 323 parking spaces rather than 460, and no underground freight loading. Additionally, the residential units would on average be smaller than those in the project, consisting mostly of studios and junior one-bedrooms.

LHIA’s alternative is not required to be included in the EIR because it is considerably similar to Alternative C. Like Alternative C, the LHIA Alternative would retain and adaptively reuse the existing structure, concentrate construction activities on the northern portion of the site, and partially preserve existing landscape features, and thus would avoid the same impacts. Other alternatives submitted by LHIA are considerably similar to alternatives in the EIR. In addition, for the reasons identified by Public Works the Department finds the additional alternatives are not required to be included in the EIR.

Comparison of Project and Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Project as approved by Planning Commission</th>
<th>Alternative A</th>
<th>Alternative B</th>
<th>Alternative C</th>
<th>Alternative D</th>
<th>Alternative E</th>
<th>Alternative F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>744 units</td>
<td>0 units</td>
<td>167 units</td>
<td>534 units</td>
<td>456 units</td>
<td>588 units</td>
<td>629 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>352,000 sf</td>
<td>406,459 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>402,404 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>34,496 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>0 sf</td>
<td>44,306 sf</td>
<td>44,306 sf</td>
<td>44,306 sf</td>
<td>14,995 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Laurel Heights Improvement Association
The Laurel Heights Improvement Association (“LHIA”), a neighborhood organization, submitted an alternative and variant to be included in the EIR. LHIA stated that their alternative’s variant could provide the same 744 residential units as the project, provide 460 on-site parking spaces, require substantially less excavation, and could be constructed within approximately four years.

San Francisco Public Works’ Bureau of Architecture assessed the LHIA alternative and concluded that it could not be not constructed as stated. Their analysis found that the LHIA alternative could only provide up to approximately 576 units, rather than 744, approximately 323 parking spaces rather than 460, and no underground freight loading. Additionally, the residential units would on average be smaller than those in the project, consisting mostly of studios and junior one-bedrooms.

LHIA’s alternative is not required to be included in the EIR because it is considerably similar to Alternative C. Like Alternative C, the LHIA Alternative would retain and adaptively reuse the existing structure, concentrate construction activities on the northern portion of the site, and partially preserve existing landscape features, and thus would avoid the same impacts. Other alternatives submitted by LHIA are considerably similar to alternatives in the EIR. In addition, for the reasons identified by Public Works the Department finds the additional alternatives are not required to be included in the EIR.

Alternative E (partial preservation, residential alternative)
Would provide 588 residential units, no office space, and 44,306 square feet of retail. It would partially retain the existing office building and convert it to residential use along with a two-story addition. New construction would be less than the project proposes, but more than considered under the full preservation alternatives in the EIR because it would build housing along Euclid Avenue on the southern portion of the site. This alternative would retain the main portion of the existing building but remove more of the landscape design features that enable the site to convey its significance as a Mid-Century Modern corporate campus. This alternative would preserve prominent public views of the site from Presidio and Masonic avenues. However, the site would be altered such that it would no longer retain integrity.

Alternative F
A code-conforming alternative, meaning that it could be approved without the need to amend the City’s Planning Code or Zoning Map. It would provide 629 residential units, no office space, and 14,995 square feet of retail. It would utilize the maximum residential development potential of the site as allowed under today’s regulations, including RM-1 Zoning, 40-X Height and Bulk Districts, and applicable Planning Commission Resolutions.