This section describes the regulatory and environmental setting for public services and recreation, including fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreation, libraries, and other public services in the city and county of San Francisco that serve the project site, and estimates changes in demand on these services that would result from the Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project (Mission Rock Project or proposed project). The analysis is based on survey responses from representatives at the San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD), San Francisco Police Department (SFPD), San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD), San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department (RPD), and San Francisco Public Library (SFPL). In addition, relevant data and policies of the Recreation and Open Space and Community Facilities Elements of the City and County of San Francisco General Plan (General Plan), and various documents published by the aforementioned agencies, are considered in this analysis.

The purpose of this section is to determine the potential for increased demand on public and recreational services as a result of the proposed project, which could require the expansion of existing facilities or construction of new facilities and trigger physical environmental effects beyond those that would directly result from the project, as examined in other sections of this Draft EIR (e.g., Sections 4.E, Transportation and Circulation; 4.F, Noise; 4.G, Air Quality; 4.K, Utilities and Service Systems; and 4.I, Wind and Shadow, and Chapter 5, Other CEQA Issues).

Issues identified in response to the notice of preparation (NOP) (Appendix 1) were considered in preparing this analysis. The City and County of San Francisco (City) received two NOP comments related to public services and recreation. One NOP comment expressed concern over a loss of green space and requested that public lands be preserved for public and recreational use. The other NOP comment requested that the Draft EIR for the proposed project discuss impacts on schools.

Information regarding the residential and employment growth in the project area that would be induced by the different development scenarios contemplated under each land use assumption is provided in the Land Use Assumptions subsection.

**ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING**

The following section discusses the current public services in the city and the immediate area in which the project site is located. Public services addressed in this section include fire protection, police protection, schools, parks and recreation, and libraries, shown in Figures 4.J-1 and 4.J-2 on the following pages.
Figure 4.J-1
Public Services and Facilities in the Project Vicinity
Seawall Lot 337 and Pier 48 Mixed-Use Project EIR
Case No. 2013.0208E

Figure 4.J-2

Parks and Open Space in the Project Vicinity

4.J-3
FIRE PROTECTION SERVICES

The SFFD provides fire protection and emergency medical services to the city. Emergency medical transportation to city hospitals is provided by a fleet of both public and private ambulances.

The SFFD is headquartered at 698 Second Street, approximately 0.3 mile north of the project site. The SFFD consists of 48 facilities, including 45 fire stations and three Airport Division stations, and serves 1.5 million people. As of January 2016, the SFFD has 757 firefighters on staff.

The SFFD is organized into three divisions citywide as well as at San Francisco International Airport. The project site is in Division 3, which covers the southern portion of the city. Division 3 is bounded by Market Street to the north, San Francisco Bay (Bay) to the east, the southern border of the city to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the west. Division 3 covers a mix of land uses, including the city’s primary concentration of industrial uses. Each division consists of an assemblage of battalions, and each battalion consists of four to six individual stations. Division 3 is divided into five battalions (Battalions 2, 3, 6, 9, and 10). Battalion 3 encompasses the project site and is bounded by Market Street to the north, The Embarcadero to the east, 20th Street to the south, and an irregular line that comprises several streets (Langton, Folsom, Ninth, Bryant, Florida, Alabama, and Harrison Streets) to the west. Battalion 3 is divided into four fire stations (Stations 4, 8, 35, and 48).

The City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters at Third and Mission Rock Streets, immediately south of the project site, including Fire Station 4 (the fire station nearest to the project site), became operational in April 2015. Fire Station 4 would serve as a first responder to fire and medical incidents at the project site. Fire Station 8 (located at 36 Bluxome Street, approximately 0.4 mile west of the project site), Fire Station 1 (located at 935 Folsom Street, approximately 0.8 mile west of the project site), and Fire Station 35 (located at Pier 22½, approximately 1 mile north of the project site) would provide supplemental fire protection and emergency medical response services for the site. Table 4.J-1 on the following page provides the fire station personnel and equipment for each fire station that would serve the project site. As shown, Fire Station 4 is staffed by nine persons per shift and houses one truck and one engine.

---

4 Conley, Nalungo. Support Services. San Francisco Fire Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 11, 2016.
TABLE 4.J-1. FIRE STATION PERSONNEL AND EQUIPMENT FOR STATIONS SERVING THE PROJECT SITE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Station</th>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 4 (first responder)</td>
<td>9 persons per shift</td>
<td>1 truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26 persons total</td>
<td>1 engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 8</td>
<td>10 persons per shift</td>
<td>1 truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 persons total</td>
<td>1 engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 1</td>
<td>7 persons per shift</td>
<td>1 engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23 persons total</td>
<td>1 fire boat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 35</td>
<td>13 persons per shift</td>
<td>1 engine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 persons total</td>
<td>1 truck, 1 rescue squad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The SFFD received a total of 130,406 calls for service citywide in fiscal year 2014–2015, resulting in units being dispatched as shown in Table 4.J-2 on the following page. Approximately 23 percent of the SFFD’s calls required a response by emergency medical services, 20 percent required a response by fire personnel only, and 57 percent required a response by both emergency medical services and fire personnel. Between March 30, 2015, and March 30, 2016, Fire Station 4 responded to 1,092 calls for service. (Note that multiple vehicles that respond to the same incident are counted as separate responses.)

The SFFD seeks to adhere to the response time standards established by the National Fire Protection Agency (NFPA). The NFPA response time standards for fire suppression incidents are:

- First Arriving Engine Company Total Response Time: 5 minutes
- First Full-Alarm Assignment Total Response Time: 9 minutes

The NFPA response time standards for emergency medical incidents are:

- First-Responder Unit Total Response Time: 5 minutes
- Advanced Life Support (ALS) Unit Total Response Time: 9 minutes

---

### Table 4.J-2. SFFD Calls by Type and Response Times (Fiscal Year 2014–2015 Unless Otherwise Noted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Call Type</th>
<th>Number of Calls</th>
<th>Average Response Time (minutes:seconds)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SFFD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>29,581</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>26,784</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services and Fire</td>
<td>74,041</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>130,406</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Station 4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,092</td>
<td>3:58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Station 8</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>6,877</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>8,879</td>
<td>4:01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Station 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>31,927</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>9,617</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>41,544</td>
<td>3:59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire Station 35</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Medical Services</td>
<td>3,375</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>4,733</td>
<td>4:20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note:

- Fire Station 4 opened in April 2015. The data are for the period between March 30, 2015, and March 30, 2016.

Across all standards, the SFFD has a response time achievement rate of 90 percent. In the city, the response time clock starts when the call is dispatched. The clock stops when the responding unit notifies the dispatcher by radio or acknowledges on the computer that it is on the scene. The SFFD standard for “turn-out” time (the time from acknowledgement of the call to leaving the station) is 1 minute, leaving 4 minutes for travel. Data for the project area show that current response times are within the NFPA standards, averaging around 4 minutes and 6 seconds.7

---

The SFFD formerly operated and maintained the Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS), which is the city’s primary source of fire protection water and used exclusively for fire protection purposes. The AWSS system is now maintained by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. Existing AWSS facilities in the vicinity of the project site include a 12-inch main within the eastern half of Third Street between Mission Rock Street and Channel Street. Fire hydrants are located along Terry A. Francois Boulevard (in the northern and eastern portions of the project site), within Pier 48, and along Third Street (at the western boundary of the project site). No fire hydrants currently exist within Seawall Lot 337. Pier 48 is currently served by fire service connections that are fed from the existing 8-inch main under Terry A. Francois Boulevard. See Section 4.K, Utilities and Service Systems, for more information regarding the AWSS.

The SFFD fireboats the Phoenix and the Guardian, as well as an unnamed fireboat at Station 35 on Pier 22½, can provide backup to the City’s two saltwater pumping stations at 698 Second Street and at Van Ness Avenue and San Francisco Bicycle Route 2. The Phoenix has a pumping capacity of more than 9,600 gallons per minute (gpm); the Guardian has the largest pumping capacity of any fireboat in the world, at 24,000 gpm. The third fireboat has a pumping capacity of 18,000 gpm.

**POLICE PROTECTION SERVICES**

The SFPD provides law enforcement services to the city. SFPD services include responding to calls for police assistance, monitoring and managing traffic, and performing general surveillance duties. As previously discussed, the City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters (including the Southern District station, which would serve the project site) at Third and Mission Rock Streets, immediately south of the project site, became operational in April 2015. The SFPD is mandated by the City Charter to maintain a minimum sworn staff of 1,971. Although the SFPD currently has 1,716 sworn officers (a deficiency of 255 from the mandated minimum), according to SFPD, the department is on track to reach the mandated minimum through current recruiting and hiring methods. The Board of Supervisors has passed a resolution to increase the mandated minimum staffing level to 2,200 sworn officers.

---

10 Conley, Nalungo. Support Services. San Francisco Fire Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 11, 2016.
13 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.
The SFPD assigns officers to ensure that an adequate staff is available to provide minimum safety services. Officers staff special events and are deployed to meet needs during major events. Patrol functions are performed by officers of the SFPD Field Operations Bureau. The officers come from the 10 district stations.

The project site is within the jurisdiction of SFPD’s Southern District, which has a population of approximately 38,160 residents and a sworn staff of 146. The Southern District police station is located within the City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters, immediately south of the project site. The Southern District extends south from Market Street to Mariposa Street, east to San Francisco Bay, and west to 13th Street, encompassing the South of Market, Embarcadero, and China Basin areas as well as Treasure Island. The Southern District contains a total of seven patrol sectors, including five on the mainland and two on Treasure Island, in addition to several foot beats and officers who patrol on bicycles. All sector staffing is based on available station personnel and any activities that may draw district or citywide personnel away from a regular assignment. There is no baseline for staffing a particular sector, but the goal of each district is to staff every sector with at least one patrol vehicle at all times.

The Southern District is responsible for managing law enforcement services for many events each year, including San Francisco Giants home games at AT&T Park, Oracle World, Macworld, and the Google convention. The Southern District is not the primary station for the St. Patrick’s Day Parade or Gay Pride Parade, but it supplements these events with officers.

The SFPD routinely increases police protection for special events. This includes assigning additional SFPD personnel (police officers and onsite command/dispatch center personnel) specifically for these events. The level of SFPD personnel required for a particular event is determined by the SFPD’s Event Commander, who coordinates with the event sponsor in

---


15 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.

16 Pedrini, Chris. Captain, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on April 18, 2016.


19 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.

20 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.
advance of the event, as well as the event security/operations plans. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency’s Department of Parking and Traffic typically provides traffic control services for special events.

For San Francisco Giants home games at AT&T Park, the SFPD typically enlists on-duty officers from five or more SFPD district stations to provide police protection in the vicinity of the ballpark during games as well as motorized patrol support from the SFPD Honda unit and the SFPD Southern District’s radio car, as needed. In addition, the SFPD’s Municipal Transportation Agency Division provides traffic control officers who assist with pedestrian traffic in San Francisco Municipal Railway (Muni) Metro areas during Giants games. Additional off-duty police officers are contracted by the SFPD to provide security within the interior of the ballpark. Also, the SFPD maintains agreements with certain parking lot operators in Mission Bay; SFPD bicycle officers provide security at lots, including Lot A, that are used by ballgame patrons during Giants games.21

The SFPD does not have an established response time goal. However, the SFPD strives to maintain an average response time of 3 to 5 minutes for Priority A calls, which are considered the highest priority and signal an emergency dispatch. October 2015 average response times from dispatch to arrival in the Southern District were 5:38 (minutes:seconds), 9:37, and 12:56 for Priority A (life threatening), Priority B (potential for harm to life and property), and Priority C (crime committed with no threat to life or property) calls, respectively.22 The peak average response time (i.e., the shortest average time it took for officers to reach the location) for Priority A calls during October 2015 was 4:45.23 The lowest average response time (i.e., the longest average time it took for officers to reach the location) for Priority A calls was 5:53.2425 In September 2016, police stations within the Southern District received 5,260 calls for service; there were 34,970 calls for service citywide; thus, calls to Southern District police stations represented approximately 15 percent of all citywide calls that year.26

---

21 Pedrini, Chris. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 11, 2016.
22 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.
23 Pedrini, Chris. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 7, 2016.
24 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.
26 Pedrini, Chris. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 7, 2016.
The SFPD does not have a standard for the ratio of officers to population; it bases its staffing levels on the number of service calls and crime incidents. Within the project site, five SFPD incidents (four thefts from vehicles and one stolen truck) were reported between November 2014 and October 2015.27

There were approximately 11,868 crimes in the Southern District in 2015.28 The Southern District averaged about 311 crimes (including violent and property crimes) per 1,000 persons, with the majority of these crimes (about 93 percent) consisting of property crimes, such as burglary, motor vehicle theft, shoplifting, and vandalism.29,30,31 There were approximately 60,067 crimes in the city in 2015.32 The citywide average crime rate was approximately 71 crimes per 1,000 persons.33 The headquarters for the Southern District was previously located in the Hall of Justice, which is where many of the walk-in crime reports were received. This could have contributed to the higher number of reported crimes for the population in the Southern District compared to the average citywide crime rate.34

SCHOOLS

The SFUSD provides school services to the city. As of the 2015–2016 school year, the SFUSD consisted of 143 schools, including 64 elementary schools (kindergarten through 5th grade), eight alternatively configured schools (kindergarten through 8th grade), 13 middle schools (6th through 8th grade), 19 high schools (9th through 12th grade), 12 early education schools, nine county and court schools, five continuation/alternative schools, and 13 active charter schools, which are authorized by the SFUSD.35

27 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.
30 As stated above, the Southern District has a population of approximately 38,160 residents.
31 Pedrini, Chris. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 7, 2016.
33 As stated in Section 4.C, Population and Housing, the city has a population of 852,000.
The SFUSD’s current enrollment, including charter schools, is approximately 58,400 students. As of the 2015–2016 school year, SFUSD employed 9,551 total permanent and temporary staff members.

Table 4.J-3, on the following page, shows classroom capacity as of 2009 (the most recent published capacity data available), enrollment for the SFUSD during the 2015–2016 school year, and remaining capacity. As shown, based on 2009 capacity data, there is capacity for approximately 2,511 students in existing SFUSD elementary schools. However, the existing SFUSD middle schools are over capacity by 279 students, and the existing SFUSD high schools are over capacity by 2,022 students. According to the SFUSD, many of the schools on the west side of the city are at or above capacity; the majority of capacity available in the SFUSD is in Bayview, which is located on the east side of the city. Capacity exists in Bayview because the SFUSD opened the new 550-student Willie Brown Jr. Middle School in 2015. That school is not included in the capacity estimates in Table 4.J-3.

Although neighborhoods with a high number of school-age children generate a proportionally high level of demand for nearby schools, the SFUSD assigns students to middle and high schools through a lottery system. This system ensures that students are distributed to facilities that have adequate capacity to serve their educational needs. However, the SFUSD assigns students to most elementary schools according to attendance boundaries.


\[ \text{Goldin, David. Chief Facilities Officer. San Francisco Unified School District. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 13, 2015.} \]

Table 4.J-3. SFUSD Classroom Capacity and Enrollment During the 2015–2016 Academic Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Number of Schools (as of 2009)</th>
<th>Capacity (as of 2009)</th>
<th>Enrollment (2015–2016)</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School (kindergarten–5th grade)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>29,800</td>
<td>27,289</td>
<td>2,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School (6th–8th grade)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>11,979</td>
<td>-279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School (9th–12th grade)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17,575</td>
<td>19,597</td>
<td>-2,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatively Configured School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3,900</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter School</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totala</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>64,775</td>
<td>58,865</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:


Notes:

- The number of schools included in this table is based on the SFUSD’s most recent Capital Plan, which was prepared in 2009. Subsequent to the preparation of the Capital Plan, the number of schools in the SFUSD increased from 117 to 143, as discussed above. The Capital Plan is used in this analysis because it includes the most current data regarding capacity at the SFUSD schools.

- Enrollment data for alternatively configured schools, charter schools, and county schools are included in the enrollment data for elementary schools, middle schools, and high schools.

The SFUSD experienced slow growth between 2012 (when enrollment was 52,989 students, excluding charter schools) and 2015 (when enrollment was 53,095 students, excluding charter schools), a growth of less than 1 percent over the 3 years.\(^{40,41}\) Its capital facilities program has focused on replacing older schools and modernizing other facilities. The district’s Capital Plan identifies a range of physical improvements that are necessary to modernize existing facilities, such as providing access that is compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), upgrading science and computer labs, expanding arts facilities, and other improvements. In addition, the SFUSD has a backlog of deferred maintenance needs.\(^{42}\)

---


\(^{41}\) Tong, Rosina. Executive Director of the Educational Placement Center. San Francisco Unified School District. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 28, 2016.

The project site is within the vicinity of the following schools:\textsuperscript{43}

- Daniel Webster Elementary School (kindergarten through 5\textsuperscript{th} grade), located at 465 Missouri Street (approximately 1 mile south of the project site);\textsuperscript{44}
- Bessie Carmichael Middle School (6\textsuperscript{th} through 8\textsuperscript{th} grades), located at 824 Harrison Street (approximately 0.6 mile northwest of the project site);
- International Studies Academy (9\textsuperscript{th} through 12\textsuperscript{th} grades), located at 655 De Haro Street (approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site);
- John O’Connell High School (9\textsuperscript{th} through 12\textsuperscript{th} grades), located at 2355 Folsom Street (approximately 1.7 mile north of the project site); and
- Downtown High School (9\textsuperscript{th} through 12\textsuperscript{th} grades), located at 693 Vermont Street (approximately 1.1 miles southwest of the project site).

As shown in Table 4.J-4, all five schools in the vicinity of the project site were within capacity during the 2015–2016 school year (the most recent year for which information is available).

**Table 4.J-4. SFUSD Classroom Capacity and Enrollment for Schools in the Vicinity of the Project Site (2015-2016)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Capacity (as of 2009)\textsuperscript{a}</th>
<th>Enrollment (2015–2016)\textsuperscript{b}</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Webster Elementary School</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Carmichael Middle School</td>
<td>616\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Academy</td>
<td>825</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Connell High School</td>
<td>1,225</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown High School</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:


\textsuperscript{c} Lim, Darlene. Executive Director of Special Projects. San Francisco Unified School District. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 11, 2016. Note: The capacity is for the 2015–2016 school year.

\textsuperscript{43} Goldin, David. Chief Facilities Officer. San Francisco Unified School District. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 13, 2015.

\textsuperscript{44} The project site is within the attendance boundaries of Daniel Webster Elementary School.
Daniel Webster Elementary School provides extensive pre-kindergarten and after-school programs. The International Studies Academy, John O’Connell High School, and Downtown High School have extensive after-school programs, including sports.

Although several SFUSD sites throughout the city (primarily on the east side in the Bayview area) are currently underutilized in terms of current enrollment, the number of locations where surplus space is available is expected to decline over the next 10 years as enrollment increases by 6,000 to 12,000 students, primarily due to population growth in the city, including 600 to 1,000 students within Mission Bay. To accommodate anticipated growth, the SFUSD is exploring the construction of new schools in areas in which additional students are expected because of new housing developments and/or an overall increase in the number of school-age children. Areas that are under review by the SFUSD include the Candlestick Point and Shipyard development areas, Mission Bay (approximately 0.2 mile west of the project site), and Parkmerced.

PARKS

**Citywide and Regional Facilities.** The RPD owns and maintains approximately 3,433 acres of publicly accessible recreational and open space in the city. Together with approximately 2,457 acres of open space properties that are owned and managed by other City, state (255 acres, including Candlestick Point State Recreation Area and Mount Sutro), and federal (1,642 acres, including the Presidio, Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Fort Mason, Lands End, Sutro Heights, and China Beach) agencies, approximately 5,890 acres of parkland and open space are within the city. These publicly owned open spaces make up approximately 20 percent of the city’s land area and include a variety of parks, walkways, landscaped areas, recreational facilities, and unmaintained open space. Overseen by the Recreation and Park Commission, the RPD administers more than 220 parks, playgrounds, and open spaces, including two outside the city.

---

49 This discussion of existing parks does not include any parks in Mission Bay because they are not owned or maintained by the RPD and are not city facilities.
50 City and County of San Francisco. 2014. Recreation and Open Space Element. April.
The system includes 25 recreation centers, nine swimming pools, five golf courses, and numerous tennis courts, baseball diamonds, soccer fields, and other sports venues. Included in the RPD’s responsibilities are the Marina Yacht Harbor, San Francisco Zoo, and Lake Merced Complex.

City residents also benefit from the Bay Area regional open space system. Regional resources include public open spaces managed by the Midpeninsula Regional Open Space District in Santa Clara, San Mateo, and Santa Cruz Counties; East Bay Regional Park District in Alameda and Contra Costa Counties; and the National Park Service in Marin and San Mateo Counties. In addition to the state park and recreational areas throughout the area, thousands of acres of watershed and agricultural lands are preserved as open spaces by water and utility districts or in private ownership; however, these lands are not accessible to the public.

Within San Francisco, publicly accessible open spaces and recreational facilities are differentiated according to locally-serving spaces and destination spaces (see Table 4.J-5 on the following page for open space categories that apply to facilities near the project site). Several larger open space areas, including Golden Gate Park (1,017 acres), the Lake Merced complex (700 acres), and John McLaren Park (317 acres), compose about 50 percent of the total City-owned acreage that is in recreational use. The previously discussed larger open spaces as well as Lincoln Park (112 acres), Glen Canyon (78 acres), and Twin Peaks (55 acres) are destination spaces. Unlike locally-serving spaces, these larger areas provide programs, activities, or recreational opportunities that serve the city as a whole. The distance between recreational and open space facilities and potential users is generally defined as the service area for the facility or open space, as dictated by the type of park (i.e., neighborhood serving or district serving). The distance correlates to how far a particular type of user would walk (i.e., a family with children will not walk as far as an adult).

As stated in Section 4.C, Population and Housing, the city had a population of approximately 852,000 as of 2014. As such, the 5,890 acres of parkland within the city translates to approximately 6.9 acres per 1,000 city residents. The RPD has not adopted a citywide target ratio of parkland to residents. However, other resources are available that provide parkland


52 Radine Bradley, Stacy. Deputy Director of Planning, Capital and Planning Division. San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 20, 2015.

53 Radine Bradley, Stacy. Deputy Director of Planning, Capital and Planning Division. San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 20, 2015.
### Table 4.J-5. Open Space Categories and Park Facilities near the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Characteristics/Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood serving (locally-serving</td>
<td>• 1 to 10 acres, preferably 4 to 5 acres</td>
<td>• Usually landscaped areas of scenic interest that are natural or man-made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaces)</td>
<td>• Serves primarily a single community or neighborhood</td>
<td>• Provides passive and/or active recreational space that does not require organized programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Usually has playground areas with a play lot, apparatus area, and turf play area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some squares, plazas, hilltop, and shoreline open spaces also act as neighborhood-serving sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subneighborhood serving (locally-serving</td>
<td>• &lt; 1 acre in size</td>
<td>• Mini parks, including a tot lot or playground, and a small landscaped space with seating areas for all users to enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaces)</td>
<td>• Used primarily by people from the immediately adjacent area</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination spaces</td>
<td>• Varies</td>
<td>• Usually possess unique amenities (e.g., natural resources, views or one-of-a-kind assets). Examples of one-of-a-kind assets include playgrounds, historic features, and theaters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facilities near the Project Site</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Map ID</td>
<td>Park or Community Garden Facility</td>
<td>Open Space Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>South Park</td>
<td>Subneighborhood serving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 2p</td>
<td>San Francisco Bay Trail</td>
<td>Neighborhood serving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>China Basin Park</td>
<td>Subneighborhood serving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Facilities near the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Park or Community Garden Facility</th>
<th>Open Space Category</th>
<th>Park Location</th>
<th>Distance from Project Site</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Main Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4, 4p</td>
<td>Mission Creek Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood serving</td>
<td>Along Berry Street and Channel Street between Fourth Street and Interstate 280</td>
<td>0.12 mile west of the project site</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>• Events space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Picnic benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Basketball courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sand volleyball courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Tennis courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Walk/run paths</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Boating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Dog play area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 5p</td>
<td>Mission Bay Commons</td>
<td>Neighborhood serving</td>
<td>Mission Bay Boulevard North between Third Street and Terry A. Francois Boulevard</td>
<td>0.14 mile south of the project site</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>• Grassy, green open space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Walk/run sidewalk loop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Kids Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood serving</td>
<td>Long Street Bridge Street and China Basin Street</td>
<td>0.15 mile south west of the project site</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>• Playground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Benches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Picnic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bike racks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mission Bay Dog Park</td>
<td>Subneighborhood serving</td>
<td>465–479 Berry Street</td>
<td>0.5 mile west of the project site</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>• Play area for dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Picnic tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Planned Blue Greenway</td>
<td>Neighborhood serving</td>
<td>Begins at China Basin Park; extends south for 13 miles along waterfront</td>
<td>Within and south of the project site</td>
<td>13 miles</td>
<td>• Established open spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• New recreational opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public access through implementation of the San Francisco Bay Trail, the San Francisco Bay Water Trail, and green corridors to surrounding neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Full waterfront access</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Facilities near the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID</th>
<th>Park or Community Garden Facility</th>
<th>Open Space Category</th>
<th>Park Location</th>
<th>Distance from Project Site</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Main Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9      | Bayfront Park (planned)          | Neighborhood serving| Terry A Francois Boulevard near Pier 52 | 0.2 mile south of the project site | 5.5          | • Grass lawn  
|        |                                  |                     |               |                            |              | • Multi-use paths along the Bay Trail for walking, biking, running, and dog walking |

**Total** | 20.73 Acres

**Sources:**
provision goals. The San Francisco Sustainability Plan recommends an open space capacity of 5.5 acres per 1,000 residents.\textsuperscript{54} The San Francisco Department of Public Health, in its Healthy Development Measurement Tool (HDMT) Development Checklist, includes a benchmark for publicly accessible open space (10 acres per 1,000 residents) that is based on National Parks and Recreation Association (NPRA) guidelines.\textsuperscript{55} However, considering the city’s high density and the confined nature of its land mass (28,918 acres), this ratio is difficult to achieve within the city. The HDMT recognizes that other indicators, such as accessibility, safety, park maintenance, and usability, are also appropriate measures for measuring open space.\textsuperscript{56} Objective 1.1 of the adopted RPD Strategic Plan establishes a performance target for additional open space in San Francisco: “Continue to exceed the mean of the five densest US cities.”\textsuperscript{57} This performance target balances the need to increase the supply of open space as the population grows with the reality of limited availability of land in the city.

**Facilities near the Project Site.** Open space designated in the Recreation and Open Space Element of the San Francisco General Plan\textsuperscript{58} as Active Use/Sports Field or Passive Use/Tranquil Spaces is considered walkable (a 10-minute walk) to users within a 0.5-mile radius. It is assumed that all parks and recreational facilities within a 0.5-mile radius could be used. Playgrounds, on the other hand, are considered walkable (a 5-minute walk) within only a 0.25-mile radius. As shown in Table 4.J-5, page 4.J-16, and Figure 4.J-2, page 4.J-3, park and recreational space in the vicinity of the project site includes both neighborhood- and subneighborhood-serving facilities, including China Basin Park (within project site), Mission Creek Park (0.12 mile west of the project site), Mission Bay Commons (0.14 mile south of the project site), Kids Park (0.15 mile south west of the project site), San Francisco Bay Trail (Immediately south of project site), South Park (0.4 mile northwest of the project site), and Mission Bay Dog Park (0.5 mile west of the project site). There is also one planned park near the project site, Bayfront Park, 0.2 mile south of the project site.

Mission Creek Park is the closest neighborhood-serving park to the project site. The 10-acre park includes grass lawns and a tree-lined esplanade, walking and biking pathways, a small amphitheater for outdoor events, sports courts, a boat launch, and an off-leash dog play area at

---


\textsuperscript{56} The NPRA no longer recommends a single absolute “average” of park acreage per population. Other factors are now considered to be of greater importance, such as location and walking distance and whether a facility provides needed services to the population it is intended to serve.


the end of Berry Street.\textsuperscript{59} There is no recreation center within 0.5 mile of the project site. The nearest recreation center is Gene Friend Recreation Center, 1 mile west of the project site. In addition, the San Francisco Bay Trail, also known as the Blue Greenway, runs along the eastern and northern portions of the project site. The Bay Trail is a planned 500-mile hiking and biking path that will encircle San Francisco and San Pablo Bays and follow the shoreline of nine counties, pass through 47 cities, and cross 4.5 toll bridges. Approximately 345 miles of the Bay Trail have been completed, including off-street paved trails, dirt/gravel trails, and on-street pathways. The Bay Trail provides scenic recreation for hikers, joggers, bicyclists, skaters, and wheelchair users. It also offers a setting for wildlife viewing and environmental education and serves as a commute alternative for bicyclists. Within San Francisco, several segments of the Bay Trail are complete, including a segment along McCovey Cove Promenade, just north of the project site, and a segment that runs in a north–south direction along Terry A. Francois Boulevard from Mission Rock Street to Illinois Street where it crosses the Islais Creek Channel and continues south.

Privately owned public open spaces (POPOS) within the city are publicly accessible areas such as plazas, terraces, atriums, and small parks and landscaped areas (some with few pedestrian amenities) that are provided and maintained by private developers.\textsuperscript{60} In the city, POPOS mostly appear in the downtown office district. The POPO at 303 Second Street is closest to the project site, at 0.7 mile away.\textsuperscript{61}

Open space areas throughout the city also include “green connections,” or heavily landscaped pathways or roadways, that serve as connections between open space, parks, and recreational facilities or otherwise provide access to scenic points of interest. These can include streets that are heavily landscaped and attractive to bicyclists and pedestrians. Such areas are known as bicycle boulevards, neighborhood greenways, or green streets. Currently, a total of 24 routes are within the city’s green connections network. Within 1 mile of the project site, there are six routes. Route 24, Shoreline: Western Snowy Plover and Salt Marsh Harvest Mouse, is within the project site. The five other routes are within a 1-mile radius of the project site: Route 3, Market to Beach: Anna’s Hummingbird (0.8 mile northwest of the project site); Route 6, Mission to Peaks: Anise Swallowtail (0.6 mile south of the project site); Route 18, Tenderloin to Potrero: Western Tiger Swallowtail (0.7 mile west of the project site); Route 19, Downtown to Mission Bay: Western Gull (0.2 mile northwest of the project site); and Route 20, Folsom, Mission Creek to McLaren: Pollinators (0.7 mile northwest of the project site).\textsuperscript{62}


LIBRARIES

The SFPL provides library services to the city. The SFPL system includes 28 neighborhood branches throughout the city as well as mobile outreach services. The Main Library is located in the Civic Center at 100 Larkin Street. Both the Main Library and branch libraries provide information and accessibility services, book and multimedia lending, reading and meeting rooms, citizenship and technological resources, and library-sponsored exhibitions and programs. During fiscal year 2015–2016, the SFPL collection totaled 3,946,841 items. The SFPL had a total of 429,633 patrons.64

The project site is served by the 7,500-gross-square-foot (gsf) Mission Bay branch of the SFPL at 960 Fourth Street, approximately two blocks west of the project site, although SFPL patrons can use any library branch in the city.65 During fiscal year 2015–2016, the Mission Bay branch collection totaled 43,441 items; the branch had a total of 125,121 patrons.66 The Potrero branch at 1616 20th Street (approximately 1 mile southwest of the project site) and the Main Library (approximately 1.5 miles west of the project site) are the next-closest SFPL locations. The Mission Bay branch, Potrero branch, and Main Library have adequate facilities for meeting the existing local demand for library services.67

The Branch Library Improvement Program (BLIP) was launched as a result of a bond measure that was passed in November 2000, providing $106 million in funding for upgrading San Francisco’s branch library system; Proposition D, which passed in November 2007, authorized additional funding for improving the branches. The BLIP was intended to provide the public with seismically safe, accessible, technologically updated, and code-compliant City-owned branch libraries in every neighborhood.68 The BLIP was completed in 2014.69

63 Includes books, CDs, DVDs, sheet music, bound periodical volumes, government documents, and software.
67 Lambert, Michael. Deputy City Librarian. San Francisco Public Library. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on September 30, 2015.
There are no current plans to build new branches in the city; however, budget planning for fiscal years 2017 and 2018 could include resource allocation related to renovation work at the Chinatown, Mission, and/or the Ocean View branch libraries. These library locations would not receive renovations until fiscal year 2019 or later.\textsuperscript{70}

**REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

**STATE**

**California Fire Code.** State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code, which include regulations concerning building standards (as also set forth in the California Building Code), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices (such as extinguishers and smoke alarms) and standards (such as those for high-rise buildings and child care facilities), and fire suppression training. California Fire Code Section 403.2 addresses public safety for both indoor and outdoor gatherings, including emergency vehicle ingress and egress, fire protection, emergency medical services, public assembly areas (e.g., directing both attendees and vehicles), vendor and food concession distribution, and the need for the presence of law enforcement and fire and emergency medical services personnel at the event.

**California Health and Safety Code.** State fire regulations are set forth in Sections 13000 et seq. of the California Health and Safety Code, including regulations pertaining to building standards (also found in the California Building Code [CBC]), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices (e.g., extinguishers and smoke alarms), and fire suppression training.

**California Master Mutual Aid Agreement.** The California Master Mutual Aid Agreement is a framework agreement between the state and local governments for aid and assistance through an interchange of services and facilities, including, but not limited to, fire, police, medical and health, communication, and transportation services and facilities, to cope with rescue, relief, evacuation, rehabilitation, and reconstruction efforts.

**California Senate Bill 50.** Under the provisions of Senate Bill (SB) 50, school districts may collect Level Two and Level Three fees to offset costs related to increasing school capacities in response to growing student enrollments associated with development. Level Two fees require a project developer to provide one-half the costs of accommodating students in new schools while the state provides the other half. Level Three fees require a project developer to pay the full cost of accommodating the students in new schools. Fees would be implemented at the time

\textsuperscript{70} Lambert, Michael. Deputy City Librarian. San Francisco Public Library. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on September 30, 2015.
the funds from Proposition 1A (approved by the voters in 1998) are expended. School districts must demonstrate to the state their long-term facilities needs and costs, based on long-term population growth, to qualify for Level Two or Level Three fees. This is also codified in Section 65996 of the State Government Code.

REGIONAL

San Francisco Bay Plan. The San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission (BCDC) San Francisco Bay Plan (Bay Plan) contains policies pertaining to the development of parks and recreational facilities in or near San Francisco Bay and public access to San Francisco Bay. The Bay Plan includes specific policies related to the San Francisco Waterfront as well as general policies related to recreation and public access. Bay Plan policies call for the preservation of scenic Bay views; the provision of diverse and accessible water-oriented recreational facilities, such as marinas, launch ramps, beaches, and fishing piers, around the Bay; and encouragement for the development of water-oriented commercial recreational establishments, such as restaurants, specialty shops, private boatels, recreational equipment concessions, and amusements in urban areas adjacent to the Bay. In addition, the Bay Plan encourages the preservation of historic districts and structures, including public access to the exterior and, where appropriate, the interior of these structures.71

One of the plan’s major conclusions is that shoreline areas that are suitable for priority uses (ports, water-related industry, airports, wildlife refuges, and water-related recreation) exist only in limited amounts and should be reserved for these purposes. One of its major proposals is that new shoreline parks, beaches, marinas, fishing piers, scenic drives, and hiking or biking pathways should be provided in many areas. The Bay Plan notes that San Francisco Bay and its shoreline offer particularly important opportunities for recreational development in urban areas where large concentrations of people now live close to the water but do not have a publicly accessible shoreline nearby. As such, it proposes that the highest priority should be given to recreational development in these areas as a means of providing immediate help to relieve urban tensions.

General recreation and public access policies of the Bay Plan that are relevant to development of the proposed project are summarized below.72

- **Recreation Policy IV.2** encourages preserving waterfront land for parks and beaches to meet future needs, with the understanding that recreational facilities need not be built all at once. Interim use of a waterfront park priority use area prior to its development as

---


a park should be permitted, unless the use would prevent the site from being converted to park use or would involve investment in improvements that would preclude the future use of the site as a park.

- **Recreation Policy IV.3** encourages the development of a variety of recreational facilities, such as waterfront parks, trails, marinas, live-aboard boats, nonmotorized small boat access, fishing piers, launching lanes, and beaches. These recreational facilities should be located, improved, and managed consistent with detailed standards for the different type of recreational facilities (e.g., general recreation facilities should be as close to major population centers as is feasible and marina facilities should include viewing areas, restrooms, and nonmotorized small boat launching facilities).

- **Public Access Policy IV.1** encourages the development of infill projects that increase public access to the Bay to the maximum extent feasible, in accordance the policies for public access to the Bay.

- **Public Access Policy IV.2** ensures public access to San Francisco Bay via waterfront parks, beaches, marinas, and fishing piers and encourages, to the maximum extent feasible, the provision of public access to and along the waterfront through every new development in San Francisco Bay or on the shoreline, whether it be for housing, industry, port, airport, public facility, wildlife area, or other use. For infill projects, in-lieu access to another location, preferably near the project site, should be provided.

- **Public Access Policy IV.2** directs public access to be sited, designed, managed, and maintained to avoid significant adverse impacts from sea-level rise and shoreline flooding.

- **Public Access Policy IV.9** encourages access to and along the waterfront by walkways, trails, or other appropriate means as well as connections to the nearest public thoroughfare where convenient parking or public transportation may be available.

- **Public Access Policy IV.11** encourages coordination between federal, state, regional, and local jurisdictions, special districts, and BCDC to provide appropriately sited, designed, and managed public access, especially to link the entire series of shoreline parks, regional trail systems (such as the Bay Trail), and existing public access areas to the extent feasible without additional San Francisco Bay filling and without significant adverse effects on San Francisco Bay natural resources. State, regional, and local agencies that approve projects should ensure that provisions for public access to and along the shoreline are included as conditions of approval and that the access is consistent with BCDC’s requirements and guidelines.
The Bay Plan identifies priority uses for the San Francisco Bay shoreline. These priority uses are identified on the Bay Plan maps and defined as ports, water-related industry, water-oriented recreation, airports, or wildlife refuges. According to Bay Plan Map No. 5 (Central Bay), Mission Rock is part of the “China Basin” and identified as a water-related industry priority use area. Policies related to this area are further specified in the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan, as described below. The proposed project includes development that would be consistent with Bay Plan recreation and public access policies (see Chapter 3, Plans and Policies).

San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan. The San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan was adopted by BCDC on April 3, 1975, to provide detailed planning and regulatory guidelines for the waterfront of San Francisco, from the east side of Hyde Street Pier to the south side of India Basin. The San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan, an element of the Bay Plan, applies the requirements of the McAteer-Petris Act and the provisions of the Bay Plan to the San Francisco waterfront in greater detail. Among many goals and policies, the primary recreational purpose of the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan is to increase public use and enjoyment of San Francisco Bay and the waterfront through the completion of a system of integrated public parks, plazas, pier public access areas, and promenades. Mission Rock is located along the Port of San Francisco’s (Port’s) Southern Waterfront, which stretches between China Basin and Earl Street at India Basin and contains most of the current maritime activity of the Port. General policies related to public access and open space include the following:

- **Policy 6a.** In accordance with general Bay Plan policies, maximum feasible public access should be provided in conjunction with any development in the area covered by this Special Area Plan. Public access should be located at ground or platform level, but minor variations in elevation intended to enhance design of open space may be permitted. Public access should also be open to the sky, although some covering may be allowed if it serves the public areas and does not support structures. Particular attention should be given to the provision of perimeter public access along the platform edge. Other uses may extend to the platform edge subject to the following conditions:

  i) Such uses should enhance the total design of the project, should serve to make the public access more interesting, and should not divert the public way along more than 20 percent of the total platform edge;

  ii) Deviations of the public way from the platform edge should be limited to short distances.

---


• **Policy 6b.** Development of public access should be required as a condition of permits for new maritime and nonmaritime development. The location of such access obtained as a condition of maritime development between Channel Street and India Basin should be guided by the designations for public recreation, open space, and public access, as found on Special Area Plan Maps 5 and 6.

According to Special Area Plan Map 5 of the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan, the portion of the project site (bounded by China Basin to the north, Terry A. Francois Boulevard to the south, Third Street to the west, and the San Francisco Bay to the east) is specifically designated as a public recreation and access area. This area is encompassed by the existing China Basin Park. The proposed Mission Rock project would retain and expand China Basin Park, consistent with the San Francisco Waterfront Special Area Plan.

**Bay Trail Plan.** The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Bay Trail Plan (Bay Trail Plan) proposes development of a 500-mile regional hiking and biking trail around the perimeter of San Francisco and San Pablo Bays. The Bay Trail Plan was prepared by ABAG pursuant to Senate Bill 100, which mandated that the Bay Trail provide connections to existing park and recreational facilities, create links to existing and proposed transportation facilities, and be planned in such a way as to avoid adverse effects on environmentally sensitive areas. The Bay Trail Plan also contains five categories of policies to guide selections of the trail route and implementation of the trail system, comprising trail alignment, trail design, environmental protection, transportation access, and implementation policies.

**The Enhanced Water Trail Plan.** Led by the State Coastal Conservancy, the Enhanced Water Trail Plan strives to create a network of launch and landing sites, or “trailheads,” to allow people in nonmotorized boats and beachable sail craft to enjoy San Francisco Bay. The Enhanced Water Trail Plan is a guide to trail implementation for the agencies and organizations that will develop and manage water trail access points and programs as well as trail proponents and other stakeholders who are also involved in implementation. Recommended policies and procedures in the Enhanced Water Trail Plan define how the trail will take shape over time by guiding planning, development, and management on organizational, programmatic, and trailhead project–specific levels.

---


LOCAL

San Francisco General Plan. The General Plan provides long-term guidance and policies for maintaining and improving the quality of life as well as the man-made and natural resources of the community. The following objectives and policies from the Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan are applicable to the proposed project:

- Objective 1: Ensure a well-maintained, highly utilized, and integrated open space system.
- Policy 1.1: Encourage the dynamic and flexible use of existing open spaces and promote a variety of recreation and open space uses, where appropriate.
- Policy 1.5: Prioritize the better utilization of McLaren Park, Ocean Beach, the Southeastern Waterfront, and other underutilized significant open spaces.
- Policy 1.7: Support public art as an essential component of open space design.
- Policy 1.9: Preserve sunlight in public open spaces.
- Policy 1.10: Ensure that open space is safe and secure for the city’s entire population.
- Policy 1.12: Preserve historic and culturally significant landscapes, sites, structures, buildings, and objects.
- Policy 1.13: Preserve and protect character-defining features of historic resources in city parks when it is necessary to make alterations to accommodate new needs or uses.

- Objective 2: Increase recreation and open space to meet the long-term needs of the city and bay region.
- Policy 2.1: Prioritize acquisition of open space in high-needs areas.
- Policy 2.2: Provide and promote a balanced recreation system that offers a variety of high-quality recreational opportunities for all San Franciscans.
- Policy 2.4: Support the development of signature public open spaces along the shoreline.
- Policy 2.8: Consider repurposing underutilized City-owned properties as open space and recreational facilities.

- Objective 3: Improve access and connectivity to open space.
- Policy 3.2: Establish and implement a network of green connections that increases access to parks, open spaces, and the waterfront.
- Policy 3.3: Develop and enhance the city’s recreational trail system, linking to the regional hiking and biking trail system, and consider restoring historic watercourses to improve stormwater management.
- Policy 3.4: Encourage nonauto modes of transportation (transit, bicycle, and pedestrian) to and from open spaces while reducing automobile traffic and parking in public open spaces.

- Policy 3.5: Ensure that, where feasible, recreational facilities and open spaces are physically accessible, especially for those with limited mobility.

- Objective 4: Protect and enhance the biodiversity, habitat value, and ecological integrity of open spaces and encourage sustainable practices in the design and management of our open space system.

- Policy 4.3: Integrate the protection and restoration of local biodiversity into open space construction, renovation, management, and maintenance.

- Policy 4.4: Include environmentally sustainable practices in construction, renovation, management, and maintenance of open space and recreational facilities.

The following objectives and policies from the Community Facilities Element of the General Plan are applicable to the proposed project:

- Policy 1.2: Provide the number of district stations that balances service effectiveness with community desires for neighborhood police facilities.

- Objective 5: Develop a system of firehouses that will meet the operating requirements of the fire department for providing fire protection services and be in harmony with related public service facilities and all other features and facilities of land development and transportation provided for other sections of the General Plan.

- Objective 6: Develop a public library system in San Francisco that will make adequate and efficient library service freely available to everyone within the city and be in harmony with related public service facilities and all other features and facilities of land development and transportation provided for in other sections of the General Plan.

- Objective 8: Ensure that public school facilities are distributed and located in a manner that will enhance their efficient and effective use.

- Objective 8.1: Provide public school facilities for education in accordance with the need for such facilities, as defined by the Unified School District and Community College District. Locate such facilities according to the Public School Facilities Plan and, wherever possible, make available for community use.

**San Francisco Fire Code.** The San Francisco Fire Code incorporates by reference the California Fire Code, with certain local amendments. The Port Building Code adopts the San Francisco Fire Code by reference. The San Francisco Fire Code regulates and governs the safeguarding of life and property from fire and explosion hazards arising from the storage, handling, and use of hazardous substances, materials, and devices as well as conditions that are hazardous to life or
property in the occupancy of buildings and premises; provides for the issuance of permits, inspections, and other SFFD services; and allows for the assessment and collection of fees for those permits, inspections, and services.

The SFFD reviews building plans to ensure that certain fire and life safety features are provided and maintained in the buildings that fall under its jurisdiction. In coordination with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, the SFFD conducts plan checks to ensure that all structures, occupancies, and systems are designed in accordance with the San Francisco Fire Code and the governing building code.

Section 511 (Local Fire Safety Feature Requirements) of the San Francisco Fire Code requires buildings that are 200 feet or more in height to provide at least one elevator that has been approved by the fire department for firefighter use under fire conditions (San Francisco Fire Code Ordinance No. 200-13). The system must be tested and maintained pursuant to Fire Department Administration Bulletin 5.07. San Francisco Fire Code Section 503 (Fire Apparatus Access Roads) and the San Francisco Public Works 2015 Subdivision Regulations (Order No. 183447) establish requirements for minimum street widths to facilitate emergency equipment access.

**San Francisco Police Code.** The San Francisco Police Code contains regulations for various types of activities, such as automobile use, permitting and licensing, and disorderly conduct. The San Francisco Noise Ordinance (Noise Ordinance) is also part of the San Francisco Police Code (Article 29, San Francisco Police Code, Section 2900). See Section 4.F, Noise, for more information regarding the San Francisco Noise Ordinance.

**Open Space 2100.** The Planning Department, in conjunction with the RPD, the mayor’s office, and the Neighborhood Parks Council, is currently evaluating the open space needs of the entire city for the next 100 years. As part of Open Space 2100, a draft open space framework is being developed that includes three components: Citywide Vision for Open Space, which provides a broad outline of the city’s ideal open space network over the next 100 years; the recent update to the Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan, adopted in April 2014; and the short-term Action Plan, which will be a set of 5- and 10-year implementation programs.78

**San Francisco Planning Code.** Seawall Lot 337 and Parcel P20, both of which are part of the project site, are in a Mission Bay Open Space (MB-OS) Use District. The MB-OS Use District was established in connection with the previously superseded Mission Bay Plan, which, unlike the current plan, included Seawall Lot 337. The principal or exclusive purpose for land in the MB-OS district is to provide open space, with additional development strictly limited. Only recreational uses and those uses that are incidental to and supportive of recreational use are
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permitted in these districts. Pier 48, also part of the project site, is within a Heavy Industrial (M-2) Use District, which requires at least 36 gsf of usable open space per dwelling unit if the open space is private and 48 gsf of usable open space per dwelling unit if the open space is public. Proposition D, the Mission Rock Affordable Housing, Parks, Jobs, and Historic Preservation Initiative, which was approved by San Francisco voters on November 3, 2015, amended the height and bulk restrictions for the project site by establishing the Mission Rock Height and Bulk District. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, the project sponsor would seek approval to rezone the project site through a Special Use District (SUD) that would be codified in the Zoning Map to reflect the proposed boundaries of the SUD. Approval of the proposed SUD would bring the proposed project into conformance with the Planning Code and Zoning Map, as previously amended by Proposition D.

**San Francisco Recreation and Parks 2016-2020 Strategic Plan.** The RPD Strategic Plan sets forth RPD’s core strategies and objectives, and lays out specific initiatives for RPD to achieve. The strategies of the RPD Strategic Plan include: inspire public space, inspire play, inspire investment, inspire stewardship, and inspire our team.\(^{79}\)

**San Francisco Public Library Strategic Plan.** The SFPL Strategic Plan, adopted in 2003 as part of the BLIP, is the library’s guiding policy and planning document. The SFPL Strategic Plan does not set a standard for library service but does provide every library with a unifying organizational vision and system-wide goals. Some of the overarching goals are to develop and maintain library programs that are community based, provide programming of interest to neighborhoods, and renovate facilities to reflect the unique characteristics of the neighborhoods they serve and enhance the library, making it an inviting and useful place to visit.\(^{80}\)

**San Francisco Blue Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines.** The Blue Greenway is a City project to improve a 13-mile-long portion of the 500-mile-long, nine-county, region-wide Bay Trail as well as the newly established San Francisco Bay Area Water Trail and associated waterfront open space system.\(^{81}\) The alignment of the Blue Greenway generally follows the alignment of the Bay Trail and Bay Area Water Trail north to south from China Basin Channel to the San Francisco county line.

The Blue Greenway Planning and Design Guidelines document presents the following elements: Linking and Connector Streets; Signage, Interpretation and Art; Site Furnishings; Planting and Landscape Plan; Port Open Space Use and Program Concepts; and Project Costs.

---


and Implementation. The guidelines include objectives, conceptual designs, and use criteria for proposed Port open spaces, including China Basin Park. The guidelines prescribe the following objectives for China Basin Park:

- Develop an open space program that provides substantial visitor-serving public open space and other neighborhood-oriented open spaces to serve the recreational needs of the residential uses developed on the site and key components of the Bay Trail and Blue Greenway. These two types of open spaces are not mutually exclusive and may overlap but must serve discreet needs.

- Expand China Basin Park and create other public open space amenities that increase public enjoyment and views of San Francisco Bay, AT&T Park, Mission Creek Channel, East Bay hills, Yerba Buena Island, and the Bay Bridge and create a unique and complementary addition to the network of parks and open space along the San Francisco waterfront and in Mission Bay.

The following use concepts were identified as appropriate and compatible for China Basin Park: a waterfront promenade, passive recreation, seating and viewing areas, family-oriented picnic areas, launches for small nonmotorized craft, public art, large public gathering areas, cafés/food kiosks, and restrooms. These concepts were developed through a public planning process and suitability analysis, as conducted under and described in the Blue Greenway Design Standards. The intent is that, as the planning and design of this open space are refined, the program of uses would also be refined and updated.

Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan and Waterfront Design and Access Element.

The Port of San Francisco Waterfront Land Use Plan (WLUP) applies goals and policies to guide development and revitalization of the city’s 7.5-mile-long waterfront area within the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission. The Port, as trustee of these public lands, is required to promote maritime commerce, navigation, and fisheries; protect natural resources; and develop recreational facilities for public use. Goals set forth by the WLUP include the following:

- New investment should stimulate the revitalization of the waterfront, providing new jobs, revenues, public amenities, and other benefits to the port, the city, and the state.

---


• Port lands should host a diverse and exciting array of maritime, commercial, entertainment, civic, open space, recreational, and other waterfront activities for all San Franciscans and visitors to enjoy.

• A network of parks, plazas, walkways, open space, and integrated transportation improvements should improve access to, and enhance the enjoyment and appreciation of, the Bay environment.

• Improvement should respect and enhance the waterfront’s historic character while also creating new opportunities for San Franciscans to integrate port activities into their daily lives.

• The design of new developments should be of exemplary quality and should highlight visual and physical access to and from the Bay while respecting the waterfront’s rich historic context and the character of neighboring development.

Policies applicable to recreation and open space are as follows:

• **Policy 1:** Ensure a diversity of open spaces and public access, which may be achieved in different ways, depending on location (e.g., places that provide access to water, quiet places, contemplative places for passive enjoyment, active places for civic gatherings and other urban events that draw large crowds, places for biking and foot races, places that restore the environment and support wildlife habitats, places to learn about waterfront activities and the Bay environment, places that appeal to children and seniors).

• **Policy 4:** Provide public access around the perimeter of piers wherever safe and feasible, as indicated in the Waterfront Design and Access Element and the BCDC Special Area Plan.

The South Beach/China Basin Waterfront subarea of the WLUP extends from Pier 22½ to Mariposa Street, encompassing the project site. An objective of the South Beach/China Basin subarea plan that is applicable to recreation and open space calls for the promotion of activities and public access to make the waterfront inviting and safe and improve the living environment of the new and emerging Rincon Hill, South Beach, and Mission Bay neighborhoods.

The WLUP strongly encourages that, where feasible and consistent with the Bay Plan and the public trust, new commercial development on piers should be a part of mixed-use developments that include maritime uses, open space, and public access activities that bring daytime and nighttime activity to the waterfront.

---


87 The public trust imposes certain use restrictions on historical tidal and submerged lands along the waterfront to protect the interests of the people of the state of California for commerce, navigation, and fisheries as well as other public benefits recognized to further trust purposes, such as recreation and environmental preservation.
In concert with the WLUP, the Port’s Waterfront Design and Access Element sets forth policies to direct the locations and types of public access, open spaces, public view corridors, and historic resources and provide site-specific design criteria for San Francisco’s waterfront. The element provides specific design and access criteria and objectives for the Mission Bay waterfront, including open space, historic preservation, massing, orientation, and architectural details.  

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

This section provides the impact analysis related to public services and recreation for the proposed project. It describes the methods used to determine the impacts of the proposed project and lists the thresholds used to conclude whether an impact would be significant. Measures to mitigate (i.e., avoid, minimize, rectify, reduce, eliminate, or compensate for) significant impacts accompany each impact discussion.

**SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA**

The proposed project would have a significant effect if it would:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or the need for new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any public services (e.g., fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other services).
- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.
- Physically degrade existing recreational resources.

**METHODS FOR ANALYSIS**

Impacts on public services and recreation would occur if the proposed project were to result in (1) substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of or a need for new or physically altered public service facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, related to maintaining acceptable levels of service as a result of increased demand; (2) increased use of existing parks or recreational facilities such that

---

substantial physical deterioration/physical degradation would occur; or (3) adverse physical environmental impacts associated with the construction of public service facilities. Other effects that could result from the proposed project, such as increased crime, public drinking, vandalism, and activities that may diminish the quality of life for residents in the project area, are not considered CEQA impacts unless they meet the above criteria. These quality-of-life issues would be considered as part of the City’s project planning and approval process, not as part of the CEQA environmental review process.

This analysis considers whether the proposed project would require the construction of new governmental or recreational facilities or alterations to such facilities to maintain acceptable performance standards for public services. If it is determined that new or altered facilities would be required to serve the proposed project, then the analysis evaluates whether the construction of such facilities would have a substantial adverse physical impact on the environment. If the proposed project were to result in increased demand for fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, or other public services, there could be economic impacts unrelated to the construction of new or altered facilities. However, costs that are incurred by the agencies that provide these services would not be considered environmental impacts under CEQA; therefore, mitigation measures to compensate public service agencies for such costs are not addressed in the CEQA environmental review process.

For the purpose of this analysis, it is assumed that project improvements would be designed and constructed in compliance with all applicable building and fire codes.

**LAND USE ASSUMPTIONS**

Impacts on public services and recreation occur because of increased demand from the increased population in the service area. Population changes induced by the proposed project are analyzed in Section 4.C, *Population and Housing*.

Compared with existing conditions, development under the High Commercial (see Table 4.J-6 on the following page) and High Residential (see Table 4.J-7 on the following page) land use assumptions would involve both residential growth and employment growth in the project area following the construction period. However, because of the different development scenarios contemplated under each land use assumption, the number of employees and residents would differ. As shown in Table 4.J-6, the High Commercial Assumption would generate 2,350 residents and 6,050 employees onsite. Based on the percent of city employees who live in the city (50.4 percent), the average number of workers per household in the city (1.35), and the average number of persons per household in the city (2.35), the 6,050 employees associated with the High Commercial Assumption would indirectly induce an additional 5,310 residents in the city, for a total of 7,660 residents. As shown in Table 4.J-7, the High Residential Assumption would generate 3,760 residents and 4,510 employees onsite. Applying the same factors noted
### TABLE 4.J-6. PROPOSED ONSITE RESIDENTS AND EMPLOYEES—HIGH COMMERCIAL ASSUMPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage (gsf)/Units</th>
<th>Generation Rate</th>
<th>Estimated Residents/Employees&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onsite Residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,100,000 gsf/1,000 units</td>
<td>2.35 persons/household</td>
<td>2,350 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,350 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>1,400,000 gsf</td>
<td>276 gsf/employee</td>
<td>5,070 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Retail</td>
<td>244,800 gsf</td>
<td>327 gsf/employee</td>
<td>750 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,000 units</td>
<td>1 employee/32 units</td>
<td>30 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 48</td>
<td>242,500 gsf</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>200 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,050 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee-Induced City Residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Who Also Live in the City</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,050 employee/residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-Induced Housing Demand</td>
<td>1.35 employees/household</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,260 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee-Induced Residents</strong></td>
<td>2.35 persons/household</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,310 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project-Induced Population Growth in City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,660 residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adavant Consulting, 2015; U.S. Census Bureau. 2014. ACS. One-year estimate. IDs B08406, B08008, S0501.

### TABLE 4.J-7. PROPOSED ONSITE RESIDENTS AND EMPLOYEES—HIGH RESIDENTIAL ASSUMPTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Gross Square Footage/Units</th>
<th>Generation Rate</th>
<th>Estimated Residents/Employees&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Onsite Residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,600,000 gsf/1,600 units</td>
<td>2.35 persons/household</td>
<td>3,760 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,760 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>972,200 gsf</td>
<td>276 gsf/employee</td>
<td>3,520 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Retail</td>
<td>241,000 gsf</td>
<td>327 gsf/employee</td>
<td>740 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,600 units</td>
<td>1 employee/32 units</td>
<td>50 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pier 48</td>
<td>242,500 gsf</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>200 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Employees</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,510 employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee-Induced City Residents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employees Who Also Live in the City</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,270 employee-residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-Induced Housing Demand</td>
<td>1.35 employees/household</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,680 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employee-Induced Residents</strong></td>
<td>2.35 persons/household</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,960 residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Project Population Growth in City</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,720 residents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Adavant Consulting 2015; U.S. Census. 2014. ACS. One-year estimate, IDs B08406, B08008, S0501.
above, the 4,510 employees associated with the High Residential Assumption would indirectly induce an additional 3,960 residents in the city, for a total of 7,720 residents. The special-event/assembly areas at China Basin Park and Mission Rock Square would be able to hold about 5,000 people and 2,000 people, respectively. Special events would be held in these areas occasionally throughout the year.

Unless specified otherwise, general references to the proposed project refer to either land use assumption because the total number of residents is similar and would not affect the conclusions presented in this section.

**IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

**Impact PS-1.** The proposed project would increase demand for fire protection services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required. *(Less than Significant)*

The proposed project would include new residential and commercial development that could increase demand for fire protection services.

**CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS**

Construction activities have the potential to result in accidental onsite fires from such sources as the operation of mechanical equipment and the use of flammable construction materials. However, in compliance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and fire and building code requirements, construction managers and personnel would be trained in emergency response and fire safety operations, which include the monitoring and management of life safety systems and facilities. Additionally, fire suppression equipment (e.g., fire extinguishers) would be maintained onsite. Furthermore, construction would occur in compliance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements concerning the handling, disposal, use, storage, and management of hazardous waste. Thus, impacts to fire protection during construction would be temporary and *less than significant.*

**OPERATIONAL IMPACTS**

**Calls for Service and Response Times.** The SFFD anticipates that the proposed project, under either the High Commercial Assumption or the High Residential Assumption, would increase the number of calls for service directed to Fire Station 4, adding approximately 1,200 calls per year, which would approximately double the number of calls placed to Fire Station 4 between March 30, 2015, and March 30, 2016.\(^{89}\) Therefore, the proposed project would cause a

---

\(^{89}\) Hayes-White, Joanne. Chief of Department. San Francisco Fire Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on March 24, 2017.
substantial increase in the call volume for Fire Station 4. The additional resources that would be required to alleviate the estimated increase in demand, according to the SFFD, are discussed below.

Under either the High Commercial Assumption or the High Residential Assumption, the 11 blocks on Seawall Lot 337 could be developed with buildings that would range in height from 90 feet (approximately six stories) to a maximum of 240 feet (approximately 23 stories), excluding mechanical and other accessory penthouse roof enclosures, which would extend up to 20 feet (40 feet on Block F) above the roofline heights. Buildings that are taller than three stories generally increase emergency response times (i.e., up to twice as long compared with average response times for single-occupancy residences or buildings that are three stories or less). Response times may, however, be substantially improved if responders are accommodated on arrival or have access to an “emergency mode” of elevator transport (preventing noncritical elevator stops).

Because the City and Port incorporate the latest CBC requirements in their respective building codes, new buildings and facilities in the project area are required to be sited and designed in accordance with the most current life-safety standards, including those buildings with towers. These standards would apply to the proposed project, and adherence to all applicable CBC and fire code provisions would ensure that the project would allow for efficient emergency response. Requirements pertaining to the water volume and pressure needed for fire suppression onsite, as well as fire-flow volume and duration, would vary depending on the specific area of the project site in question. As part of the proposed project, new fire hydrants would be provided and spaced in accordance with City requirements. As discussed in Section 4.K, Utilities and Service Systems, if the SFFD determines that improvements to the AWSS are necessary to serve the proposed project, such improvements would be coordinated with and subject to approval by the SFFD during the design review and permitting process. The project sponsor would work with the SFFD to determine utility and access requirements for fire protection and emergency services at the project site during construction and operation.

One NOP comment expressed concern over access for emergency vehicles at the City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters at Third and Mission Rock Streets, immediately south of the project site. As discussed in Section 4.E, Transportation and Circulation, adequate emergency access throughout the project site and at surrounding properties would be maintained under the proposed project, including during events at the project site and at the adjacent AT&T Park; thus, the proposed project would not affect access for emergency vehicles at the Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters.
As previously discussed, data for the project area indicate that current response times average around 4 minutes and 6 seconds. The City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters (including Fire Station 4, which would serve the project site) is located at Third and Mission Rock Streets, immediately south of the project site. As such, the proximity of the City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters to the project site would reduce the distance responders would need to travel to respond to emergencies on the site, and, therefore, would contribute to minimizing the response time associated with the additional demand on fire services generated by the project. However, longer-than-average response times could result with project implementation when more than one call is in the system for Fire Station 4.

According to the SFFD, although the proposed project would provide adequate emergency access to the project site and within the proposed high-rise buildings, Battalion 3, which would serve the project site, could become strained as a result of the project. As such, according to the SFFD, battalions would need to be redistricted, an additional battalion chief would be needed (as discussed below), and an additional ambulance would need to be staged in the project area (as discussed below) to alleviate the project-related fire protection coverage strain and maintain the state’s response-time standard of 5 minutes for fire suppression and emergency medical incidents.

**Personnel, Equipment, and Facilities.** The SFFD has a service ratio of approximately 0.89 fire personnel per 1,000 residents, based on the city’s existing population. This analysis conservatively considers the High Residential Assumption because it would generate more residents and, thus, have a greater potential impact on the SFFD’s personnel-to-resident ratio.

Operation under the High Residential Assumption could result in approximately 7,720 new residents in the city, which would only slightly degrade the existing SFFD service ratio to 0.88 fire personnel per 1,000 residents with current staffing levels. Thus, seven additional SFFD employees would be needed to maintain the existing citywide service ratio. The seven additional SFFD employees could be located at fire stations throughout the city. In addition, as discussed above, the SFFD has indicated that the fire protection demand associated with the proposed project could place a strain on current staffing levels, requiring additional resources to
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93 0.89 = (757 fire safety personnel/service population [852,000]) × 1,000 residents.

94 0.88 = (757 fire safety personnel/[service population [852,000]] + new city residents generated by the project (7,720]) × 1,000 residents.

95 Cofflin, Ken. Port Fire Marshal. San Francisco Fire Department. Personal communication with Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on December 7, 2016.
provide adequate fire and emergency medical service protection. Specifically, an additional battalion chief would be needed, and an additional ambulance would need to be staged in the project area. As discussed below, the project would contribute additional revenue to the City’s General Fund, which provides funding for SFFD personnel and equipment. According to the SFFD, the redistricting of the battalions would alleviate the strain on the SFFD.

As discussed in Section 4.E, Transportation, the project site can accommodate the parking needs of ambulances and emergency vehicles; therefore, according to the SFFD, no physical changes are necessary to stage an ambulance in the project area. Thus, the proposed project would not represent an increase in demand for fire protection or emergency services that would be substantial enough to warrant the construction of a new facility or expansion of an existing station.

As discussed above, response times from existing facilities to the project site would not be affected substantially with the increased project-related demand for fire and emergency medical services, although, as noted above, longer-than-average response times could result with project implementation when more than one call is in the system for Fire Station 4. Although the increase in call volumes due to the proposed project would most likely result in increased wear and tear on vehicles, additional maintenance, and the eventual replacement of equipment at a faster rate, the project would contribute additional revenues to the City’s General Fund, which supports SFFD’s ongoing personnel, equipment, and maintenance needs. Because the proposed project would not result in the need to construct or expand facilities for fire or emergency services, no substantial adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction or alteration of fire or emergency service facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives would occur. Based on the above, fire protection service impacts as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Impact PS-2. The proposed project would increase demand for police services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would include new residential and commercial development, which could increase demand for police services. The SFPD bases its assessment of the need for services not just on population growth but also on calls for service, the types and times of traffic and pedestrian flow patterns, and the operational hours of uses within the Southern District.

The increase in population on the site would increase the number of calls for service to the site, modify traffic and pedestrian flow patterns, and increase daytime and nighttime activity in and around the project site. This analysis conservatively considers the High Residential Assumption because it would generate more residents than the High Commercial Assumption and, thus, have a greater potential impact on police service.

**CONSTRUCTION IMPACTS**

When not properly secured, construction sites can attract theft and vandalism and contribute to a temporary increase in demand for police protection services. The construction contractor would implement temporary security measures including security fencing, lighting, and locked entry to secure the project site during construction, in accordance with standard construction practices. Impacts to police protection during construction would be temporary and *less than significant*.

**OPERATIONAL IMPACTS**

**Calls for Service and Crime Rate.** The Southern District, with a population of 38,160 residents, experienced 11,868 crimes in 2015, about 0.311 crimes per person. The SFPD anticipates that the proposed project, under either the High Commercial Assumption or the High Residential Assumption, would increase the number of calls for service within the Southern District. The proposed project would add an estimated 7,720 or 7,660 residents to the city under the High Commercial Assumption or High Residential Assumption, respectively. In addition, the proposed retail space may increase the number of calls for service because of theft or other types of crimes99 as well as the addition of employees to the project site (approximately 6,050 employees under the High Commercial Assumption and 4,510 employees under the High Residential Assumption).

**Personnel, Equipment, and Facilities.** The SFPD has a Southern District service ratio of approximately 3.83 sworn officers per 1,000 residents and a citywide service ratio of 2.01 sworn officers per 1,000 residents.\(^{100}\) This analysis conservatively considers the High Residential Assumption because it would generate more residents and, thus, would have a greater potential impact on police service. Operations under the High Residential Assumption could result in approximately 7,720 new residents in the city. This analysis conservatively assumes that all of the new residents would live in the Southern District, which would only slightly degrade the existing SFPD service ratio for the Southern District to 3.18 sworn officers per 1,000 residents.

---

99 Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.

100 \(3.83 = (146 \text{ police personnel/service population } [38,160]) \times 1,000 \text{ residents.}\)

101 \(2.01 = (1,716 \text{ police personnel/service population } [852,000]) \times 1,000 \text{ residents.}\)
with current staffing levels. Thus, 30 additional SFPD sworn officers would be needed to maintain the existing service ratio within the Southern District. They would be housed both across the street and in nearby areas, depending on the locations of the service calls. Of the 7,720 new residents in the city, 3,960 would be employee-induced city residents and could live outside of the Southern District, which would only slightly degrade the existing SFPD service ratio for the city to 2.00 sworn officers per 1,000 residents with current staffing levels. Thus, four additional SFPD sworn officers would be needed to maintain the existing service ratio within the Southern District. In addition, the SFPD has indicated that demands associated with the proposed project could place a strain on current staffing levels, requiring additional staffing because of the increase in calls for service. Although the SFPD is currently experiencing a deficiency of 255 sworn officers from the mandated minimum of 1,971 officers citywide, the SFPD is on track to reach the mandated minimum through current recruiting and hiring efforts. In addition, the Board of Supervisors has passed a resolution to increase the mandated minimum staffing level to 2,200 sworn officers. Thus, it is anticipated that the additional staffing needed as a result of the proposed project (i.e., 30 officers) would be accommodated within the SFPD’s efforts to reach its mandated minimum staffing levels and would not represent an increase that would be substantial enough to warrant the construction of a new facility or expansion of an existing station. Furthermore, the SFPD indicated that it will meet the increased demand with data-driven deployments, which involve continuous analysis of crime trends and incident data, to remain flexible and efficient. In addition, the City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters (including the Southern District, which would serve the project site) is located at Third and Mission Rock Streets, immediately south of the project site. As such, the proximity of the City’s Public Safety Building and Police Headquarters to the project site would reduce the distance officers would need to travel to calls for service on the site, and, therefore, would minimize the response time associated with the additional demand on police services generated by the project. Finally, the SFPD stated that no new additional facilities are planned or necessary as a result of the proposed project.

---

102 \(3.18 = \frac{146 \text{ police personnel}}{[\text{service population} (38,160) + \text{new residents generated by the project} (7,720)]} \times 1,000 \text{ residents.}\)

103 \(2.00 = \frac{1,716 \text{ police personnel}}{[\text{service population} (852,000) + \text{new employee-induced city residents generated by the project} (3,960)]} \times 1,000 \text{ residents.}\)
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The SFPD recognizes the need to expand some facilities as the population of the city increases, including, but not limited to, the Crime Lab Facility/Traffic Division and Evidence Storage, and increase equipment procurement. Collectively, these efforts, which are not specifically in response to the proposed project, are designed to respond to the needs of the city on a program-wide basis and ensure that adequate response times and distributions for police officers are achieved.

The SFPD will continue to evaluate its performance, based on response times, and, when appropriate, reallocate resources to accommodate the need for services in specific parts of the city if and when conditions warrant. Furthermore, although the proposed project would increase the resident and daytime population at the project site, it would not result in unplanned population growth. As discussed in Section 4.C, Population and Housing, the population, housing, and employment generated by the proposed project would fall within Association of Bay Area Governments projections for the city; therefore, this growth has already been factored into SFPD forecasts, and the SFPD will increase staffing accordingly. As such, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction or alteration of police service facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives. Thus, based on the foregoing, police protection service impacts as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant.

Impact PS-3. The proposed project would increase demand for school services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would include new residential development, which could generate students who would attend local public schools. To analyze project demand on schools, estimates of the number of students generated by the proposed project were made by using student generation rates that varied by unit size, housing price, type, affordability, and the nature of the neighborhood.

At this time, the types and locations of the housing units that project employees would occupy are unknown. Therefore, this analysis assumes a breakdown in housing units similar to that of existing unit types within the city. For the 1,600 onsite units proposed, 40 percent, or 640 units, would be below market rate, and the remaining 960 units would be at market rate. Based on the student generation rates identified in Table 4.J-6, page 4.J-35, it is estimated that the onsite units included in the proposed project would result in up to 208 school-age children who could attend schools in the SFUSD.
For the additional 1,680 housing units anticipated to be induced by the project (refer to Table 4.J-6, page 4.J-35), assumptions for the rate of affordable units, based on the City’s 2014 Housing Element, were used. This equates to approximately 34.5 percent of the housing units constructed between 2004 and 2013 being affordable units. Therefore, for the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that 580 of the 1,680 induced housing units generated by the proposed project would be affordable, and the remaining 1,100 would be market-rate dwelling units. Based on the student generation rates identified in Table 4.J-6, it is estimated that induced offsite units related to the proposed project would result in up to 200 school-age children who could attend schools in the SFUSD.

Table 4.J-8, on the following page, summarizes the anticipated number of SFUSD students as a result of the proposed project, using the High Residential Assumption as a “worst-case” scenario because it would generate more students than the High Commercial Assumption. As shown, it is estimated that the proposed project, for both onsite and offsite units, would result in up to 408 school-age children who could attend schools in the SFUSD. The 408 school-age children generated by the High Residential Assumption, if evenly distributed between the brackets (elementary [kindergarten through 5th grade], middle [6th through 8th grade], and high [9th through 12th grade]), would result in approximately 188 new students at elementary schools in the city, 94 new students at the middle schools in the city, and 126 new students at the high schools in the city.

In the city, approximately 25 percent of students attend private schools. Therefore, this represents a conservative analysis because it does not account for student enrollment at private schools. As previously discussed, most elementary schools in the SFUSD have attendance boundaries. The SFUSD currently uses a diversity index lottery system to assign students to other schools, which are based on a number of factors. Under the diversity index lottery system, students generated by the proposed project may attend a SFUSD school other than the nearest school; however, that school would have to have the needed capacity. Thus, the assumption that all students generated by the proposed project would attend the nearest school is a conservative assumption of the impact on the students’ default school assignment.

---


110 The 408 total students, distributed evenly by grade (13 total grades) = 31.4 students per grade. 31.4 × 6 grades = 188 elementary school students; 31.4 × 3 grades = 94 middle school students, and 31.4 x 4 grades = 126 high school students.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Unit</th>
<th>Total Units</th>
<th>Student Generation Rate</th>
<th>Estimated Student Growth Due to Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Onsite Units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Rate Units</td>
<td>960&lt;sup&gt;b,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below-Market-Rate Units</td>
<td>640&lt;sup&gt;b,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Onsite Units</td>
<td>1,600&lt;sup&gt;b,c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee-Induced Housing Demand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market-Rate Units</td>
<td>1,100&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below-Market-Rate Units</td>
<td>580&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Employee-Induced Units</td>
<td>1,680</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Students Generated by the Project in the City</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Notes:

- The modified yield student generation rate provided by the SFUSD, which is higher than the historical yield generation rate, was used to provide a conservative analysis.
- This analysis considers the High Residential Assumption, which would include more residential units (and thus generate more students) than the High Commercial Assumption. Therefore, this represents a conservative analysis.
- As stated in the Chapter 2, Project Description, the project sponsor has agreed to restrict 40 percent of the onsite units to inclusionary affordable housing targets.
- Data regarding the number of affordable units in the city before 2004 are not available.

As shown in Table 4.J-3, page 4.J-12, there is capacity for approximately 2,511 students in existing SFUSD elementary schools. The existing SFUSD middle schools are over capacity by approximately 279 students, and the existing SFUSD high schools are over capacity by approximately 2,022 students. Thus, the SFUSD would have the capacity to accommodate the approximately 188 elementary school students generated by the proposed project. However, the SFUSD would not have the capacity to accommodate the 94 middle school students or the approximately 126 high school students generated by the proposed project. As discussed below, SFUSD is exploring the construction of new schools in areas in which additional students are expected because of new housing developments and/or an overall increase in the number of school-age children, such as the Mission Bay neighborhood. A new school in the Mission Bay neighborhood, which has been dedicated under the Mission Bay South Plan, would increase capacity for students in the SFUSD.

The project site is served by, or within the vicinity of, Daniel Webster Elementary School, Bessie Carmichael Middle School (6<sup>th</sup> through 8<sup>th</sup> grades), the International Studies Academy (9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades), John O’Connell High School (9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades), and Downtown High School (9<sup>th</sup> through 12<sup>th</sup> grades). As discussed above, it is not known where project employees would live within the city. Thus, this portion of the analysis considers only the
proposed onsite housing units. Assuming that SFUSD student generation as a result of the proposed project (208 students) is distributed evenly among the grade levels, the project’s proposed onsite units could result in approximately 96 new elementary students, 48 new middle school students, and 64 new high school students. As discussed previously, the assumption that all students generated by the project’s proposed onsite units would attend the nearest school is a conservative assumption of the impact because of the SFUSD’s diversity index lottery system.

As shown in Table 4.J-9 on the following page, Daniel Webster Elementary School, the International Studies Academy, John O’Connell High School, and Downtown High School could accommodate the students that could be generated by the proposed project. However, the proposed project would generate 48 middle school students, which is not within the remaining capacity of Bessie Carmichael Middle School. As previously stated, although many of the schools on the west side of the city are at or beyond capacity, according to the SFUSD, the majority of available capacity is in Bayview, which is located on the east side of the city. As such, other schools in the project area have capacity (including Starr King Elementary School in Potrero Hill, Bryant Elementary School in the Mission District, Cesar Chavez Elementary School in the Mission, and Buena Vista Horace Mann K–8 Community School in the Mission District) and could accommodate students generated by the proposed project. Furthermore, to accommodate anticipated growth, SFUSD is exploring the construction of new schools in areas in which additional students are expected because of new housing developments and/or an overall increase in the number of school-age children, such as the Mission Bay neighborhood. Areas under review by the SFUSD include the Candlestick Point (approximately 0.2 mile west of the project site) and Shipyard development areas, Mission Bay, and Parkmerced. It is anticipated that the SFUSD will authorize a new school in Mission Bay in Spring 2017. The new schools could serve the project site and, thus, reduce the number of students generated by the proposed project who would attend Bessie Carmichael Middle School.

113 The 208 total students, distributed evenly by grade (13 total grades), = 16 students per grade. The 16 × 6 grades = 96 elementary school students, 16 × 3 grades = 48 middle school students, and 16 × 4 grades = 64 high school students.


Table 4.J-9. Project SFUSD Enrollment at Schools near the Project Site

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Remaining Capacity</th>
<th>Estimated Student Growth Due to Project</th>
<th>Within Capacity?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daniel Webster Elementary School</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bessie Carmichael Middle School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Studies Academy</td>
<td>699</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John O’Connell High School</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown High School</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

a. Remaining capacity is based on Table 4.J-4.

b. This analysis assumes the 64 new high school students that could be generated by the proposed project would be distributed evenly between the three high schools that serve the project site.

Over the next 10 years, SFUSD anticipates the enrollment will increase by 6,000 to 12,000 students, including 600 to 1,000 students within Mission Bay.\textsuperscript{118,119} The students generated by the proposed project would represent a small portion (3 percent) of the anticipated increase in enrollment citywide but 35 percent of the anticipated increase in enrollment within Mission Bay. As previously discussed, SFUSD is exploring the construction of new schools in areas where additional students are expected because of new housing developments and/or an overall increase in the number of school-age children. According to the SFUSD, new schools would be built regardless of the proposed project.\textsuperscript{120} New school projects would be subject to separate CEQA review, which would analyze the environmental impacts of constructing new school facilities.

The Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998, or SB 50, restricts the ability of local agencies to deny land use approvals on the basis that public school facilities are inadequate. SB 50, however, permits the levying of developer fees to address local school facility needs resulting from new development. Local jurisdictions are precluded under state law from imposing school enrollment-related mitigation beyond the school development fees. The SFUSD collects these fees for all construction and building permits issued within the city and county. Developer fee revenues are used, in conjunction with other SFUSD funds, to support efforts to complete capital improvement projects. The school impact fees to be collected for residential, commercial,

\textsuperscript{118} Leigh, Myong. Deputy Superintendent for Policy and Operations. San Francisco Unified School District. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on May 3, 2016.
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and retail developments are set at $3.480 per square foot for new residential construction, $0.388 per square foot for retail space, $0.540 per square foot for office space, and $0.478 per square foot for industrial/warehouse/manufacturing development.\textsuperscript{121}

New residential development that may indirectly result from the increase in employment and generate students would be subject to separate CEQA review as well as residential school impact fees, which are higher than nonresidential school impact fees. The estimated increase of approximately 96 new elementary students, 48 new middle school students, and 64 new high school students under the Maximum Residential Scenario would not result in the need for new facilities because of the existing available capacity within the SFUSD system. Furthermore, the proposed project would pay school impact fees. As such, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts because construction of new or expanded facilities would not be required. School service impacts as a result of the proposed project would be \textit{less than significant}.

\textbf{Impact PS-4. The proposed project would increase demand for park and open space services but not to such an extent that construction of new or expanded facilities would be required. (Less than Significant)}

The proposed project would include new residential and commercial development, which could increase demand for park and open space services. This analysis conservatively considers the High Residential Assumption because it would generate more residents and, thus, have a greater potential impact on park and open space services. Operations under High Residential Assumption would accommodate an onsite residential population of 3,760.

As discussed in more detail in Chapter 2, \textit{Project Description}, the proposed project’s approximately 8.0 acres of new and expanded open spaces would include the 4.4-acre China Basin Park, 1.1-acre Mission Rock Square, 0.5-acre Channel Wharf, 0.2-acre Channel Lane, and 1.1-acre Waterfront Promenade, along with 0.6 acre of pedestrian paseos and a new public access area on the apron of Pier 48. The parks would be connected to a new pedestrian-oriented street network, including the pedestrian-privileged Shared Public Way, which would connect China Basin Park to Long Bridge Street and areas south of the project site. These areas would also provide access to the city’s proposed Blue Greenway. The proposed parks and open spaces are illustrated in Figure 2-4, page 2-21, in Chapter 2.

The public parks and open spaces would remain under Port ownership but could be programmed and managed by the project sponsor. The design and programming of this open space would be subject to Port approval and Bay Conservation and Development Commission

major permit conditions, as applicable. It is expected that ongoing maintenance of the new and expanded parks and open spaces would be the responsibility of the onsite neighborhood association that would be associated with the proposed development once operational. Alternatively, special taxes for maintenance could be levied by a Mello-Roos Community Facilities District.122

The hours of operation for the proposed parks would be similar to the hours at other parks under Port jurisdiction, which generally open at 5:00 a.m. and close at 12:00 a.m. Special events or assembly uses, including small concerts, picnics in the park, Sunday Streets, and cultural events, could occur at the proposed parks on a year-round basis.

As previously discussed, Seawall Lot 337 and Parcel P20, both of which are part of the project site, are in an MB-OS Use District. The principal or exclusive purpose for land in MB-OS districts is to provide open space, with additional development strictly limited. Pier 48, also part of the project site, is within a Heavy Industrial (M-2) Use District, which requires at least 36 gsf of usable open space per dwelling unit if the open space is private and 48 gsf of usable open space per dwelling unit if the open space is public. However, the only existing open space within the project site is the 2.2-acre China Basin Park.

As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, the project sponsor would seek approval to rezone the project site through an SUD that would be codified in the Zoning Map to reflect the proposed boundaries of the SUD. As described in detail on page 2-64 of Chapter 2, Project Description, and illustrated in Figure 2-4, on page 2-21, flexible zoning would allow for a mixed-use development that responds to future market conditions; incorporates specific development controls, such as height limits, allowed development densities, bulk limits, and building setbacks on upper floors within Seawall Lot 337; and requires all development on the project site to comply with the Design Controls under a design review process that would be referenced in the Planning Code text amendment. Approval of the SUD, which would be required in order for the proposed project to be developed as proposed, would bring the proposed project into conformance with the Planning Code and Zoning Map, as previously amended by Proposition D. Although the project site would not be zoned for open space, the proposed project would increase the total amount of onsite public open space to approximately 8.0 acres. In addition to the parks developed for the project, common usable open space areas such as courtyards, rooftop terraces, and public passages would be provided at a ratio of 48 square feet per residential unit. Private usable open space would be provided at a ratio of 36 feet per residential unit in the form of private setback areas, balconies, and decks. As such, with approval of the SUD, the proposed project would meet the onsite demand for park and open space services generated by new residents and workers, as defined by the Planning Code.

122 A Mello-Roos Community Facilities District is established by a county, city, special district, school district, or joint powers authority to allow financing of public improvements and services.
Based on accessibility, future residents would most likely choose to use nearby onsite facilities provided as part of the proposed project instead of other, more-distant parks and recreational facilities. Furthermore, local residents who use existing parks and recreational facilities may choose to visit the new facilities that would be provided with the proposed project, which could alleviate the rate of deterioration at the existing and additional baseline parks and recreational facilities within a 0.5-mile radius of the project site. An increase in population, and therefore an increase in park users, is expected as a result of the proposed project; however, such an increase is not the single factor that leads to increased deterioration or physical degradation of recreational resources. Other factors that contribute to physical degradation of recreational resources may include park design, age of infrastructure, how the park is used, and level of maintenance. The proposed project’s approximately 8.0 acres of new and expanded open spaces, especially the 4.4-acre China Basin Park, would offset demand on other facilities in the project area, such as Mission Creek Park, Mission Bay Commons, and others, that could otherwise experience deterioration. Overall, existing and future residents would have more opportunities to engage in recreational activity in their neighborhood with the range of open spaces that would be developed as part of the proposed project.

The proposed project would not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction or alteration of park or open space facilities, beyond those impacts associated with construction of the proposed project that are discussed elsewhere in this EIR in Section 4.E, Transportation and Circulation, Section 4.F, Noise, Section 4.G, Air Quality, 4.K, Utilities and Service Systems, and Section 4.I, Wind and Shadow, in order to meet project demand. Thus, project impacts related to the provision of open space would be less than significant (refer to Impact PS-5 for a discussion of existing neighborhood parks and recreational facilities and the related less-than-significant impact associated with the potential physical deterioration of such facilities that would occur with implementation of the project).

**Impact PS-5. The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks, regional parks, or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. (Less than Significant)**

The proposed project would include new residential and commercial development, which could increase demand for neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities. As analyzed in Impact PS-4, the proposed project would meet the onsite demand for open space set forth by the SUD. However, new residents and workers may choose to use offsite parks and recreational services, thereby increasing the use of these facilities.

Workers often use local plazas and parks for lunch breaks or other light-impact activities; these activities are not considered to be substantial contributors to the deterioration of recreational facilities and open space. Thus, this analysis conservatively considers the High
Residential Assumption because it would generate more residents and, thus, have a greater potential impact on neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities. Operations under the High Residential Assumption would result in an additional residential population of 7,720.

As shown in Table 4.J-5, page 4.J-16, and Figure 4.J-2, page 4.J-3, there are many parks in the vicinity of the project site: China Basin Park (within project site), Mission Creek Park (0.12 mile west of the project site), Mission Bay Commons (0.14 mile south of the project site), Kids Park (0.15 mile south west of the project site), San Francisco Bay Trail (Immediately south of project site), South Park (0.4 mile northwest of the project site), and Mission Bay Dog Park (0.5 mile west of the project site). There is also one planned park near the project site, Bayfront Park (0.2 mile south of the project site). In addition, the San Francisco Bay Trail, also known as the Blue Greenway, runs along the eastern and northern portions of the project site. The closest POPO is at 303 Second Street, 0.7 mile away.

Project residents and, to a lesser extent, project workers would utilize the aforementioned nearby public parks and open spaces. These facilities are designed to serve the population density found in this portion of the city. Nonetheless, according to the RPD, there is a deficit of recreational services with active uses (e.g., multi-use playfields, sport courts, fitness stations) as well as dog play areas and community gardens. Additional demand for the aforementioned types of recreational services could exacerbate the demand for these services.

As previously discussed, there are approximately 6.9 acres of parkland per 1,000 city residents. Operations under the High Residential Assumption would increase the number of residents by 7,720, which would only slightly degrade the existing parkland-to-resident service ratio (which would be 6.8 acres per 1,000 residents) with the current inventory of parkland. In addition to offsite open space areas, residents and workers would use the private and shared onsite open spaces that would be provided by the proposed project, which are discussed in Impact PS-4. Because the proposed project would provide the required square footage for open space within the project site, as discussed in Impact PS-4, it is not anticipated that residents would need to seek open space opportunities elsewhere within the city to such a degree that overuse of existing facilities would result.

Given the wide variety and quantity of nearby public parks, plazas, and recreational opportunities, as well as the provision of adequate onsite open space, the anticipated increase in demand generated by the proposed project would not increase the use of adjacent or nearby

---
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124 6.8 = (5,890 acres of parkland/service population [852,000+7,720]) × 1,000 residents.
recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of existing facilities would occur or be accelerated. Therefore, project impacts related to the use of adjacent or nearby recreational facilities would be less than significant.

Impact PS-6. The proposed project would include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, but they would not have an adverse physical effect on the environment beyond that analyzed and disclosed in this EIR. (Less than Significant)

The proposed project would include approximately 8 acres of new and expanded open spaces, including China Basin Park, Mission Rock Square, Channel Wharf, Channel Lane, Waterfront Promenade, pedestrian paseos, and new public access on the apron of Pier 48, as part of the overall program of development analyzed in this Draft EIR. Landscaping and trees on the open spaces and streetscapes would reduce the heat-island effect, reduce wind, and provide shelter for birds. In addition, stormwater treatment gardens would be integrated within the programmatic land uses. Open space would generally require minimal construction, mainly for trails and other hardscapes, the installation of irrigation infrastructure, and landscaping. Drilling and pile driving (to an average depth of 145 feet) associated with project construction for streets and the promenade and boardwalk at China Basin Park could affect geologic units that could contain significant paleontological remains or traces of paleontological remains. Implementation of Mitigation Measure M-GE-5 would reduce the impact to less than significant (see Section 4.M, Geology). Other project-related impacts related to construction of the various park and recreational facilities are summarized below and discussed in detail in the appropriate topical sections of this Draft EIR (e.g., Sections 4.E, Transportation and Circulation; 4.F, Noise; and 4.G, Air Quality) as part of the assessment of overall project impacts.

Construction of parks and recreational facilities, as a component of the proposed project, could result in impacts on the transportation and circulation network. As discussed in Section 4.E, Transportation and Circulation, construction of the proposed project would not cause significant impacts on the transportation and circulation network because construction activities would be of limited duration and temporary. However, Improvement Measure I-TR-1.1 is identified to further reduce the potential less-than-significant conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, bicyclists, transit and other vehicles, and nearby businesses and residents.

As described in Section 4.F, Noise and Vibration, construction of the proposed project, including construction of the various park and recreational facilities, would result in temporary noise increases in excess of standards in the Noise Ordinance (Article 29 of the Police Code), even with implementation of applicable mitigation measures. Thus, construction of the proposed project could cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity, above levels existing without the proposed project, and could expose people and structures to or generate excessive ground-borne vibration levels.
Construction of the proposed project, including construction of the various park and recreational facilities, would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, which would violate an air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in criteria air pollutants. Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1a through M-AQ-1e, M-AQ-2a, and M-AQ-2b, as discussed in Section 4.G, Air Quality, are proposed to minimize emissions. However, although implementation of Mitigation Measures M-AQ-1a through M-AQ-1e would substantially reduce construction and operations-related emissions, impacts would remain significant and unavoidable during construction and operation of the proposed project.

In summary, the effects related to construction of the proposed project, including the proposed parks and recreational facilities for the proposed project, are addressed as part of the analysis of construction impacts for the proposed project as a whole. Mitigation measures are proposed to reduce significant environmental effects; however, there would be significant and unavoidable construction impacts related to air quality, noise, and vibration. Construction of the proposed project’s parks and recreational facilities would not result in additional significant impacts that were not otherwise disclosed elsewhere in this EIR; therefore, the physical environmental impacts as a result of construction of parks and recreational facilities as part of the proposed project would be considered less than significant, and no additional mitigation beyond that identified elsewhere in this EIR is necessary.

**Impact PS-7. The proposed project would not increase demand for library services to the extent that construction of new or expanded library facilities would be required. (Less than Significant)**

The proposed project would include new residential and commercial development, which could increase demand for library services. The number of new residents at the project site under the High Residential Assumptions (the most conservative analysis, because it would introduce the greatest number of residents) would represent an approximate 41 percent increase in the total number of residents located in Census Tract 607, the census tract in which the project site would be located. Although this increase would be large for the project area, it would be not be substantial for the city as a whole, because it would represent 4.3 percent of total citywide population growth from 2015 to 2025 (see Table 4.C-4 in Section 4.C, Population and Housing).

The BLIP resulted in expanded and updated services in each neighborhood that is currently served by a branch library, including a facility in Mission Bay that serves the project site. In addition, according to the SFPL, the library service needs of patrons are being met by the SFPL;
there is not a citywide service gap. Furthermore, nine branch libraries are currently open only 5 or 6 days per week, giving the SFPL the option of responding to increased population growth citywide by increasing service to 7 days per week.

There are no current plans to build new branches in the city, but budget planning for fiscal years 2017 and 2018 could include resource allocation related to renovation work at the Chinatown, Mission, and/or the Ocean View branch libraries. Renovation work at these library locations could alleviate the demand for library services in those respective neighborhoods and citywide.

As previously discussed, the project site is served by the Mission Bay branch, which would be the library that would be most affected by the proposed project. The Potrero branch and the Main Library are the next closest SFPL locations; these facilities could also serve residents and workers generated by the proposed project.

Given the analysis above, it is anticipated that the existing libraries in the city would be able to accommodate the increase in residents and workers at the project site. As such, the proposed project would not result in substantial adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction or alteration of library facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Based on the foregoing, library service impacts as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant.

CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The geographic scope of the potential cumulative impacts of the proposed project related to public services includes the areas served by the SFFD, SFPD, SFUSD, RPD, and SFPL. For the most part, these areas consist of the entire city. Future development projects considered in the cumulative impact analysis of public services include all of the projects listed in Table 4-1, Reasonably Foreseeable Projects in the Site Vicinity, in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting and Impacts, because all of the projects would require fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, libraries, or other public services. The cumulative impact analysis assumes that construction and operation of other projects in the immediate vicinity would be in compliance with applicable regulations regarding the provision of public services.
Impact C-PS-1: The proposed project, in combination with other development in the city, would not result in significant adverse cumulative impacts on fire protection, police protection, schools, parks, libraries and other services. (Less than Significant)

**FIRE PROTECTION AND EMERGENCY RESPONSE SERVICES**

The proposed project would add to the demand for fire response and emergency medical services within Battalion 3, but the cumulative contribution of the proposed project’s impact combined with other development projects in the city would not be considerable. The SFFD has not identified a citywide service gap, and the incremental increase in the demand for fire and emergency medical services as a result of the proposed project and other development projects would not be beyond levels anticipated and planned for by the SFFD. If necessary, Fire Stations 1, 8, and 35, along with other nearby stations, could respond to calls in the event that Fire Station 4 personnel and equipment are unavailable or require additional support. For these reasons, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative demand on fire and emergency medical services citywide would not be cumulatively considerable. The proposed project, in combination with other development, would have a *less-than-significant* cumulative impact on fire and emergency services.

**POLICE SERVICES**

Population and employment growth associated with implementation of other development projects in the city would increase the number of service calls and could create a need for additional facilities to maintain existing SFPD service levels. This would be considered a significant cumulative impact if such growth were to result in the need for physically expanded facilities, which could result in physical environmental impacts.

The proposed project would add to the demand for police services in the Southern District, but the cumulative impact of the proposed project’s impact combined with reasonably foreseeable development projects would not be considerable. The SFPD will meet the increased demand with data-driven deployments to remain flexible and efficient.\(^1\) In addition, the Board of Supervisors has passed a resolution to increase the mandated minimum staffing level to 2,200 sworn officers. Based on Board of Supervisors legislation, the police district boundaries would be reanalyzed every 10 years, with consideration given to workload, district boundaries, response times, and facilities. The SFPD also recognizes the need to expand some facilities as the population of the city increases, including, but not limited to, the Crime Lab Facility/Traffic Division and Evidence Storage, and increase equipment procurement. As previously stated, these efforts are designed to respond to the

---

\(^1\) Walsh, Peter. Lieutenant, Administration Bureau. San Francisco Police Department. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on November 6, 2015.
needs of the city on a program-wide basis and ensure that adequate response times and
distributions of police officers are achieved. However, the anticipated increase in the number
of residents as a result of the proposed project would not be beyond the service level
anticipated and planned for by the SFPD. For these reasons, the proposed project’s
contribution to cumulative demand on police services citywide would be less than
cumulatively considerable.

SCHOOL SERVICES

Population and employment growth associated with implementation of other development
projects in the city would generate students and increase demand on schools in the SFUSD.

As previously discussed, Section 65996 of the State Government Code explains that the
payment of school impact fees established by the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act of 1998
is deemed to constitute full and complete mitigation for school impacts. The SFUSD has
enacted development fees in accordance with the Leroy F. Greene School Facilities Act and
levies these fees on development projects within its service area. Development projects would
be required to pay the school impact fees, which are based on the amount of proposed
residential and commercial space. This process, including fee payment, would ensure that
school services that accommodate current and future citywide growth could be reasonably
provided within the cumulative context. As previously discussed, according to the SFUSD,
new schools would be built regardless of the proposed project.129 New school projects would
be subject to separate CEQA review, which would analyze the environmental impacts of
constructing new school facilities. Therefore, other development is not expected to result in a
significant cumulative impact on schools, and overall cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant.

PARKS SERVICES

Population and employment growth associated with implementation of other development
projects in the city would increase demand on RPD parks and open space. This would be
considered a significant cumulative impact if such growth were to result in the need for
physically expanded facilities, which could result in physical environmental impacts.

The City is currently meeting or exceeding the established parkland-to-resident ratio
established by the Sustainable Communities Index of 5.5 acres per 1,000 residents, and each
individual development project is responsible for providing a sufficient amount of onsite open
space, per the Planning Code or guiding development controls.

129 Goldin, David. Chief Facilities Officer. San Francisco Unified School District. Personal communication with
Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on October 13, 2016.
The increase in the number of residents as a result of the proposed project and reasonably foreseeable projects would not be beyond the service level anticipated and planned for by the RPD. Current planning efforts for the provision of parks and open space, including Open Space 2100, will consider the city’s need for parks and open space over the next 100 years; projected population growth will be factored into the planning framework. The growth in San Francisco’s open space system that has occurred as a result of the passage of the 2008 and 2012 Clean and Safe Neighborhood Parks General Obligation Bonds, which included a focus on the development of new open spaces in the eastern portions of San Francisco, reflects the City’s efforts to continually assess and improve its open space system and match recreational facilities and services provided to the population served. Development of new and upgraded open space acreage as a result of these bond measures has also led to improvements in the delivery of recreational programs, facilities, and services to a growing population.

In addition to the parks developed for the project, common usable open space areas such as courtyards, rooftop terraces, and public passages would be provided at a ratio of 48 square feet per residential unit. Private usable open space would be provided at a ratio of 36 feet per residential unit in the form of private setback areas, balconies, and decks. Approval of the SUD, which would be required in order for the proposed project to be developed as proposed, would bring the proposed project into compliance with the development regulations for the project site set forth in the Planning Code. Therefore, other development is not expected to result in a significant cumulative impact on park services, and overall cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant (refer to Impact C-PS-2 for a discussion of cumulative impacts associated with recreational resources).

**LIBRARY SERVICES**

Population and employment growth associated with implementation of other development projects in the city would increase demand on SFPL facilities. This could be a significant cumulative impact because such growth could result in the need for physically expanded facilities, which could result in physical environmental impacts.

The proposed project would add to the cumulative effects of other reasonably foreseeable development projects on library services and facilities, but the project’s contribution to these effects would not be considerable. According to the SFPL, the library service needs of patrons are being met by the SFPL, and there is not a citywide service gap. Therefore, an additional increase in citywide population would most likely not have a considerable impact on the library system. For these reasons, the proposed project’s contribution to cumulative demand on library services citywide would not be cumulatively considerable, and the cumulative impact would be considered less than significant.

---

Lambert, Michael. Deputy City Librarian. San Francisco Public Library. Email to Jessica Viramontes, ICF International. Received on January 20, 2016.
Impact C-PS-2: The proposed project, in combination with other development in the city, would not increase the use of existing neighborhood parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. (Less than Significant)

Population and employment growth associated with implementation of other development projects in the city would increase demand on neighborhood parks and recreational facilities. The cumulative recreation demand would be met by existing adjacent parks and recreational facilities provided at China Basin Park, Mission Creek Park, Mission Bay Commons, Kids Park, South Park, and Mission Bay Dog Park. In addition, the San Francisco Bay Trail, also known as the Blue Greenway, runs along the eastern and northern portions of the project site. Park and open space acreage in this area of the city and along the waterfront is proposed to be augmented as development projects, such as Central SOMA, Mission Bay, and the Transit Center District Plan, move toward approval or completion. Specifically, as discussed above under Environmental Setting, Parks, the Mission Bay project plans to include, create, and improve public open space along the channel, which is located adjacent to the project site to the west. Although other development projects would also increase the number of residents in the area, due to the provision of the additional public spaces discussed above it is not anticipated that increased use would result in physical degradation of existing facilities, and overall cumulative impacts would be considered less than significant.