L. PUBLIC SERVICES

This section of the EIR discusses police protection; fire protection and emergency medical services; public school facilities; hospitals; and public libraries. The Setting discussion describes the existing baseline conditions for police protection, fire protection, and public school facilities serving the Project Site. These facilities are shown on Figure IV.L.1: Police and Fire Stations, Schools, Hospitals, and Libraries in Northeast San Francisco. The Impacts discussions address whether the Proposed Project would require new or expanded facilities to provide the same levels of public services as currently exist. These sections also consider the contribution of the Proposed Project and other reasonably foreseeable development projects in San Francisco to cumulative environmental impacts related to police protection services, fire protection and emergency medical services, public school facilities, hospitals, and public libraries.

L.1 POLICE

SETTING

The San Francisco Police Department (“SFPD”), headquartered at 850 Bryant Street, provides public safety services in the City and County of San Francisco, including Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. The SFPD consists of three Bureaus (Operations, Administrative Services, and Chief of Staff) and ten Districts located throughout the City. Police services are made up of four basic activities: responding to citizens’ requests for service; initiating activities designed to promote order and detect or deter criminal behavior; conducting administrative tasks; and engaging in community policing (attending community meetings; working with community groups, businesses, schools, and other government agencies to prevent and control crime violence and disorder; meeting informally with residents and business people; working on problem-solving projects).

An organizational assessment of the SFPD, completed in December 2008, recommended a structure for allocating patrol officers’ time among all four of these activities.1 Findings from the study indicate that, in 2007, the proportion of time spent on calls for service varied between 30.0 percent and 50.7 percent among San Francisco’s ten police districts. Citywide, the average was 42.9 percent.

Crimes recorded by the SFPD are organized into two groups: Part I crimes include aggravated assault, arson, breaking into cars, burglary, homicide, larceny, auto theft, rape, and robbery.

FIGURE IV.L.1: POLICE AND FIRE STATIONS, SCHOOLS, HOSPITALS, AND LIBRARIES IN NORTHEAST SAN FRANCISCO

E.S. = ELEMENTARY SCHOOL
Part II crimes range from disorderly conduct to receiving stolen property; they include embezzlement, forgery, gambling, prostitution, sex offenses, and other non-violent offences.

**Staffing**

The SFPD does not have an adopted standard for the ratio of officers to population or developed acreage, and bases its staffing levels on the number of service calls and crime incidents. In 2007, the most recent data available, the Police Department employed approximately 2,650 people, of which 2,374 (90 percent) were uniformed officers. Authorized staffing at each District Station includes 1 captain, 4 lieutenants and 16 sergeants, as well as members of the Patrol Division, which, together with the Traffic Division, make up the Field Operations Bureau. The Patrol Division, supported by Field Operations Bureau staff, is responsible for community policing throughout San Francisco by car and on foot. The number of patrol officers is based on the population and crime statistics reported within the District. The SFPD has over 65 Beat Patrol geographical areas.

**Southern Police District**

The SFPD Southern District (covering about 6.5 percent of the City’s land area) is one of San Francisco’s ten police districts. The Project Area lies within the Southern District, which is based in the Southern Police Station, shown on Figure IV.L.1, located at 850 Bryant Street in the Hall of Justice. Police operating from this station provide service to Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island in addition to the SOMA, Rincon Hill, South Beach, and North Mission Bay neighborhoods in San Francisco located south of Market Street and north of the Mission District and China Basin Channel. These neighborhoods differ in density and income levels from each other and the existing communities on Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island. Southern Station personnel include district command staff, administrative officers, and patrol officers. In total, there were 144 sworn officers in 2007, the latest year for which statistics were available. The Southern Station receives on average 2,688 calls for service per week, which are dispatched from the City of San Francisco Emergency Communication Division.

The number of officers on patrol varies by shift, which are staggered throughout the day. The SFPD has increasingly focused their efforts on community policing strategies to improve public safety and empower residents to collaborate with police to improve neighborhoods. In the

---

2 City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco City Charter Section 4.127 states that the City is to maintain a staffing level of a minimum of 1,971 sworn officers.
3 The Police Department had 2,449 budgeted positions for uniformed officers, of which 2,374 were filled, which represents approximately 97 percent of budgeted positions.
5 *District Boundaries Analysis*, p. D1.
Southern District, over 20 Neighborhood Watch Programs have been implemented,\(^6\) including one on Treasure Island.\(^7\) In addition, there are six beat areas with foot patrols within the Southern District.\(^8\) The Police Department also operates programs for youth based at community centers.

**Treasure Island Police Station**

There is an existing police station that provides police protection services for the Islands located in Building 1 on Treasure Island. The Treasure Island Police Station is staffed with a force of 1 lieutenant, 3 sergeants, 12 officers, and 3 security guards. The Treasure Island station handles all calls for service on the Islands and most calls involving the San Francisco Oakland Bay Bridge. The SFPD motorcycle training facility is also located on Treasure Island.

**Crime Incidents**

According to SFPD records, a total of 7,178 Part I crimes were reported in the Southern District in 2007, which constitutes approximately 17 percent of reported Part I crimes citywide (42,071 total incidents). A total of 5,735 Part II crimes were reported in the Southern District in 2007, or about 13 percent of reported Part II crimes citywide (44,196 total incidents). These are the highest numbers for any district in San Francisco. For comparison, based on the 2000 Census data, the Southern District accounted for approximately 3.1 percent of the total City population (24,157 residents in SOMA compared to 776,733 San Francisco residents).\(^9\) Calls for services in the Southern District occupied an average of 44.7 percent of patrol officers’ time in 2007.

In 2008 there were a combined total of 299 Part I and Part II crimes reported on the Islands. This constitutes a small proportion, 1.8 percent, of the 2008 reported crime level in the Southern District, which had a total of 16,680 reported Part I and Part II crimes. In 2009, of the 15,975 reported crimes in the Southern District, 218 crimes were committed on the Islands, or about 1.4 percent of the total crimes in the Southern District for that year.\(^10\)

**Response Time**

The type of police response varies according to the nature and urgency of the call. In San Francisco, the following four call priorities have been established:

---


\(^8\) Beat officers patrol the same beat on the same watch for at least a year.

\(^9\) *District Boundaries Analysis*, p. 28.

\(^10\) Facsimile from SFPD Media Relations, Officer Bo Mariles, in response to request of Michael Tymoff, Office of Economic and Workforce Development, TIDA, February 8, 2010. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E. A breakdown between Part I and Part II crimes was not available.
Priority A calls are defined as involving a “Life-threatening emergency.” These calls are the highest priority.

Priority B calls are defined as involving “Potential for harm to life and/or property.” These calls are the second priority.

Priority C calls are defined as involving “Crime committed with no threat to life or property. Suspect left crime scene.” These calls are third in priority.

Priority I calls are “Information only broadcast, e.g. public disturbance. Caller wants to remain anonymous.”

In the SFPD’s “Performance Measures” established as part of the City’s 2008–2009 budget, the department established the following target response times for 2008–2009:

- Priority A Calls – 4.4 minutes,
- Priority B Calls – 8.3 minutes, and
- Priority C Calls – 10.8 minutes.

The 2007 Citywide average response times were reported in the SFPD *District Station Boundaries Analysis*. In 2007, the overall average response time in the Southern District for Priority A calls was 4.8 minutes, the longest response time in San Francisco. The response times for Priority B (15.7 minutes) and Priority C (15.5 minutes) calls were similarly the slowest in the City. In 2007, Southern Station received 8,050 Priority A calls, 18,297 Priority B Calls, and 20,416 Priority C calls, for a total of 46,763 calls. There were also 52,092 “on-view” incidents, where a police officer observed situations that required police attention. While, in general, police department response times vary depending on a number of factors, including types of calls received and proximity of the nearest vehicle, response times in the Southern District generally have not met performance measure targets.

In 2008, the Islands Station received 265 Priority A calls, 574 Priority B calls, and 6,271 Priority C calls, which is a small proportion of the overall call volume in the Southern District. The response times for the Islands Police Station was 4.57 minutes for Priority A calls, 7.13 for Priority B calls, and 10.6 minutes for Priority C calls. The Islands Station performance fell within the Performance Measures set forth in the City’s 2008–2009 budget for Priority B and C calls, and not substantially over the performance measure for Priority A calls.

---

11 *Organizational Assessment*, p. 87.
13 Email from Lt. Lyn Tomioka, February 22, 2010. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
Demand for Police Services

Land use and location affect the types of incidents that prompt calls for police assistance. Residents tend to call police regarding domestic disturbances, neighborhood disputes, burglaries, or drug sales, while calls from retail establishments are generally to report shoplifting and traffic incidents. Calls from offices have a higher proportion of burglaries (auto or personal items) compared to other uses, and calls from entertainment uses depend largely on the type of tenants; for example, busy nightclubs often have a higher proportion of physical altercations.

As identified in the District Boundaries Analysis, one factor affecting the demand for police services is personal and family income. In the Southern District, similar to the Tenderloin, Mission, Bayview, Northern, and Central Districts, which are areas with 20 to 50 percent of the population living below the poverty level, there is a consistently higher recorded need for police services. As a correlation, the current poverty level on the Islands is not above the Citywide average, and does not place high demand on existing police services.

Regulatory Framework

Local

The San Francisco General Plan Community Facilities Element contains Objectives and Policies relevant to police station planning, including Objectives 1 and 2 and their underlying policies:

Objective 1: Distribute, locate, and design police facilities in a manner that will enhance the effective, efficient and responsive performance of police functions.

Policy 1.1: Locate police functions that are best conducted on a centralized basis in a police headquarters building.

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

Policy 1.3: Enhance closer police/community interaction through the decentralization of police services that need not be centralized.

Policy 1.4: Distribute, locate, and design police support facilities so as to maximize their effectiveness, use, and accessibility for police personnel.

Policy 1.5: As they require replacement, relocate existing nonconforming facilities consistent with community desires for neighborhood police facilities.

In light of the high community value attached to parks in San Francisco, the preservation and restoration of park areas to park use is a long-range objective. Under the Recreation and Open Space Element of the General Plan, police facilities in designated recreation and open space areas are nonconforming uses. As these facilities become obsolete and require replacement, they should be relocated, consistent with the location and neighborhood service policies of this plan, and consistent with community desires for continued location of a district station in the neighborhood.
Policy 1.6: Design facilities to allow for flexibility, future expansion, full operation in the event of a seismic emergency, and security and safety for personnel, while still maintaining an inviting appearance that is in scale with neighborhood development.

Policy 1.7: Combine police facilities with other public uses whenever multi-use facilities support planning goals, fulfill neighborhood needs, and meet police service needs.

Objective 2: Locate and design facilities in a manner that encourages constructive police/neighborhood interaction.

Policy 2.1: Provide expanded police/community relations and police services through outreach programs, primarily utilizing existing facilities.

Policy 2.2: Establish police district boundaries along natural neighborhood edges, and reinforce neighborhood identity by locating district stations near the centers of their service areas.

Policy 2.3: Design police facilities to maximize opportunities for promoting community/police relations through dual use of facilities.

**IMPACTS**

**Significance Criteria**

The City and County of San Francisco has not formally adopted significance thresholds for impacts related to police services. The Planning Department Initial Study Checklist Form provides a framework of topics to be considered in evaluating potential impacts under CEQA. Implementation of a project could have a potentially significant impact related to police services if the project were to:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, [or the] need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Police Department.

**Approach to Analysis**

Impacts on police protection services are considered significant if an increase in population or development levels as a result of the Proposed Project would result in inadequate staffing levels, increased response times, and/or increased demand for services that would require construction or expansion of new or altered facilities that themselves could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Thus, a significant impact would occur if the proposed Treasure Island Police Station could not accommodate the number of officers required to meet Proposed Project demand, or require the construction of a new or expanded police facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts. The information used to assess the impacts on police protection services was obtained from the SFPD and a review of the Public Safety Strategies
Group’s assessment of facilities needs. Additionally, the Proposed Project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts is evaluated in the context of existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable future development expected.

**Project Impacts**

**Construction Impacts**

**Impact PS-1:** Project construction activities could result in adverse physical impacts or in the need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police protection. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

The Proposed Project, including construction of the new joint Police-Fire station on Treasure Island, could result in construction-related impacts on existing police services provided on the Islands. The existing police station on Treasure Island would serve the Project Area during Phase 1 of construction. As described on pages II.78 and II.85, Phase 1 construction would include ground and soil improvements in the initial development areas on Treasure Island, and construction of initial backbone infrastructure on the Islands. Thus, Phase 1 construction would not be expected to increase demand for police services. Existing police staffing and facilities would be adequate to maintain existing response times and other performance objectives. A new, centrally located, joint Police-Fire station would be constructed in Phase 2, along with the initial development of residential units, retail and hotel uses, and renovation of Building 2 on Treasure Island. *(Refer to the Project Description, pp. II.79–II.82, for a description of construction phases.)* Thus, the Proposed Project would not result in significant construction-related impacts on police services during the interim period that the Islands would continue to be served by the existing police station and staff and, therefore, no mitigation is required.

Construction activities could result in increased demand for police services if construction activities cause traffic conflicts requiring SFPD response. Access to the Development Plan Area site during construction would be maintained with implementation of a Construction Traffic Management Plan (“CTMP”), as required by Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, discussed in Section IV.E, Transportation, p. IV.E.69. The CTMP would provide necessary information to various contractors and agencies about how to maximize the opportunities for complementing construction management measures and to minimize the possibility of conflicting impacts on the roadway system, while safely accommodating the traveling public in the area. A cohesive program of operational and demand management strategies designed to maintain acceptable levels of traffic flow during periods of construction activities on the Islands would be implemented. These could include construction strategies, demand management strategies, alternate route strategies, and public information strategies.
Construction activities also could increase demand for SFPD services if a particular construction site is not adequately secured, providing increased opportunity for criminal activity. This increased demand during construction would not require construction of new or expanded police facilities because there would be no substantial increase in population or employment during the initial phases of construction. Additionally, the joint Police-Fire station would be constructed during Phase 2 and would provide increased staffing and patrols on the Islands during subsequent phases of construction.

Potential impacts associated with the construction of the proposed new joint Police-Fire station have been addressed in this EIR in Section IV.E, Transportation, pp. IV.E.67 (Impact TR-1); Section IV.F, Noise, pp. IV.F.14-IV.F.20 (Impacts NO-1 and NO-2); Section IV.G, Air Quality, pp. IV.G.24-IV.G.38 (Impacts AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4); Section IV.M, Biological Resources, pp. IV.M.41-IV.M.63 (Impacts BI-1, BI-2, BI-3, BI-4, and BI-6); Section IV.O, Hydrology and Water Quality, pp. IV.O.35-IV.O.41 (Impacts HY-1, HY-2, HY-3, HY-4, HY-5, HY-6, and HY-7)); and Section IV.P, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, pp. IV.P.39-IV.P.47 (Impacts HZ-1, HZ-2, HZ-3, HZ-4, HZ-5, and HZ-6). As discussed in these sections, construction impacts, including impacts associated with construction of the joint Police-Fire Station, would be less than significant, or could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

**Operational Impacts**

**Impact PS-2:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase demand for police services that would result in the need to construct new police facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Police Department. *(Less than Significant)*

Evaluating the need for increased SFPD staff when new development is planned involves considering the size, location, and character of the new development. In most instances, development within San Francisco occurs within a fully developed urban area, and the incremental increase in service area or service requirements associated with any one project is minimal.

However, in this instance, the Project Area is underutilized. Implementation of the Proposed Project would introduce new uses to the Islands (e.g., retail, entertainment, and open space), and would substantially increase the density of development on the Islands. At full buildout, the Proposed Project would result in a total residential population of about 18,640, plus a total employee population of about 2,920 employees in 2030. Refer to Section IV.C, Population and Housing, Tables IV.C.3 and IV.C.4 for estimates of total residential and employment populations on the Islands in 2030. Patrolling and responding to calls within the Project Area would require deployment of additional police services on the Islands.
To estimate personnel requirements for new projects, the SFPD considers the size of the incoming residential population and the expected or actual experience with calls for service from other potential uses of the site. Any potential increase in staffing at the SFPD Treasure Island Station would be expected to take place over time throughout the 20-year development period with the incremental addition of new housing and new non-residential land uses.

Although the City has not adopted staffing ratio standards, the existing level of service at the SFPD can be determined by comparing citywide police force staffing to total City population (including both residents and workers). Using a total City daytime population for San Francisco of 1,351,410 (including workers who commute into the City) and a police department staffing level of 2,033 in 2005, a Citywide ratio of 1 officer per 665 people was calculated. This ratio, if applied to the total projected resident and employee population of the Development Plan Project Area at full build-out, would result in a potential need for a total of about 32 police personnel to provide a comparable level of service on the Islands. Although the officer-to-population ratio yields a contingent of 32 police, the SFPD’s planned staffing, based on the current and projected call and incident load at Treasure Island, calls for 6 sergeants and 40 officers.

Under the Proposed Project, a new joint Police-Fire Station of about 30,000 square feet would be built on block IC4, near the center of Treasure Island, on a site that is currently undeveloped.

Impacts on police protection services are considered significant if an increase in population or development levels would result in inadequate staffing levels (as measured by the ability of the SFPD to respond to call loads) or if increased demand for services that would require the construction or expansion of new or altered facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Since the police staff expected at the proposed joint Police-Fire station would be 6 sergeants and 40 officers, the officer-to-population ratio would be met, thus there would be no expected significant impacts to the level of police service on the Islands. Therefore, no mitigation would be required.

While the development of the Proposed Project would require construction of new joint Police-Fire Station facilities to maintain acceptable levels of police protection, potential impacts associated with the construction of this facility have been addressed in this EIR, as discussed under Impact PS-1 above.

---

14 Letter from Captain Albert Pardini, San Francisco Police Department, to Kyri McClellan, Base Reuse and Development, Re: Estimating Future Use Levels and Costs for Treasure/Yerba Buena Islands, September 30, 2004. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
Cumulative Impacts

Impact PS-3: The Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative projects would not affect police department response times or performance objectives, nor would it contribute to the need to construct new police facilities. (Less than Significant)

There are two separate projects that are expected to occur in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. The first project is the Yerba Buena Island Ramps Improvement Project (Ramps Project), which includes the replacement of the freeway ramps on the east side of the Yerba Buena Island tunnel and the seismic upgrade of the viaduct connecting the Yerba Buena Island causeway to the Bay Bridge westbound ramps and to Hillcrest Road.15 The second project is the development of an expanded 400-slip marina at Clipper Cove.16 The landside services necessary to support the marina project are part of the Proposed Project. Neither of these projects would have a substantial impact on the public services in the vicinity. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impacts on demand for police protection as a result of these projects. The cumulative transportation effects of these two projects are analyzed in Section IV.E, Transportation.

Aside from those two projects, there is no other development proposed or under consideration in the vicinity. The cumulative impact with respect to the rest of San Francisco is minimal as San Francisco is to the west of the Islands, making police response from the mainland to the Islands difficult because of both the distance and the commonly congested traffic conditions on the Bay Bridge. As a result, the Proposed Project would be served primarily by on-Island police personnel and would not typically draw mainland police personnel away from other parts of the City. The Proposed Project would not result in cumulative impacts on police protection services that would affect police response times or performance objectives on the Islands or in the remainder of the City, nor would it cumulatively contribute to the need to construct police facilities, beyond the joint Police-Fire Station proposed as part of the Proposed Project. Thus, the Proposed Project would not have a considerable cumulative impact on police response times in San Francisco.

15 There are one off-ramp and two on-ramps in the westbound direction, and two off-ramps and one on-ramp in the eastbound direction. The ramps are accessed from a series of short bridges, or viaducts, on Yerba Buena Island. The existing eastbound on-ramp (on the east side of the Yerba Buena Island tunnel) is being replaced as part of the Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project. The Ramps Project which includes the replacement of the other ramps on the east side of the Yerba Buena Island tunnel and the seismic upgrade of the viaduct connecting the Yerba Buena Island causeway to the Bay Bridge westbound ramps and to Hillcrest Road, is a separate project from the Proposed Project and the Bay Bridge East Span Seismic Safety Project.

16 A proposal to redevelop and expand the existing marina from 100 to 400 slips was previously analyzed in the Transfer and Reuse of Naval Station Treasure Island Final Environmental Impact Report, certified on May 5, 2005. The marina expansion is not part of the Proposed Project; however, the landside facilities and improvements associated with the expanded marina are included in the Proposed Project.
L.2 FIRE AND EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES

SETTING

The San Francisco Fire Department (“SFFD”) is responsible for protecting life and property throughout San Francisco from fires, natural disasters, and hazardous materials incidents. The SFFD also provides unified emergency medical services in the City, including basic life support and advanced life support services. In addition, several privately operated ambulance companies are authorized to provide basic and advanced life support services. Water supply for fire suppression in San Francisco is provided mainly from the potable supply, but is augmented by an auxiliary water supply system (“AWSS”) on the east side of San Francisco. The Islands currently do not have an AWSS system and use only potable water for firefighting.

The SFFD has approximately 1,700 firefighting and emergency personnel and consists of three divisions, divided into 10 battalions and 43 active stations located strategically throughout the City. Staffing at each station is determined based on the types of firefighting apparatuses each station maintains. Engines are staffed with one officer and three firefighters, and trucks are staffed with one officer and four firefighters. Ambulances are staffed with a driver and one paramedic specialist who provides pre-hospital advanced medical and trauma care.

Fire stations are strategically located in order to be able to reach emergencies in the surrounding area quickly. In San Francisco, response times are calculated from the time the dispatch is received and acknowledged at the station to the time the responding unit informs dispatch that it is on-scene. The SFFD target response time goal for Code 1 (non-emergency) calls is 8 minutes, for Code 2 (non-life-threatening fire and medical emergencies) calls is 20 minutes, and for Code 3 (life-threatening fire and medical emergencies) calls is 5 minutes. Code 3 calls are the highest response priority. When responding to Code 3 calls, responding vehicles use flashing lights and sirens and cross intersections against control lights. The SFFD is currently in the 90th percentile for attainment of all the department’s response time goals.

Of the 43 SFFD fire stations located throughout the City, one is located on Treasure Island and none are on Yerba Buena Island. Station 48 is located in Building 157, Avenue D at 10th Street on Treasure Island.

17 The mission of the Fire Department is stated on the City and County of San Francisco Fire Department website at http://www.sf-fire.org/, accessed April 20, 2010. The mission statement also includes fire prevention education and goals for the work environment.

18 The terms fire engine and fire truck represent different types of firefighting apparatus.

19 Office of the Controller, City and County of San Francisco, A Review of the San Francisco Fire-EMS System, April 2004, Appendix B. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
IV. Environmental Setting and Impacts
L. Public Services

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 Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, the California Building Code), fire protection and notification systems, fire protection devices (such as extinguishers and smoke alarms, high-rise building and childcare facility standards), and fire suppression training.

Local

*San Francisco Fire Code*

The San Francisco Fire Code incorporates by reference the California Fire Code, with certain local amendments. The San Francisco Fire Code was revised in 2007 to regulate and govern the safeguarding of life and property from fire and explosion hazards arising from the storage, handling, and use of hazardous substances, materials and devices, and from conditions hazardous to life or property in the occupancy of buildings and premises; to provide for the issuance of permits, inspections, and other SFFD services; and the assessment and collection of fees for those permits, inspections, and services.

The SFFD reviews building plans to ensure that fire and life safety is provided and maintained in the buildings under its jurisdiction. SFFD plan review applies to all fire alarm and fire suppression systems and all of the following occupancy types:

- Assembly occupancies (including restaurants and other gathering places for 50 or more occupants);
- Educational occupancies (including commercial day care facilities);
- Hazardous occupancies (including automobile repair garages, body shops, fuel storage, and emergency generator installation);
- Storage occupancies where potential exists for high-piled storage (Fire Code §112.2, Table 112-A);
- Institutional occupancies;
- High-rise buildings of all occupancies; and
- Residential occupancies, such as hotels, motels, lodging houses, residential care facilities, apartment houses, small-and large-family day care homes, and R-1 artisan buildings (excluding minor residential repairs such as kitchen and bath remodeling and dry rot repair).
In coordination with the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, the SFFD conducts plan checks of building permit applications to ensure that all structures, occupancies, and systems outlined above are designed in accordance with the San Francisco Fire Code, including structures within the City that are under federal jurisdiction.

Section 511 (Local Fire Safety Feature Requirements) of the San Francisco Fire Code requires that buildings 200 feet or more in height must provide at least one elevator approved by the Fire Department for firefighter use under fire conditions. The section also requires that for buildings having floors used for human occupancy located more than 75 feet above the lowest level of Fire Department vehicle access, an air replenishment system shall be installed to provide a means for firefighters to refill air bottles for self-contained breathing apparatus through a permanently installed piping distribution system. The system shall be tested and maintained pursuant to the Fire Department Administration Bulletin.

San Francisco General Plan

The San Francisco General Plan Community Facilities Element contains Objectives and Policies relevant to fire station planning, including Objective 5 and its underlying principles. Objective 5 states that:

Development of a system of firehouses which will meet the operating requirements of the fire department in providing fire protection services and which will be in harmony with related public service facilities and with all other features and facilities of land development and transportation provided for in other sections of the general plan.

Principles

The following principles are an integral and basic part of the Fire Facilities Section:

In general, firehouses should be distributed throughout the city so that each firehouse has a primary service area extending within a radius of one-half mile. This spacing should vary in relation to population densities, building intensities and types of construction, the pattern of trafficways, and with the relative degree of fire hazard.

Firehouses should be located on streets close to and leading into major or secondary thoroughfares.

Firehouses should be so located that no topographic barriers require time-consuming detours within the primary service area of each firehouse.

IMPACTS

Significance Criteria

The City and County of San Francisco has not formally adopted significance thresholds for impacts related to fire protection and emergency medical services. The Planning Department Initial Study Checklist Form provides a framework of topics to be considered in evaluating
potential impacts under CEQA. Implementation of a project could have a potentially significant impact related to fire protection and emergency medical services if it were to:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Fire Department.

**Approach to Analysis**

Impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services are considered significant if an increase in population or development levels as a result of the Proposed Project would result in inadequate staffing levels, increased response times, and/or increased demand for services requiring the construction or expansion of new or altered facilities beyond those included in the Proposed Project that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Thus, a significant impact would occur if the proposed combined Police-Fire Station could not accommodate the additional SFFD personnel needed to meet Proposed Project demand, or would require the construction of new or expanded police facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts. Additionally, the Proposed Project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts is evaluated in the context of existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable future development expected in the vicinity of the Project Site.

**Project Impacts**

**Construction Impacts**

**Impact PS-4:** Project construction activities could result in adverse physical impacts or in the need for new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for fire protection. *(Less than Significant with Mitigation)*

The Proposed Project could result in construction-related impacts due to potential impacts on existing fire services provided on the Islands, or the construction of the new joint Police-Fire station on Treasure Island. The existing fire station on Treasure Island would serve the Project Area during Phase 1 of construction, which would include ground and soil improvements in the initial development areas on Treasure Island, and construction of initial backbone infrastructure on the Islands. Phase 1 construction would not be expected to increase demand for fire services. Existing fire staffing and facilities would be adequate to maintain existing response times and other performance objectives. A new, centrally located, joint Police-Fire station would be constructed in Phase 2, along with the initial development of residential units, retail and hotel uses, and renovation of Building 2 on Treasure Island. The existing fire station would continue to operate until the new joint Police-Fire station is operational. Thus, the Proposed Project would not result in significant construction-related
impacts on fire protection services during the interim period while the Islands would continue to be served by the existing police station and staff and, therefore, no mitigation is required.

Emergency access throughout the Islands would be maintained with implementation of the Construction Traffic Management Plan as specified in Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, discussed in Section IV.E, Transportation, p. IV.E.69. Compliance with the CTMP would require that emergency access is not obstructed during construction activities. The CTMP would provide necessary information to various contractors and agencies as to how to maximize the opportunities for complementing construction management measures and to minimize the possibility of conflicting impacts on the roadway system, while safely accommodating the existing residents and employees on the Islands. As such, construction of the Proposed Project would not affect SFFD response times, nor would construction require expansion of, or replacement of, SFFD stations. With the adoption of Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, impacts during construction of the Proposed Project on fire protection services would be less than significant.

Construction-related impacts of the new Police-Fire station have been addressed in Section IV.E, Transportation, pp. IV.E.67 (Impact TR-1); Section IV.F, Noise, pp. IV.F.14-IV.F.20 (Impacts NO-1 and NO-2); Section IV.G, Air Quality, pp. IV.G.24-IV.G.38 (Impacts AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4); Section IV.M, Biological Resources, pp. IV.M.41-IV.M.63 (Impacts BI-1, BI-2, BI-3, BI-4, and BI-6); Section IV.O, Hydrology and Water Quality, pp. IV.O.35-IV.O.41 (Impacts HY-1, HY-2, HY-3, HY-4, HY-5, HY-6, and HY-7); and Section IV.P, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, pp. IV.P.39-IV.P.47 (Impacts HZ-1, HZ-2, HZ-3, HZ-4, HZ-5, and HZ-6). As discussed in those sections, construction impacts, including construction of the joint Police-Fire Station, would be less than significant, or could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of construction-related mitigation measures. Therefore, construction of the proposed joint Police-Fire Station would not result in significant environmental impacts.

Operational Impacts

Impact PS-5: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase demand for fire services, which would result in the need to construct new fire service facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Fire Department. (No Impact)

The Project Area is currently served by an existing SFFD fire station, Station 48, located on Avenue D at 10th Street on Treasure Island. The existing station would be closed as part of the Proposed Project and relocated to a joint San Francisco Police and Fire Station of about 30,000 square feet that would be built in block IC4, near the center of Treasure Island. Figure IV.L.1, p. IV.L.2, shows the locations of the existing SFFD station on Treasure Island and stations in northeastern San Francisco. The new, joint Police-Fire station would be
constructed in Phase 2 and would be equipped with 2 pumper engines, one ladder truck, an ambulance, and a spare ambulance, and be staffed with 16 Fire Department staff persons. All new development would be constructed in an area that is accessible from the proposed fire station. The existing station would be closed after the new joint Police-Fire station is completed and operational as part of Phase 2 construction activities.

Buildings constructed or rehabilitated as part of the Proposed Project would be more fire-resistant than existing structures on the Islands due to improvements in the building codes and the provision of automatic sprinklers. In addition, the majority of the new buildings would not be wood-framed structures sharing common walls.

For fire protection and suppression, the Proposed Project would rely on three water supply systems. The primary fire water supply would be the domestic water system, which includes water storage of 4 million gallons in two tanks on Yerba Buena Island. These tanks would provide water to hydrants on both Islands. In order to have access to water for firefighting in the event the supply lines providing domestic water to the Islands were ruptured, the Proposed Project would also include a supplemental system using recycled water. Recycled water from the waste water treatment plant would be stored in a 1.14 million gallon tank located at the northeast corner of Treasure Island near the wastewater treatment and recycled water plants. The recycled water would be distributed from the tank to a separate system of fire hydrants spaced to accommodate a 1,000-foot hose length, which would be able to reach the farthest building. This system would have backup power and redundant pumps for reliability. A second, separate supplemental system would also be provided drawing on Bay water, with two fire boat manifolds and two suction hydrants located along the southern shore of Treasure Island near the existing hangar buildings.

A supplemental firefighting water system is not planned for Yerba Buena Island, due to its steep topography, smaller size, and proximity to potable water storage tanks on the island and to water supply lines on the Bay Bridge. Refer to Section IV.K, Utilities and Service Systems, pp. IV.K.38-IV.K.47, for additional detail about water infrastructure, including the supplemental firefighting system.

With construction of the approximately 8,000 new residential units in the Development Plan Area, the number of residents on the Islands would increase to about 18,640 at full buildout. The new retail uses, hotels, educational facilities, and other uses on the Islands are expected to increase total employment to about 2,920 employees. The increased number of residents and employees on the Islands, combined with an increase in the number of buildings, would result in increased demand for fire protection and emergency medical service and the potential to increase response times.
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Approximately 50 percent of all housing units are anticipated to be in low-rise buildings (building height 70 feet and lower); 35 percent would be in mid-rise buildings (generally buildings 70 to 125 feet in height) or neighborhood towers (building height between 125 and 240 feet); and 15 percent would be in high-rise buildings (building height greater than 240 feet). The tallest buildings would be located in and adjacent to the Island Center District, near the proposed Ferry Terminal and Transit Hub, with one 650-foot-tall building in the “Main Tower” height zone across California Avenue from Building 1 (see Figure II.6a: Treasure Island Maximum Height Limit Plan, in Chapter II, Project Description, p. II.25). All new buildings above 70 feet in the Development Plan Area would be subject to current state and local regulations governing fire and life safety in high-rise construction. The SFFD would review building plans to ensure that adequate fire and life safety measures are provided, including review of emergency access and egress; sprinkler systems; fire-rated design, construction and materials; restrictions on occupant loads; emergency lighting; smoke alarms; mechanical smoke control and emergency notification systems; hydrants; and roadway access for fire equipment.

Project demand for fire protection and emergency medical service is expected to increase as the phases of the Proposed Project are completed and buildings are occupied. To maintain acceptable response times, the SFFD may need to hire additional personnel, and/or redeploy existing personnel, and acquire and/or redeploy equipment to serve the Development Plan Area. The need for additional staff and/or equipment would not, in itself, constitute a significant environmental impact related to fire protection service unless it would “[r]esult in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.”

Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase demand for fire services; however, the demand would be met by the construction of a new joint Police-Fire Station included in the Proposed Project that would allow the SFFD to maintain acceptable response times on the Islands. The new joint Police-Fire Station would be located on Block IC4, as shown in Figure IV.A.2: Proposed Land Use Plan for Treasure Island, Section IV.A, Land Use and Land Use Planning, p. IV.A.17. The staffing, programming, and other characteristics would be flexible in response to future needs and conditions, as well as in accordance with future SFFD, City, and community priorities and resources. Thus, construction of the new joint Police-Fire Station would allow the SFFD to continue to meet its target response times for the Islands, due to its increased size and staffing capability and more central location. Therefore, increased demand for fire services could be accommodated such that response times would not be adversely affected. Construction of a new SFFD facility would therefore allow the SFFD to maintain acceptable
response times for fire protection and emergency medical services (3 minutes for Treasure Island and 6 minutes for Yerba Buena Island\textsuperscript{20}).

Although the Proposed Project would require new SFFD facilities to maintain acceptable levels of fire protection and emergency medical services, potential impacts associated with the construction of the new Police-Fire station have been addressed in this EIR as discussed under Impact PS-4 above.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact PS-6: The Proposed Project’s contribution to cumulative impacts would not affect fire department response times or performance objectives, nor would it contribute to the need to construct new fire station facilities (\textit{Less than Significant}).

Cumulative demand for fire protection and emergency medical service is expected to increase as the residences and commercial space in the Proposed Project and other reasonably foreseeable development projects are built and occupied in San Francisco over the analysis period. Although cumulative development may result in a demand for additional SFFD staff, that alone would not result in a significant physical environmental effect. The proposed Police-Fire station facilities included as part of the Proposed Project would not be greatly affected by cumulative San Francisco growth, as the Islands are not proximate to any other San Francisco neighborhood and are surrounded by the San Francisco Bay.

There are two separate projects that are expected to occur in the vicinity of the Proposed Project. The first project is the Ramps Project, which includes the replacement of the freeway ramps on the east side of the Yerba Buena Island tunnel and the seismic upgrade of the viaduct connecting the Yerba Buena Island causeway to the Bay Bridge westbound ramps and to Hillcrest Road. The second project is the development of an expanded 400-slip marina at Clipper Cove. Neither of these projects would have a substantial impact on the public services in the vicinity. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impacts on fire protection or emergency medical services as a result of these projects. The cumulative transportation effects of these two projects are analyzed in Section IV.E, Transportation.

The rest of San Francisco is west of the Islands, making fire and emergency medical response from the mainland to the Islands impractical, both because of the travel distance and the commonly congested state of the Bay Bridge. As a result, the Proposed Project would be served primarily by on-Island fire personnel and would not typically draw mainland Fire Department

\textsuperscript{20} Memo from Jack Sylvan to Gary Massentani (San Francisco Fire Department), Re: Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island Fire Protection, June 29, 2010. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
IV. Environmental Setting and Impacts
L. Public Services

personnel away from other parts of the City. The Proposed Project would not result in cumulative impacts on fire protection and emergency medical services that would affect SFFD response times or performance objectives on the Islands or in the remainder of the City, nor would it cumulatively contribute to the need to construct fire station facilities beyond the proposed joint Police-Fire station proposed as part of the Proposed Project. Thus, the Proposed Project would not have a considerable cumulative impact to fire and emergency response times in San Francisco.

L.3 SCHOOLS

SETTING

Existing School Facilities

Treasure Island and Yerba Buena Island are within the San Francisco Unified School District (“SFUSD”). The SFUSD oversees the public school system in San Francisco (K–12) and has 37 preschools and 104 schools serving various grade levels (K–5, K–8, and 9–12). Based on data for the 2008–2009 school year, there are approximately 56,000 students currently attending public schools in San Francisco. Approximately 20,000 students, 26 percent of the total student population in San Francisco, attend local private schools. From 1999 to 2008, student enrollment in the SFUSD declined by approximately 0.1 percent annually.21

SFUSD has capacity for approximately 63,835 students in existing facilities; there is additional capacity in elementary, middle, and high schools. Although neighborhoods with many school-age children generate a proportionally higher level of demand for nearby schools, SFUSD assigns students based on a lottery system. This system distributes students to facilities that have sufficient capacity. If a student is not assigned to a nearby school, SFUSD provides bus transportation to the assigned school. SFUSD provides bus transportation to approximately 5,300 elementary students attending 16 nonattendance area schools and 48 attendance area schools. SFSUD provides some transportation to Burton, Galileo, Mission, and Balboa high schools; however, most middle and high school students use public transportation.22

Since student enrollment has been declining, SFUSD has been closing schools. SFUSD has focused on replacing older schools and modernizing facilities. The SFUSD Capital Plan identifies a range of physical improvements necessary to modernize existing facilities, such as providing Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant access, upgrading science and computer labs, and expanding arts facilities.

---

21 California Department of Education, DataQuest, http://data1.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/, accessed June 19, 2010. The same data source shows that there was a slight increase in the number of students in 2008-2009 from 56,222 to 56,454.

Student Assignment System

From the 2002-2003 academic year until the 2010-2011 academic year, the SFUSD operated a three-part, race-neutral, choice-based student assignment system that focused on outreach and recruitment, program placement, and a diversity index lottery. Under this system, the most significant determinants of a student’s school assignment were parental choice and school capacity. Parents submitted an application with a list of ranked school choices, and the SFUSD assigned students based on available openings, attendance areas, and the diversity index lottery. Since the SFUSD allowed students to apply to any school in the City, schools with higher demand received more enrollment requests than seats available. Whenever enrollment requests were greater than the number of seats available, the SFUSD used the diversity index lottery to determine which students received an assignment offer. The diversity index lottery results were based on a formula that used race-neutral, factors including extreme poverty, socioeconomic status, student’s home language, quality of student’s prior school, and student’s prior academic achievement.

In March 2010, this system was altered to create a hybrid system that, while retaining certain aspects of the prior system, places more weight on the test scores in a student’s census tract and the student’s proximity to a school, granting children in low-scoring tracts and children near a given school preferential status in the lottery system over other students.23 The new system will be implemented starting with student assignments for the 2011-2012 school year.

For elementary schools, students would be chosen for high-demand schools using the following order of preferences:

1. Students with siblings in the school,
2. Students who attended preschool in the elementary school’s attendance area,
3. Students in low-scoring census tracts,
4. Students in the preferred school’s attendance area, and
5. All others applying.

For middle schools, students would be chosen for high-demand schools using the following order of preferences:

1. Students with siblings in the school,
2. Students in low-scoring census tracts,
3. Students in the preferred school’s attendance area,
4. Students in densely populated attendance areas, and

5. All others applying.

For high school, students would be chosen for high-demand schools using the following order of preferences:

1. Students with siblings in the school,
2. Students in low-scoring census tracts,
3. All others applying.

When elementary school students are assigned to a school outside of their neighborhood, the district provides them with bus transportation to the assigned school. Busses are provided to some middle and high school students assigned to schools outside their neighborhoods, while the remainder rely on public or private transportation to travel to their assigned schools.

**Project Area**

There are currently no public schools operated by SFUSD on either Treasure Island or Yerba Buena Island. Treasure Island School, located at 13th and E Streets, is owned by the Navy and was formerly operated by the SFUSD until its closure in 2005. At that time, it had 88 students and a capacity for 676 students. In 2001, 529 students from kindergarten through 8th grade were enrolled in Treasure Island School. Seven percent of these students were residents of the Islands; the rest were bused to Treasure Island from the Tenderloin, SOMA, Mission, and Chinatown neighborhoods.

There are several non-SFUSD educational institutions and programs on Treasure Island, most of which are located on the grounds of the former Treasure Island School. As of 2009, a portion of the buildings on the Treasure Island School site were being used for the Glide YouthBuild Program, the San Francisco’s Sheriff’s Five Keys Charter School, the Boys and Girls Clubs of San Francisco, and the San Francisco Police Department’s motorcycle training unit. These programs and schools are on one-year leases with TIDA.

The Glide YouthBuild Program is a leadership and training program for 16- to 24-year-old youth from San Francisco’s poorest and most violent neighborhoods. The program is partnered with John Muir Charter School, and includes on-site construction skills training, personal development and leadership skills workshops, GED preparation, and the ability to earn academic credit toward a high school diploma. It places graduates in apprenticeship opportunities with building trade unions (carpentry, drywall, ironwork, and cement masons). Glide’s YouthBuild program has grown over the past few years, and thus sought out the larger 22,000-square-foot Treasure Island

---

School facility in 2008. The Treasure Island School has classrooms, a large auditorium, kitchen, garden, and nearby sports field that serves the Glide YouthBuild student programs. The additional space permitted an expansion of program capacity by about 30 percent, to a total of 114 students. The Treasure Island Clubhouse of the Boys & Girls Clubs of San Francisco is also located in the former Treasure Island School. This program provides after-school programs for youth in the areas of education, health & fitness, social recreation, and teen services. The Boys & Girls Clubs of San Francisco opened the Treasure Island Clubhouse in 2000. The San Francisco Sheriff’s Five Keys Charter School is a GED program for formerly incarcerated women.

The 24,000-square-foot Life Learning Academy is currently open on Treasure Island at 651 8th Street, Building 229, between Avenues I and M, and is expected to remain on Treasure Island after Project buildout is complete. The Life Learning Academy is a Charter School founded in 1998, designed to serve 60 at-risk high school youths who have not been successful in traditional schools. The curriculum was developed by the Delancey Street Foundation as part of a juvenile justice reform effort to reduce youth incarceration and recidivism. Youth are referred to the Life Learning Academy by SFUSD, police, probation officers, and community-based organizations.

Since January 1, 2010, Catholic Charities has operated a child development center on Treasure Island. Catholic Charities is a member of the Treasure Island Homeless Development Initiative, which manages 250 units of housing for the homeless on Treasure Island.

The San Francisco Police Department’s motorcycle training unit, located on Treasure Island, educates police officers on the proper handling of motorcycles for police duty. This use is not expected to continue under the Proposed Project.

**Regulatory Framework**

**State**

California Senate Bill 50 (“SB 50”) and Proposition 1A were designed to construct and modernize California schools. According to Government Code Section 65996, the development fees authorized by SB 50 are deemed to be full and complete school facilities mitigation for increased development. The legislation also has provisions to adjust the fee periodically to keep pace with inflation. These provisions will remain in place as long as subsequent state bonds are approved and available. As a result of this legislation, school districts are expected to continue to levy a school fee on developers under existing rules (Government Code Sections 65995, 65995.5, and 65995.7).

**Local**

The SFUSD began collecting school impact fees authorized by the state under SB50 in 1987. School impact fees are collected from developers prior to issuance of building permits to mitigate
impacts associated with enrollment growth created by new development. The SFUSD collects fees for all construction and building permits issued within the City. Developer fee revenues are used, in conjunction with other SFUSD funds, to support efforts to complete capital improvement projects. The current fees for new construction, when building permits are issued, range from 9 cents per square foot for hotels to $2.24 per square foot for residential construction, with other rates for office, research and development, hospitals, industrial, and retail and services uses.

**IMPACTS**

**Significance Criteria**

The City and County of San Francisco has not formally adopted significance thresholds for impacts related to school services. The Planning Department Initial Study Checklist Form provides a framework of topics to be considered in evaluating potential impacts under CEQA. Implementation of a project could have a potentially significant impact related to school services if it were to:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, [or the] need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Unified School District.

**Approach to Analysis**

Impacts on schools are considered significant if an increase in population or development levels as a result of the Proposed Project would result in inadequate staffing levels, overcrowding, and/or increased demand for services requiring the construction or expansion of new or altered facilities beyond those included in the Proposed Project that could have an adverse physical environmental effect. Thus, a significant impact would occur if the proposed rebuilt or renovated Treasure Island School could not accommodate the additional students expected with the Proposed Project, and would require the construction or expansion of new or expanded school facilities that would cause significant environmental impacts. Additionally, the Proposed Project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts is evaluated in the context of existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable future development expected in the vicinity of the Islands.
Project Impacts

Construction Impacts

Impact PS-7: Project construction activities would not result in adverse physical impacts or in the need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable staffing ratios, prevent overcrowding, or to meet other performance objectives for school services. (Less than Significant)

The Proposed Project, including renovation or rebuilding of the Treasure Island School, could result in construction-related impacts on existing educational and school services provided on the Islands. Construction would not, in itself, create new residents or any other impact on City schools. Construction-related impacts from re-building or renovating the Treasure Island School are addressed in this EIR in Section IV.E, Transportation, pp. IV.E.67 (Impact TR-1); Section IV.F, Noise, pp. IV.F.14-IV.F.20 (Impacts NO-1 and NO-2); Section IV.G, Air Quality, pp. IV.G.24-IV.G.38 (Impacts AQ-1, AQ-2, AQ-3, and AQ-4); Section IV.M, Biological Resources, pp. IV.M.41-IV.M.63 (Impacts BI-1, BI-2, BI-3, BI-4, and BI-6); Section IV.O, Hydrology and Water Quality, pp. IV.O.35-IV.O.41 (Impacts HY-1, HY-2, HY-3, HY-4, HY-5, HY-6, and HY-7); and Section IV.P, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, pp. IV.P.39-IV.P.47 (Impacts HZ-1, HZ-2, HZ-3, HZ-4, HZ-5, and HZ-6). As discussed in those sections, construction impacts, including impacts from construction of a new or renovated Treasure Island School facility, would be less than significant, or could be mitigated to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures.

Construction of the Proposed Project would not prevent access to existing educational programs on Treasure Island, as access would be maintained through compliance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan prepared for the Project, as required by Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, discussed in Section IV.E, Transportation, p. IV.E.69. Compliance with the CTMP would ensure that access to educational programs on Treasure Island and access to schools located off the Islands by Island residents is not obstructed during construction activities. Thus, construction impacts to the schools and educational programs would be considered less than significant.

Operational Impacts

Impact PS-8: Implementation of the Proposed Project would increase demand for school services that would result in the need to construct new school facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Unified School District. (Less than Significant)

The Proposed Project would renovate and expand or construct a new school of up to 105,000 square feet at the site of the existing 30,000-square-foot Treasure Island School to serve the future school age children who would reside on the Islands. Assuming 8,000 housing units, the SFUSD expects about 1,695 students would live on the Islands. The new school would likely serve pre-
kindergarten (preschool), elementary, and middle school students;\(^{25}\) high school students would most likely continue to attend schools in other parts of San Francisco.\(^{26}\) For planning purposes, about 48 preschool aged children were estimated.\(^{27}\) The remaining 1,647 students were distributed evenly by grade. As shown in Table IV.L.1, a total of approximately 1,695 school-age children would live on the Islands following full build-out of the Project. As of 2009, approximately 320 students live on the Islands.\(^{28}\)

Table IV.L.1 presents the student enrollment that would likely be generated as a result of the Proposed Project, based on generation rates used by the SFUSD.\(^{29}\) While 26 percent of the total school-age children in San Francisco now attend private schools, Table IV.L.1 conservatively assumes that 100 percent of the school-age children associated with the Proposed Project would attend public schools.

Comparing the 2008 SFUSD school capacity of 63,835 to a projected 2030 school population of 71,573 school age students, there would be a future shortfall of about 7,738 places, or about a 12 percent shortfall. The proposed Treasure Island School would help alleviate this shortfall by providing room for about 2,000 additional elementary and middle school students. The projected 520 high school students on the Islands would need to travel to existing or future SFUSD facilities off the Islands, the effects of which are considered in Section IV.E, Transportation. Currently, high school assignment in SFUSD is undertaken in a complex lottery process, with busing provided in certain areas. Future students on the Islands would be expected to use a variety of modes of travel to school, including cars, mass transit, and school buses.

\(^{25}\) As explained in note 3 to Table IV.L.1, the capacity of the renovated or constructed Treasure Island School was based on a combined elementary and middle school, both of average size within the SFUSD. If the Treasure Island School is built to this size, then it is expected that SFUSD would bus other San Francisco elementary and middle school students to the Treasure Island School.

\(^{26}\) Letter of Carlos Garcia, Superintendent of Schools, SFUSD, of August 3, 2009. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.

\(^{27}\) Factor is based on the 2010 SFUSD Child Development Center (CDC) enrollment of 1,559 students, or about 2.86 percent of total 2010 SFUSD student enrollment. (1,695 students x 0.0286 = about 48 preschool aged students.)

\(^{28}\) Data is from 2008-2009 school year. On the Islands, there are 131 high school students (personal communication w/ Michael Tymoff, Mayor's Office of Work Force and Economic Development, May 27, 2010), 127 elementary school students, and 62 middle school students (elementary and middle school numbers for 2008 school year found in http://portal.sfusd.edu/data/epc/Comparison%20of%20student%20residences%20with%20location%20of%20school%20attended.pdf, accessed June 2, 2010)

\(^{29}\) Letter of Carlos Garcia, Superintendent of Schools, SFUSD, of August 3, 2009. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
Table IV.L.1: Public School Enrollment at Project Buildout Compared to SFUSD Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Preschool / Elementary School (Grades Preschool-5)</th>
<th>Middle School (Grades 6-8)</th>
<th>High School (Grades 9-12)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Area (estimated)</td>
<td>808</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Citywide Enrollment¹</td>
<td>33,036</td>
<td>16,518</td>
<td>22,024</td>
<td>71,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009 SFUSD Capacity</td>
<td>29,260</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>17,575</td>
<td>63,835²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030 Projected Shortfall</td>
<td>3,776</td>
<td>4,818</td>
<td>4,449</td>
<td>7,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Treasure Island School Capacity³</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
¹ Categories may not add up to total due to rounding.
² Total includes capacity for 5,300 students in varying grade levels in alternative schools and public charter schools.
³ Based on combined average size of elementary and middle schools within SFUSD. See Comparison of Number of Students Living in Each SF City Planning Neighborhood with Elementary and Middle School Capacity, found at http://portal.sfusd.edu/data/epc/Comparison%20of%20Number%20of%20Students%20Living%20in%20Each%20SF%20City%20Planning%20Nhood.pdf, accessed June 20, 2010.


As discussed in the Setting section, improvements are planned for many SFUSD schools, including replacing older schools and modernizing other facilities. The San Francisco Unified School District Capital Plan identifies a range of physical improvements necessary to modernize existing facilities, such as providing access compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act, upgrading science and computer labs, expanding arts facilities, among other improvements. Those improvements will improve accessibility, add new laboratories, provide better access to computing technology, and provide other advantages over existing facilities. The proposed Treasure Island School would provide elementary and middle school capacity, but would not provide facilities for the additional 520 high school students generated by the Proposed Project. To accommodate these high school students, SFUSD would use the allocation system in place at the time to place students in existing high schools.

Increased enrollment resulting in school overcrowding is considered to be a social, rather than a physical, environmental impact and would not be a significant environmental impact requiring mitigation under CEQA.³⁰ However, increased enrollment may lead to a secondary physical environmental impact if the increase in enrollment would require physical changes in the environment, such as constructing a new school, changing bus routes, and altering traffic patterns. California Government Code Sections 65995 and 65996 limit the ability of cities to mitigate

school impacts. Pursuant to these sections, a lead agency is required to mitigate school impacts beyond State-mandated fees only when a physical environmental effect beyond the mere addition of students to a school occurs. Residential growth in the City would be addressed by SB 50 fees, and these fees may increase school capacity by the time students are living in the Proposed Project’s residential units. In addition, the Proposed Project is expected to include a new or rehabilitated Treasure Island School, to partially address the expected Citywide shortfall. 31

SFUSD could also choose to address future shortfalls by shifting students to other facilities, beginning year-round schools, and/or increasing the use of portable classrooms. While the new or rehabilitated Treasure Island School would be included in the Proposed Project, the capacity of that facility would not be sufficient to meet the City’s expected future overcapacity problem resulting from citywide population growth. The school impact fees paid pursuant to SB 50 would improve school capacity to accommodate growth in school attendance.

Therefore, the Treasure Island school included in the Proposed Project, plus payment of the school impact fees as required by SB 50, would ensure that future facilities are provided. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

Although the Proposed Project would require renovating or rebuilding the Treasure Island School to maintain acceptable staffing ratios, prevent overcrowding or to meet other performance objectives for school services, potential impacts associated with the renovation or construction of the new school have been addressed in this EIR as discussed under Impact PS-5 above.

Implementation of the Proposed Project would not have significant impacts on schools and educational programs currently located on the Treasure Island School site that would result in the need for new construction or expansion of existing facilities. All of these educational uses would be eligible to seek leased space in the community facility spaces that would be included in the Proposed Project. The Treasure Island School would be rebuilt or renovated in Phase 2 of construction. At the time of Phase 2 construction, educational uses located on the school site would be required to relocate. The Life Learning Academy and the Treasure Island Clubhouse of the Boys & Girls Clubs of San Francisco are expected to remain on the Islands and transition to other Island facilities. Other educational programs operated by community organizations and the San Francisco Police Department are on one-year leases and would either relocate off-site or lease space in the community facilities included in the Proposed Project. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project, which would include rebuilding or renovation of the Treasure Island School, would not require construction of new or expanded governmental school

31 Even though the expected capacity of 2,000 students exceeds the number of students expected to live in the Proposed Project (1,695), an estimated 520 of those students in the Proposed Project would be high school students, who could not be accommodated at the Treasure Island School and would contribute to the districtwide shortfall.
facilities to accommodate existing schools on the Islands or elsewhere, and would result in less-than-significant environmental impacts on schools.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact PS-9: The Proposed Project cumulative contribution would not result in additional demand for educational facilities (Less than Significant)

Cumulative impacts on schools could result if the demand created by the Proposed Project, when combined with other proposed projects or existing conditions, required physical environmental changes such that the construction of additional school facilities in and of themselves would cause significant environmental impacts.

The two projects expected to occur in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, the Ramps Project and the expanded 400-slip marina at Clipper Cove, would not have a substantial impact on the public services in the vicinity. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impacts on schools as a result of these projects. The cumulative transportation effects of these two projects are analyzed in Section IV.E, Transportation.

The Proposed Project would contribute to the demand for educational facilities in San Francisco generated by population growth, including that from other large proposed developments at Parkmerced in the southwest quadrant of the city and Hunters Point and Candlestick Point in the southeast quadrant of the city. Increased demand for schools generated by the Proposed Project would be partially offset by the rehabilitation or construction of the Treasure Island School. Additionally, under SB 50 and Government Code Section 65996, the payment of development fees by the Project Sponsors is deemed “full and complete school facilities mitigation” for the additional demand created by development. Thus, the Proposed Project's impacts on schools would not be cumulatively considerable and would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required.

L.4 HOSPITALS

SETTING

As shown in Figure IV.L.1, p. IV.L.2, there are no hospitals on the Islands. The City and County of San Francisco, Department of Public Health (“DPH”), operates San Francisco General Hospital (“SFGH”) and has programs to provide medical care to all its citizens, including residents of the Islands. DPH also provides a number of public medical clinics throughout the City.32 These public clinics are all City-run facilities where primary care can be received;

32 These include the Castro-Mission Health Center, the Children's Health Center at SFGH, the Chinatown Health Center, the Curry Senior Center, the Family Health Center at SFGH, the General Medical Clinic
none are located on the Islands. In addition, the City has affiliated with various other facilities to provide primary health care; none of these facilities are located on the Islands.  

San Francisco has seven privately-run hospital systems providing inpatient care. Three of these hospital systems—California Pacific Medical Center (“CPMC”), Kaiser Permanente (“Kaiser”), and University of California, San Francisco (“UCSF”) Medical Center—operate hospital facilities at more than one location. St. Francis Memorial and St. Mary’s Medical Center are separate facilities, and are both part of the Catholic Healthcare West system.

In 2006, according to the latest data available from the Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development, San Francisco hospitals (excluding the Veterans Affairs Medical Center) had a total of 2,736 staffed inpatient beds, of which 1,961 were in use on average. CPMC had about one-third of the City’s daily hospital census; UCSF maintained approximately one-quarter, and San Francisco General Hospital another 19 percent. Thus, there are more hospital beds in San Francisco than patients.

SFGH provides a full complement of inpatient, outpatient, emergency, skilled nursing, diagnostic, mental health, and rehabilitation services for adults and children. It is the largest acute inpatient and rehabilitation hospital for psychiatric patients in the City. Additionally, it is the only acute hospital in San Francisco that provides 24-hour psychiatric emergency services and operates the only Trauma Center (Level 1) for the 1.5 million residents of San Francisco and northern San Mateo County. Because of this, ambulances are likely to bring those injured on the Islands to SFGH for emergency medical care. Currently, 30 percent of all ambulances within San Francisco go to SFGH, and 20 percent of all hospital patients are treated there. SFGH is located at 1001 Potrero Avenue, approximately 7 miles from the Islands. As part of its Rebuild Program, SFGH is currently constructing a new, approximately 422,144 gross-square-foot, 284-bed (increase of

33 These include Glide Health Services, Haight Ashbury Free Clinics, Lyon-Martin Women's Health Services, Mission Neighborhood Health Center, Native American Health Center, North East Medical Services, San Francisco Community Clinic Consortium, San Francisco Free Clinic, South of Market Health Center, and St. Anthony Free Clinic.
34 The City and County of San Francisco also operates Laguna Honda Hospital to provide long-term care, rehabilitation, and skilled nursing services to adult residents of San Francisco who are disabled or chronically ill. Laguna Honda does not provide inpatient services.
36 CPMC IMP, p. 11.
32 beds), acute care hospital and trauma center that will be completed in 2015 at its current location.  

For non-trauma-related care, residents of the Islands would likely use one of several private hospitals in San Francisco, such as Chinese Hospital (845 Jackson Street, about 5 miles from the Islands), St. Francis Memorial Hospital (900 Hyde Street, about 7.5 miles from the Islands), CPMC’s Pacific Campus (2333 Buchanan, about 8 miles from the Islands), Kaiser’s Geary Campus (2425 Geary Boulevard, about 8.5 miles from the Islands), or Island residents could use hospitals in Oakland, such as Children’s Hospital (5.6 miles from the Islands) or Kaiser Permanente Medical Center of Oakland (6 miles from the Islands). Once completed, the UCSF Mission Bay Hospital would be about 6 miles away from the Islands. There is also a proposal for a new California Pacific Medical Center hospital on Cathedral Hill, which is about 8 miles from the Islands.

**IMPACTS**

**Significance Criteria**

The City and County of San Francisco has not formally adopted significance thresholds for impacts related to hospital services. The Planning Department Initial Study Checklist from provides a framework of topics to be considered in evaluating potential impacts under CEQA. Implementation of a project could have a potentially significant impact related to hospital services if it were to:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, [or the] need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Health Department.

**Approach to Analysis**

Impacts on hospitals would be considered significant if an increase in population or development levels as a result of the Proposed Project would result in inadequate staffing levels, increased morbidity and mortality rates, and/or increased demand for services requiring the construction or expansion of new or altered facilities that could have an adverse physical effect on the environment. Thus, a significant impact would occur if the existing and projected hospitals could not accommodate the additional demand created by the Proposed Project, and a new facility would have to be constructed or an existing facility expanded, resulting in significant physical impacts. Additionally, the Proposed Project’s potential contribution to cumulative impacts is

---

evaluated in the context of existing, proposed, and reasonably foreseeable future development expected in the vicinity of the Proposed Project.

**Project Impacts**

**Construction Impacts**

**Impact PS-10:** Project construction would not result in adverse physical impacts or in the need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain adequate staffing levels, acceptable morbidity and mortality rates, or other performance objectives for hospital services. *(Less than Significant)*

There would be no hospital-related construction impacts, because project-related construction activities would not affect any existing hospital facilities. Although construction activities associated with the Proposed Project could result in injuries requiring use of hospital facilities, the increase in demand would be well within the capacity of existing local hospitals in San Francisco and Oakland. Construction would not prevent access to existing hospitals, as access would maintained through compliance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan prepared for the Project, as required by Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, discussed in Section IV.E, Transportation, p. IV.E.69. Compliance with the CTMP would require that access to hospitals is not inhibited during construction activities. Thus, construction impacts to hospitals would be considered less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

**Operational Impacts**

**Impact PS-11:** Implementation of the Proposed Project would not increase demand for hospital services that would result in the need to construct new hospital facilities in order to maintain adequate staffing levels, acceptable morbidity and mortality rates, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Health Department. *(No Impact)*

While there are no studies or numerical measures to determine whether a city has sufficient hospital coverage, there are more staffed hospital beds in San Francisco than patients. Of the 2,376 staffed hospital beds in the City, an average of 1,961 beds are in use on any given day. Because there is sufficient capacity at existing and proposed hospitals, the addition of new residents or employees on the Islands who would be potential patients would not be sufficient to require the construction of new or expanded hospital facilities in San Francisco. Thus, the addition of 18,640 persons on the Islands would not create a significant impact on hospital service, and no mitigation is required.
Cumulative Impacts

Impact PS-12: The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution would not increase demand for hospital services that would result in the need to construct new hospital facilities in order to maintain adequate staffing levels, acceptable morbidity and mortality rates, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Health Department. (No Impact)

Cumulative impacts on hospital care would result if demand created by the Proposed Project, added to demand from other proposed development projects, were to require the construction of additional hospital facilities. The two projects expected to occur in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, the Ramps Project and the expanded 400-slip marina at Clipper Cove, would not have a substantial impact on the public services in the vicinity. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impacts on hospitals as a result of these projects. Reasonably foreseeable future development projects within the City, including growth in the southeast and southwest quadrants at Hunters Point/Candlestick Point and at Parkmerced, would increase the City’s resident population in 2030 to about 922,600, \(^{38}\) of which the Proposed Project would constitute 2 percent, resulting in increased demand for hospital and other medical resources.

The Proposed Project and the reasonably foreseeable development projects would add to the demand on hospital facilities in San Francisco and Oakland. However, the capacity of existing and planned hospital facilities in San Francisco is greater than the current demand. Thus, the additional demand would be met, and the Proposed Project would not result in considerable cumulative impacts on hospital services that would require the need to construct other new or expanded hospital facilities.

L.5 LIBRARIES

SETTING

The San Francisco Public Library (“SFPL”) operates the Main Library at Civic Center and 28 neighborhood branches distributed throughout San Francisco. During the 2007–2008 fiscal year, the main library had a collection of about 1.3 million volumes\(^{39}\) and, combined, all of the branch libraries had a collection of 1,203,126 volumes, for a SFPL total of 2,500,979 volumes.\(^{40}\) Community-based branch libraries, as well as the Main Library, provide reading rooms, book lending, information services, access to technology, and library-sponsored public programs. Most branches offer an event almost every day, often for pre-school and elementary school

---

\(^{38}\) The basis for population projections is discussed in Section IV.C, Population and Housing, p. IV.C.2.


\(^{40}\) San Francisco Public Library Collection Size Fact Sheet. A copy of this document is available for public review at the San Francisco Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, in Case File No. 2007.0903E.
All SFPL branch libraries offer books at adult, teen, and children’s reading levels. Basic collections consist of fiction, nonfiction, and reference books; magazines; newspapers; audio books; CDs; and DVDs. If specific materials are not available at a SFPL branch, items may be obtained electronically through the library’s ebook system, or through interlibrary loan.\textsuperscript{41} Interlibrary loan involves loaning items from various libraries and institutions in North America that agree to loan items to one another.\textsuperscript{42} Most of SFPL’s collection of electronic resources is accessible from all branch locations and online 24 hours a day at the SFPL website.

As shown in Figure IV.L.1, p. IV.L.2 and described in Table IV.L.2: Library Branches Near the Islands, there are four branch libraries within a 6-mile radius of the Islands: the Chinatown Branch, Mission Bay Branch, the Main Library, and the North Beach Branch. In addition, residents of the Islands may consider using libraries in the East Bay, including the main Oakland Library at 125 14th Street (about 9 miles away), and the Berkeley City Library at 2090 Kittredge (about 10 miles away).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Distance from Islands</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Size of Library in Square Feet (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinatown</td>
<td>1135 Powell St.</td>
<td>5.5 miles</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>17,858 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Beach</td>
<td>2000 Mason St.</td>
<td>6 miles</td>
<td>Open; new library in design stage</td>
<td>5,330 SF (current)\textsuperscript{1} 8,500 SF (proposed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission Bay</td>
<td>960 4th St.</td>
<td>5 miles</td>
<td>Opened 2009</td>
<td>7,500 SF\textsuperscript{2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Library</td>
<td>100 Larkin</td>
<td>5.4 miles</td>
<td>Open</td>
<td>375,000 SF\textsuperscript{3}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Source: Email from Brian Bannon, San Francisco Public Library, June 11, 2010, available as part of the project file in the San Francisco Planning Department, 650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, file 2007.0903E.

The Chinatown library offers the largest public collection in Northern California of Chinese language materials and English books on Asian interest topics, as well as a sizable number of materials in Vietnamese. Twice the size of the original library built in 1921, the branch holds more than 90,000 books, periodicals, newspapers, video and audio media. An extensive file is also maintained of pamphlets, newspaper and magazine articles on Chinatown's history and issues.

of concern to the Chinese and Asian American community. A new community meeting room and roof garden are available for public use, by reservation. The Children's department has more than 25,000 English and Chinese picture stories, fiction, non-fiction and general reference materials, periodicals, video and audio cassettes, computers, board games, plus books in 15 other languages. There is also a storytelling room and a computer lab with software in English and Chinese. Bilingual staff members are available to assist patrons.43

The Mission Bay Branch Library has a medium-size collection of Chinese-language materials, a small collection of Russian language materials, and a small collection of Spanish language materials.

The Main Library has multiple collections in many different languages and houses the African-American Center; the Art, Music, and Recreation Center; the Chinese Center; the Deaf Services Center; the Environmental Center; the Government Information Center; the Filipino American Center; the Gay and Lesbian Center; the International Center; the Jobs and Careers Center; the Magazines and Newspapers Center; the Patent and Trademark Center; the San Francisco History Center; the Small Business Center; and the Teen Center. The Main Library also has the Koret Auditorium which holds 235 people; a café; and the typewriter room.

The existing North Beach Branch Library is being redesigned as part of the Branch Library Improvement Program (“BLIP”), discussed below.

In 1994, San Francisco voters passed Proposition E, a Charter amendment that created the Library Preservation Fund. This measure established a dedicated fund to be used to provide library services and materials, as well as to operate library facilities. Proposition E requires the City to maintain funding for the San Francisco Public Library at a level no lower than the amount it spent during the 1992–1993 fiscal year. Voters renewed the Library Preservation Fund in November 2007 (Proposition D).

Branch Library Improvement Program

The Branch Library Improvement Program was launched as a result of a bond measure passed in November 2000 to provide $106 million in funding to upgrade San Francisco’s branch library system, and Proposition D, which passed in November 2007, authorizing additional funding to improve the branches. The BLIP is intended to provide the public with seismically safe, accessible, technologically updated, and code-compliant City-owned branch libraries in every neighborhood.44 Improvements to be made at each branch were determined through the

preparation of a Community Needs Assessment for each branch, with public meetings, community surveys, and outreach to neighborhood organizations.

Design options, such as public meeting rooms, more computers, separate teen facilities, child and adult reading areas, and other library services, were considered. Choices about each branch reflect its budget (which is fixed), input from staff, and input from the neighborhood, in part through community meetings to discuss services and architectural plans.

The SFPL has implemented a number of interim programs to serve the public while branches are closed for renovation or replacement. These include increasing hours at nearby branches, holding programs at neighborhood schools and community centers, and offering bookmobile services.

New library branches have since been constructed or are currently being constructed. The new one-story, 6,300-square-foot Mission Bay branch opened in February 2009. The branch opened with a collection of 34,000 items and has room to grow by an additional 10 percent to 15 percent. Construction of the new Visitacion Valley branch began in summer 2007 and is scheduled to be completed in 2010. The North Beach Branch redesign was also authorized under Proposition D. Under Proposition D, the North Beach project budget was increased from $3.7 million to between $7.6 and $8.4 million, and the project scope was expanded from a renovation to a brand new building. The SFPL also undertook a Master Planning process for the adjacent park, in conjunction with the Recreation & Park Department, with the goal of deciding where in relation to the park the new larger library should be located. Three community meetings were held (July 2003, December 2008, and February 2009), plus an additional three public meetings in 2008 and 2009, followed by design presentations in late 2008 and in 2009. The redesign process is underway, and as the design process moves forward, the Library will hold additional community meetings.45

Regulatory Framework

Local

San Francisco Public Library Strategic Plan (2003–2006)

The SFPL Strategic Plan was adopted in 2003 and is the guiding policy and planning document for the SFPL. The SFPL Strategic Plan does not set a standard for library service. Instead, each library must evaluate how it may best meet the needs of the community. To this end, the SFPL has developed the Strategic Plan, which provides every library facility and program with a unifying organizational vision and systemwide goals. These goals are broad and flexible so that services can be tailored to the unique needs of each neighborhood.

IMPLICATIONS

Significance Criteria

The City and County of San Francisco has not formally adopted significance thresholds for impacts related to library services. The Planning Department Initial Study Checklist form provides a framework of topics to be considered in evaluating potential impacts under CEQA. Implementation of a project could have potentially significant impacts related to library services if it were to:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, [or the] need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable levels of service or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Library system.

Approach to Analysis

Impacts on library services are considered significant if an increase in population or development levels would result in an increased demand for library services that would require the need for new or physically altered library facilities in order to maintain acceptable levels of service, the construction of which could result in substantial adverse environmental effects. Additionally, the Proposed Project's potential contribution to cumulative library impacts is evaluated.

Project Impacts

Construction Impacts

Impact PS-13: Project construction would not result in adverse physical impacts or in the need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service objectives for library services. (No Impact)

Construction of the Proposed Project would not result in impacts on the San Francisco Public Library system, as the construction itself would not result in an increase in population requiring library services. No library branches are located on the Islands. All existing library services in San Francisco would continue to be available to existing Island residents throughout the duration of project construction, as under current conditions. Construction would not prevent access to existing libraries located off-site, as access would maintained through compliance with the Construction Traffic Management Plan prepared for the Project, as required by Mitigation Measure M-TR-1, discussed in Section IV.E, Transportation, p. IV.E.69. Compliance with the CTMP would ensure that access on and off the Islands is not obstructed during construction activities. Thus, there would be no construction-related impacts to libraries and no mitigation is required.
Operational Impacts

Impact PS-14: Implementation of the Proposed Project would not increase demand for library services to a level that would result in the need to construct new library facilities in order to maintain acceptable levels of service, or other performance objectives of the San Francisco Public Library system. (Less than Significant)

Residential and nonresidential development associated with the Proposed Project would increase demand for local library services within the Development Plan Area. The Proposed Project would result in a total of about 18,640 future residents. ABAG’s Projections 2007 estimates that the City will gain about 113,900 persons between 2010 and 2030. Though population increase on the Islands would be substantial from a localized perspective, population growth due to implementation of the Proposed Project would represent about 16 percent of Citywide population growth (113,900 persons) expected by 2030. The residential population expected on the Islands in 2030, about 18,640, would represent about 2 percent of the expected San Francisco population in 2030, which would be 922,600. (See Section IV.C, Population and Housing.) Although the Proposed Project would result in a population increase within the Development Plan Area, existing library branches, including the new Mission Bay branch (opened in 2009), the North Beach branch soon to be reconstructed, and the Main Library, would meet the demand for library services generated by the Proposed Project, and would not require construction of new or expanded library facilities beyond those already proposed or under construction under the Branch Library Improvement Program.

Thus, the new, existing, and rebuilt SFPL branches would accommodate increased demand from the Proposed Project, and no additional library facilities would be required. Impacts on library services would be less than significant, and no mitigation is required.

Cumulative Impacts

Impact PS-15: The Proposed Project’s cumulative contribution would not increase demand for library services that would result in the need to construct new library facilities in order to maintain acceptable levels of service, performance objectives, or need to construct new or physically altered facilities in order to maintain acceptable service objectives. (No Impact)

The geographic context for the analysis of cumulative impacts associated with libraries is the City and County of San Francisco. The existing library services in the City are described in the Setting section, p. IV.L.33, representing the baseline conditions for evaluation of cumulative impacts. Reasonably foreseeable future development forecasts are based on projections of future growth and take into account projects going through the entitlement process. The City of San Francisco provides public services within the City’s boundaries. The BLIP, launched as a result of a 2000 bond measure, included plans for construction of eight new library branches. The BLIP
includes completion of a Community Needs Assessment for each branch, with public meetings, community surveys, and outreach to neighborhood organizations. Most branch libraries in the City are currently being renovated, or are planned for future renovation, under the BLIP program. As stated in the SFPL Strategic Plan, there is no City standard for library service and each branch library must evaluate how it may best meet the needs of the community. To this end, the SFPL has developed the Strategic Plan, which provides every library facility and program with a unifying organizational vision and systemwide goals.

The two projects expected to occur in the vicinity of the Proposed Project, the Ramps Project and the expanded 400-slip marina at Clipper Cove, would not have a substantial impact on the public services in the vicinity. Therefore, there would be no significant cumulative impacts on libraries as a result of these projects.

Reasonably foreseeable future development projects within the City, including growth in the southeast and southwest quadrants at Hunters Point/Candlestick Point and at Parkmerced, would increase the City’s resident population in 2030 to 922,600,\(^{46}\) of which the Proposed Project would constitute 2 percent, resulting in increased demand on public library resources. All cumulative projects would be expected to be considered during development of renovation planning for individual branches. Therefore, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Project would have considerable cumulative impacts on the demand for library services that would require construction of new or expanded library facilities beyond those already proposed or under construction under the Branch Library Improvement Program. The Proposed Project would not result in a significant cumulative impact to library service, and no mitigation would be required.

---

\(^{46}\) The basis for population projections is discussed in Section IV.C, Population and Housing, p. IV.C.2.