

3.3 COMMUNITY SERVICES

This section describes the existing physical affected environment and regulatory framework related to fire protection/emergency medical services, public safety, law enforcement services, and parks and recreation and discusses the potential effects of the EIS Alternatives related to these community services.

3.3.1 Affected Environment

This section describes law enforcement, fire protection, and parks/recreational conditions in the immediate vicinity of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus and in the Mission Bay area of San Francisco. Other public services, including solid waste disposal, are discussed in Section 3.12, “Solid and Hazardous Materials and Hazards.”

Fire Protection Services and Emergency Medical Services

The San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) provides fire suppression services and emergency medical services throughout San Francisco. SFFD operates out of 44 fire stations and is headquartered at 698 Second Street in the South of Market Area (SOMA). SFFD operates 42 engines, 19 trucks, multiple ambulances, two heavy-rescue squads, two fireboats, and multiple special-purpose units. Emergency response operations include fire suppression, tactical rescues, emergency medical care, fire prevention, arson investigations, responses to natural disasters, responses to mass-casualty and hazardous-materials incidents, and fire and emergency medical services (EMS) dispatch supervision. SFFD has a current staff of 1,571 uniformed members and 64 civilians. The daily operational strength is approximately 412 staff members (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011). Based on San Francisco’s estimated 2010 population of 856,095 residents (DOF, 2010), SFFD’s staffing levels on a per-capita basis are 1.9 staff members per 1,000 residents.

SFFD has three divisions: the Airport Division (serving San Francisco International Airport) and Divisions 2 and 3 (serving the rest of San Francisco). Division 2 is divided into four battalions and extends from downtown San Francisco and the Financial District to the city’s northwestern boundaries. Division 3 is divided into five battalions that serve an area extending from SOMA to the southwestern city limits. The roles and responsibilities of the members of Divisions 2 and 3 are to establish command and control at emergency scenes, conduct fire suppression activities, provide emergency medical services, manage disaster operations, mitigate the effects of hazardous-materials spills, respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction, and effectively and rapidly bring closure to mass-casualty incidents. Fire prevention responsibilities consist of preplanning and inspections of buildings, fire protection devices, and water supplies. San Francisco ensures fire safety and emergency accessibility in new and existing developments through provisions of its building and fire codes (CCSF, 2010).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

SFFD responds to fire, EMS, and other emergency calls at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. As a primary and specialty acute-care center, the Campus provides limited emergency medical service because it lacks a fully licensed emergency room. The Campus is located within the Division 2 service area in San Francisco’s outer Richmond District neighborhood. The Campus is in the first-alarm area¹ for the following stations: Station

¹ The first alarm is the geographic area in which a station is responsible for arriving first in case of an emergency call.

34 (Battalion 7), Station 14 (Battalion 7), and Station 23 (Battalion 8). Station 34, the nearest fire station, is located at 499 41st Avenue, approximately 0.3 mile southeast of the Campus. Station 34 houses an engine company that is staffed by one officer (a lieutenant or captain) and three firefighters, all of whom are qualified as emergency medical technicians (EMTs).² Station 14, located at 551 26th Avenue, is 1.2 miles southeast of the Campus and houses one fire engine and one truck. Staffing includes two officers and seven firefighters for a total of nine staff members, all of whom are EMT qualified. Station 23, located at 1348 45th Avenue, is located approximately 2.1 miles south of the Campus and houses an engine company that is staffed by one officer (a lieutenant or captain) and three firefighters. All three firefighters are EMT qualified.

If additional fire resources are necessary, Station 31, located at 441 12th Avenue, would also be dispatched to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. Station 31 (Battalion 7) is situated approximately 2 miles east of the Campus and houses an engine company. Staffing includes one officer and three firefighters as well as a rescue captain (paramedic supervisor) and a battalion chief (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011).

SFFD also transports clinically stable patients to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus upon request (Myers, pers. comm., 2011). The primary entrance for emergency medical vehicles is at the intersection of 42nd Avenue and Clement Street. Patients are delivered to the west side of Building 200 (the Ambulatory Care Center) via an internal Campus roadway, Fort Miley Circle (VA, 2012). As indicated previously, the Campus is a primary and specialty acute-care center that provides limited emergency medical service because it lacks a fully licensed emergency room. The Campus does not receive a high number of ambulance transports compared to the other hospitals in San Francisco, and most are not considered life-threatening emergencies (Myers, pers. comm., 2011). According to SFFD, the Campus received 756 transports in 2010 and 561 transports in 2009. SFFD can expect to have an average of 650 transports to the Campus per year (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011).

According to the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is not designated as a “Community at Risk” of wildfire because it is an urbanized area; therefore, the Campus is not considered susceptible to wildland fires (ABAG, 2015a). In addition, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) has ranked the Campus as having “little to no threat” of fire susceptibility, based on expected fire behavior and according to site-specific topography and vegetation (ABAG, 2015b). Furthermore, CAL FIRE has no record of any wildfire in San Francisco (CCSF, 2009).

Mission Bay Area

Three SFFD stations operate in the Mission Bay area of San Francisco (see Figure 2-5 in Chapter 2.0, “Alternatives”). All three stations are located within the Division 3 service area, which extends from SOMA to the southwestern city limits.

Station 8 (Battalion 3) is located in SOMA at 36 Bluxome Street and houses one fire engine and one truck. Staffing includes a battalion chief, two officers, and seven firefighters, all of whom are EMT qualified. Station 29 (Battalion 2) is located in SOMA at 299 Vermont Street and houses one engine company. Staffing includes one officer and three firefighters, all of whom are EMT qualified. Station 37 (Battalion 10) is located in the Potrero Hill neighborhood at 798 Wisconsin Street and houses one engine company. Staffing includes one officer and three firefighters, all of whom are EMT qualified (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011).

² On any given day one of the EMT qualified personnel may be a paramedic (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011).

A fourth station is being incorporated into the Public Safety Building at Third Street and Mission Rock. As of the writing of this document, construction is near completion with a targeted opening by early 2015 (DPW, 2014).

According to ABAG, the Mission Bay area is designated as an urbanized area; therefore, this area is not considered susceptible to wildland fires (ABAG, 2015a). In addition, CAL FIRE has ranked the area as having “little to no threat” of fire susceptibility, based on expected fire behavior and according to site-specific topography and vegetation (ABAG, 2015b).

Fire Water Needs and Fire Truck Access

The San Francisco Water Department supplies water for the city’s domestic and industrial water needs and for fire service. Fire service requirements include not only the water supplied to SFFD’s low-pressure hydrants but also the water supplied to the storage reservoir and tanks of SFFD’s high-pressure system. This system, also known as the Auxiliary Water Supply System, is a separate and distinct water supply for fire protection use only. The system was built in response to the 1906 earthquake and fire, solely for the purpose of firefighting, and has special features designed to protect the city in emergency situations. Additionally, a separate backup water supply is provided in the form of underground cisterns strategically located throughout San Francisco. SFFD’s cistern system consists of 172 cisterns with a total storage capacity of approximately 11 million gallons (CCSF, 2010).

SFFD has established required minimum street widths to facilitate access by emergency equipment. The San Francisco Fire Code requires a minimum of 20 feet of unobstructed roadway and a vertical clearance of no less than 13.5 feet, and specifies that a turnaround area of at least 80 feet and a 40-foot radius are sufficient for dead-end fire access roads exceeding 150 feet. All site improvements must meet the minimum requirements for fire access stipulated in the San Francisco Fire Code and required by SFFD (SFFD, 2011a).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

The domestic and fire water needs of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus are served by a common water system. The system consists of a 500,000-gallon reservoir located in Building 29; a primary pump (P-1), secondary pump (P-2), and fire pump (P-3) located in Building 30 (pump station); and a 40,000-gallon water tower (Building 206). The reservoir is fed from the City’s water distribution system through primary and secondary connection points located on Clement Street. From the reservoir, the primary and secondary pumps (P-1 and P-2) pressurize the Campus’s loop water system and feed the water tower. The water tower back-feeds the distribution system when the pumps are not running.

Annex H of the 2009 National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Fire Code provides the required minimum fire flow rate and duration for all new buildings or building upgrades. These requirements are based on the type of building construction and the total building area in square feet. The minimum required fire flow for any building type or size is 1,500 gallons per minute for a minimum of 2 hours, with a minimum system residual pressure of no less than 20 pounds per square inch. A reduction in the required fire flow rate of up to 75 percent, as approved by the local fire chief, and not less than 1,000 gallons per minute is allowed if each new building is equipped with an approved automatic sprinkler system installed in accordance with the applicable building and fire code requirements (Kennedy, pers. comm., 2011).

The Campus's existing fire flow system has sufficient capacity to meet NFPA Fire Code requirements (Kennedy, pers. comm., 2011).

Fire access is provided to each building on the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus via Fort Miley Circle and Veterans Drive, which together form an access loop around the perimeter and through the center of the Campus. Emergency fire apparatus and related vehicles use the 42nd Avenue or 43rd Avenue entrance to the Campus. Although the Campus provides limited emergency medical service, Building 200 is the Ambulatory Care Center and the current destination of emergency medical vehicles to the Campus. Patients are delivered to the west side of Building 200 via Fort Miley Circle. The primary entrance for emergency medical vehicles is at the intersection of 42nd Avenue and Clement Street.

Emergency Response Times

SFFD is a permitted ambulance provider in San Francisco providing EMS care for the full spectrum of medical emergencies. The department follows the local ambulance ordinance and adheres to the policies and protocols for pre-hospital care set by the San Francisco Emergency Medical Services Agency. SFFD responds to an average of more than 73,000 EMS calls per year (more than 200 per day) and, as of 2010, provided about 80 percent of the ambulance response in San Francisco (SFFD, 2011b).

To bring a higher level of care to patients more quickly, SFFD reconfigured ambulance deployment in 2004. As part of the reconfiguration, ambulances were moved to geographically relevant locations, and ambulance scheduling was adjusted to accommodate the busiest times of day. The new deployment, which was completed in 2009, benefited SFFD by providing flexibility of scheduling, increased efficiency, and improved response times, creating a more mobile response force to cover its service area. SFFD is working closely with the San Francisco Department of Emergency Management to explore new ways to further reduce response times and improve efficiency (SFFD, 2011b).

According to SFFD, any single-alarm response³ brings the four closest available fire engines, the two closest available fire trucks, and the closest available heavy-rescue squad. Each vehicle is typically staffed by at least one officer and three to four firefighters. Some of the firefighters may be licensed paramedics, but that is not always the case. An ambulance carrying two paramedics and one paramedic rescue captain would also be dispatched to the scene. This response scenario is the *initial* dispatch (first response) to any confirmed working fire, regardless of the size of the fire. If the magnitude of the fire is found to require more resources, a second-alarm response (i.e., more fire trucks and/or engines) would be dispatched to the scene, as would be the case in a high-rise building. The responding units are from the nearest and available stations (assuming that all engines and trucks are available and not responding to calls somewhere else). Because four engines respond to a fire, a minimum of four stations would receive a dispatch for a single fire incident. Chief officers from various stations may be dispatched as well.

³ A single-alarm response is defined as the initial response to a confirmed working fire or reports of smoke.

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

All emergency (911) and nonemergency calls for police, fire, and medical services are received by San Francisco's Emergency Communications Dispatch Center located at 1011 Turk Street. The 911 dispatch center receives approximately 2,500 calls per day; of these calls, 80 percent require police services, 14 percent involve EMS, and the remaining 6 percent require fire protection (CCSF, 2010). Based on this information, the dispatch center receives approximately 912,500 calls per year, of which 182,500 are related to EMS or fire.

Table 3.3-1 provides a breakdown of the annual number of calls responding to SFVAMC according to service type (fire or EMS) during the time frame from 2006 to 2010. According to SFFD personnel, SFFD can expect to respond to calls at the Campus an average of 50 times per year, with 55 percent expected to be EMS-related responses and 45 percent expected to be fire-related responses (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011). Given that SFFD annually responds to 182,500 calls per year, the estimated 50 calls for service at the Campus represent less than 0.01 percent of the total call volume for EMS or fire services in San Francisco.

Table 3.3-1: Responses to the Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus by the San Francisco Fire Department

Year	Fire	EMS	Total	% Fire	% EMS
2006	25	8	33	75.76%	24.24%
2007	20	19	39	51.28%	48.72%
2008	26	26	52	50%	50%
2009	18	27	45	40%	60%
2010	23	29	52	44.23%	55.77%

Note:

EMS = emergency medical services

Source: Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011

San Francisco's objective is to get professional help to the scene of high-priority medical emergencies within 6.5 minutes of receiving a 911 call, 90 percent of the time. The 6.5-minute goal includes 2 minutes for dispatch and 4.5 minutes for the fire engine or ambulance to arrive at the curb. This standard was adopted in 2004 by the San Francisco Emergency Medical Services Agency under the Department of Public Health. The State's goal for emergency response to a high-priority call in an urban area is 5 minutes (CCSF, 2010). According to SFFD personnel, the department's average response time is 3 minutes and 23 seconds for all emergency calls, which indicates that SFFD is exceeding both the City and State standards (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011). The two closest stations to the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus (Stations 34 and 14) also have superior average response times. Table 3.3-2 displays the average response times per station and SFFD as a whole.

Table 3.3-2: Average Response Times by the San Francisco Fire Department for All Emergency Calls: Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

SFFD Station	Destination	Average Response Time (minutes)
Station 34, 499 41st Avenue	SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, 4150 Clement Street	3:47
Station 14, 551 26th Avenue		3:32
All SFFD stations	Citywide	3:23

Notes:

SFFD = San Francisco Fire Department; SFVAMC = San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center

Average response times were not provided for Stations 23 and 31

Source: Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011

Mission Bay Area

As mentioned earlier, SFFD's average response time of 3 minutes and 23 seconds for all emergency calls surpasses both the City and State standards (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011). All three stations located in the Mission Bay area also have superior average response times. Table 3.3-3 presents a breakdown of average response times per station in the Mission Bay area.

Table 3.3-3: Average Response Times by the San Francisco Fire Department for All Emergency Calls: Mission Bay Area

SFFD Station	Destination	Average Response Time (in minutes)
Station 8, 36 Bluxome Street	Mission Bay Area	3:35
Station 29, 299 Vermont Street		3:26
Station 37, 798 Wisconsin Street		3:25
All SFFD stations	Citywide	3:23

Note:

SFFD = San Francisco Fire Department

Source: Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011

Fire Hazards***Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus***

Fire response services to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus are provided by SFFD as described above. The Campus itself is ranked by CAL FIRE as having "little to no threat" of fire susceptibility, based on expected fire behavior and according to site-specific topography and vegetation (ABAG, 2015b). Although CAL FIRE has no record of any wildfire in San Francisco (CCSF, 2009), the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is located at the wildland urban interface (ABAG, 2015a) and surrounded on three sides by forested public land belonging to the National Park Service's (NPS's) Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA), with an identified wildfire threat of "high" and "very high" (CCSF, 2008).

Mission Bay Area

Fire response services to the Mission Bay area are provided by SFFD. According to ABAG, the Mission Bay area is designated as an urbanized area; therefore, the area is not considered to be susceptible to wildland fires (ABAG, 2015a). In addition, CAL FIRE ranked the area as having “little to no threat” of fire susceptibility, based on expected fire behavior and according to site-specific topography and vegetation (ABAG, 2015b). The Mission Bay area is not located at a wildland urban interface or adjacent to forested land.

Law Enforcement Services

VA maintains a police force, VA Police, at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. As a federal entity, VA Police operates under the Office of Security and Law Enforcement (OS&LE). The OS&LE provides national oversight and direct support in the areas of physical security and law enforcement to individual VA Police services at each location throughout the United States. In addition to OS&LE upper-level management and specialty positions, there are standardized rank positions established within each VA Police service at the local level. VA Police services are empowered by statute to exercise federal authority for offenses occurring on property owned by VA (SFVA Police, 2011a). According to VA Police personnel, there is a mutual-aid agreement with the San Francisco Police Department (SFPD) for nonroutine police matters, such as traffic control and parking enforcement (Baczek, pers. comm., 2011). The mutual-aid agreement articulates a reciprocal relationship where each party helps one another when needed (Baczek, pers. comm., 2011).

SFPD provides police protection services to San Francisco. SFPD operates out of 10 district stations and is headquartered at 850 Bryant Street, in SOMA. There are a total of 2,242 sworn members and 412 civilian members in SFPD (SFPD, 2011a). Based on San Francisco’s estimated 2010 population of 856,095 residents (DOF, 2010), SFPD’s staffing levels on a per-capita basis are 3.1 staff members per 1,000 residents. Authorized staffing at each district station includes one captain, four lieutenants, and 16 sergeants. The number of active patrol units varies from day to day from one station to another (SFPD, 2011a). SFPD has mutual-aid agreements with all government law enforcement agencies that border the City and County of San Francisco (SFPD, 2011a).

In the performance measures for SFPD set out as part of the City’s 2008–2009 budget plan, the department established target response times for 2008–2009. All calls are prioritized into three categories—A, B, and C—with Type A calls reflecting those of highest priority. Priority A calls are defined as “life-threatening emergencies,” otherwise known as Code 3 calls, and include situations such as a homicide or an officer down. Priority B calls are defined as involving “potential for harm to life and/or property” but are not considered emergency situations, and include violations such as a burglary. Priority C calls, the lowest priority, are categorized as “crime committed with no threat to life or property/suspect left crime scene” and typically consist of quality-of-life violations, found property, or an auto burglary with no suspect (CCSF, 2010).

Target response times are 4.4 minutes for Priority A calls, 8.3 minutes for Priority B calls, and 10.8 minutes for Priority C calls. In 2007, SFPD met the 2008–2009 target response times for Priority A and C calls but failed to meet the Priority B target response time of 8.3 minutes (CCSF, 2010).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

VA Police is responsible for the protection and safety of the Veterans, staff members, and visitors who use the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. SFVAMC's police force at the existing Campus consists of 22 VA Police officers (Baczek, pers. comm., 2011). The police officers provide 24-hour patrols of the facility and parking lots; their duties include responding to suspicious or criminal activity, vehicle accidents, and personal property losses on the facility grounds (SFVA Police, 2011b). The area directly south of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is patrolled by SFPD's Richmond Police District Station. The Richmond Police District Station is within SFPD's Golden Gate Division and employs a total of 98 sworn officers. Located at 461 Sixth Avenue, the Richmond District Station is located approximately 2.4 miles southeast of the Campus (SFPD, 2011a).

Although property owned by VA is considered federal property and outside the jurisdiction of SFPD, SFPD may provide backup support in the event of an emergency.

Mission Bay Area

SFPD provides police protection services throughout San Francisco, including the Mission Bay area. The Mission Bay area is currently patrolled by SFPD's Southern and Bayview Police District Stations. As explained above, VA Police is responsible for providing law enforcement and security services to Veterans, staff members, and visitors on VA facilities and grounds. Thus, any VA-owned medical center facility in this area would be under the jurisdiction of VA Police and not the local SFPD station.

Parks and Recreation

The City and County of San Francisco has approximately 5,848 acres of land permanently dedicated to publicly accessible park and recreational uses. These lands are under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department (SFRPD), the State of California, NPS, and local agencies. SFRPD owns and manages approximately 3,433 acres of that total, including more than 200 parks, playgrounds, and open spaces. System recreation facilities also include 15 recreation centers, nine swimming pools, five golf courses, and more than 300 athletic fields, tennis courts, baseball diamonds, and basketball courts. The State of California owns approximately 255 acres at Candlestick Point State Recreation Area and Mount Sutro, and the federal government owns approximately 1,600 acres, including portions of the Presidio and the GGNRA, managed by NPS.

The remaining 560 acres of publicly accessible lands are under the jurisdiction of local agencies other than SFRPD (e.g., Port of San Francisco, San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, San Francisco Department of Public Works, and San Francisco Unified School District). These spaces include shoreline access, reservoirs, schoolyards open during nonschool hours, college campuses, urban plazas, alleys, and undeveloped street rights-of-way (CCSF, 2010).

The National Park and Recreation Association (NPRA) formerly required 10 acres of open space per 1,000 city residents. However, the NPRA no longer recommends a single absolute "average" park acreage per population, in recognition of the fact that it is more relevant for each area plan and its program facilities to be based on community need. More important than acreage is accessibility (location and walking distance) and whether the facility provides needed services to the population in question. Based on San Francisco's estimated 2008

household population (856,095 persons) (DOF, 2010), the 5,848 acres of parkland result in approximately 6.8 acres per 1,000 residents, somewhat less than the former NPRA standard.

The City has not established a citywide target ratio of parkland to residents, nor has it adopted a Quimby Act ordinance requiring land dedications or in-lieu fees, because San Francisco’s population density, small land mass, and other development constraints make such policies infeasible. However, revisions to the Recreation and Open Space Element (May 2009 draft) of the *San Francisco General Plan* (City General Plan) do not state a baseline standard to be maintained. The focus of the updated Recreation and Open Space Element is on developing existing open space into high-performing open spaces that better serve neighborhood residents, improving access to open space, and prioritizing open space acquisitions and improvements in high-need areas. Furthermore, the updated Recreation and Open Space Element states that publicly owned open spaces make up almost 20 percent of the city’s total land area, making San Francisco among the top five cities in the nation in terms of parkland per resident (SF Planning, 2014a).

Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

Recreational resources within 0.5 mile of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus are discussed below. A 0.5-mile radius to recreational resources was defined because the City General Plan specifies that this is an acceptable walking distance (an approximately 10-minute walk) for City-serving open spaces (CCSF, 2010). As listed in Table 3.3-4, two GGNRA facilities and one SFRPD facility are located within 0.5 mile of the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus.

Table 3.3-4: Parks and Related Facilities within 0.5 Mile of the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus

Facility	Park Acres	Ownership
Lands End	110	NPS/GGNRA
East and West Fort Miley (excluding SFVAMC Campus)	24.82	NPS/GGNRA
Lincoln Park	112	SFRPD

Notes:

GGNRA = Golden Gate National Recreation Area; NPS = National Park Service; SFRPD = San Francisco Recreation and Park Department; SFVAMC = San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center

East and West Fort Miley acreage was derived from Figure 1-2 of the SFVAMC Long Range Development Plan (“Existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus Layout”).

Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2013

Golden Gate National Recreation Area

The existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus occupies 29 acres near the Lands End region of San Francisco. Lands End is a 110-acre portion of the GGNRA⁴ known for its rugged natural areas and dramatic coastal cliffs. NPS manages the Golden Gate National Parks and 391 other park sites across the United States (NPS, 2010). These

⁴ Established in 1972, the GGNRA constitutes one of the largest urban parks in the world, encompassing 80,500 acres in three counties: Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo. Parklands in San Francisco County ring the northern and western shores of San Francisco and include areas such as Ocean Beach, Fort Funston, Lands End, and the Presidio. These lands are coastal preserves that encompass many miles of bay and ocean shorelines. Each year 16–20 million visitors explore the park, accounting for nearly 50 percent of all visits to the 29 national park systems in California (NPS, 2014).

federal parklands border the Campus to the north, east, and west and provide a greenbelt next to the dense urban neighborhoods of the outer Richmond District. Some of the featured attractions in Lands End are Eagles' Point Overlook, East and West Fort Miley, and Point Lobos, which includes the Cliff House and Sutro Baths.

Lands End is considered a coastal preserve and offers a number of mid-length hikes along a network of trails that meander through the cliff bluffs. In addition to several informal trails, the most popular trails are the California Coastal Trail⁵ and El Camino del Mar Trail. The California Coastal Trail at Lands End offers a cliff-top walk with several scenic overlooks (including the Golden Gate Bridge and Marin Headlands), 30-mile views of the coast, opportunities for bird watching, and foot access to several shoreline pocket beaches (GGNPC, 2011). The Coastal Trail at Lands End is currently being improved and the surrounding forest is being revitalized through NPS stewardship programs. Since the recent area restorations and upgrades to the Lands End section of the Coastal Trail, visitor use has increased substantially (GGNRA, 2011). El Camino del Mar Trail at Lands End runs parallel to the California Coastal Trail, offering access points through connector trails or staircases. Visitors follow the trails, stopping at historic landmarks such as the *USS San Francisco* Memorial and the Fort Miley Military Reservation.

The existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is surrounded on three sides by GGNRA-managed property (including East Fort Miley and West Fort Miley) and a historic resource listed in the National Register of Historic Places. (For more information about the historical significance of Fort Miley, see Section 3.4, "Cultural Resources.") There are several access points into Fort Miley via the surrounding trail system, but the main entrances are located at the Merrie Way parking lot located on Point Lobos Avenue and Merrie Way and the El Camino del Mar parking lot off Point Lobos Avenue. Access to Fort Miley from the Legion of Honor is also very common (The Bandit Notes, 2000).

Because of its unique location adjacent to the GGNRA, the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus provides access points to East Fort Miley and West Fort Miley. Two paved roadways lead into GGNRA lands. One is located on the east side of the Campus immediately south of Building 211, and the other is located on the west side of the Campus near the western termini of Parking Areas G and H. These roadways provide access through the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus to GGNRA lands and are intended for use by NPS personnel. Pedestrians are allowed to pass through on these roadways unless the Campus is in a secure status because of an emergency. Along these access points, signage indicates entry into GGNRA lands. For the most part, the boundaries between the Campus and the NPS portion of Fort Miley are delineated with a chain-link fence and dense vegetation (Winzler and Kelly, 2011).

The portion of Fort Miley within the GGNRA is a popular visitor attraction because it offers hiking and sightseeing, all within a historic military setting. NPS maintains picnicking facilities and hiking trails within West Fort Miley. The picnic area is open during daylight hours and is accessible from the West Fort Miley entrance at El Camino del Mar and 48th Avenue. This area is popular because it is situated among three gun emplacements, including Battery Chester, which offers views down to Ocean Beach (NPS, 2011). West Fort Miley is also the site of an outdoor skills and fitness challenge course sponsored by Pacific Leadership in partnership with NPS (PLI, 2009). East Fort Miley houses a maintenance building for NPS (NPS, 2011). The remains of several pre-World

⁵ The Coastal Trail at Lands End is part of a larger network of public trails along the 1,200-mile California Coast (Coastwalk, 2011).

War I batteries are located along the perimeter of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus (NPS, 2011) and represent some of the original concepts of coastal defense.

These adjacent federal parklands are patrolled by law enforcement programs provided by the GGNRA. The mission of the GGNRA's law enforcement personnel is to protect people, property, and park resources and to ensure that park visitors can enjoy the park without unlawful interference. Patrol operations cover all GGNRA lands (GGNRA, 2011). In addition, SFFD has a memorandum of understanding with the GGNRA to provide fire suppression services for GGNRA property (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011).

Lincoln Park

Immediately east of and contiguous to East Fort Miley is Lincoln Park, a 112-acre facility owned and maintained by SFRPD. Because of its adjacency to GGNRA lands, Lincoln Park includes some natural areas and trails; however, the bulk of the park is consumed by a golf course and the Legion of Honor (The Bandit Notes, 2000). The Lincoln Park Golf Course is an 18-hole golf facility known for its scenic qualities and year-round public memberships. Views are highlighted by the famed 17th hole, which overlooks San Francisco Bay and the Golden Gate Bridge (SFNGF, 2007). The Legion of Honor is one of two fine arts museums in San Francisco (FAMSF, 2011). This museum can be accessed by trails and overlooks the Pacific Ocean, Golden Gate Bridge, and large portions of San Francisco.

Mission Bay Area

As listed in Table 3.3-5, 10 SFRPD and five non-SFRPD facilities are located within the boundaries of the Mission Bay project area.

Esprit Park, located at Minnesota and 20th Streets, features a grass field surrounded by redwood trees and picnic tables (NPC, 2011a). Jackson Playground, located at 17th and Carolina Streets, provides a variety of amenities including a kids' play structure and sand area, tennis and basketball courts, and two baseball fields (NPC, 2011b). James Rolph Playground, located at Potrero Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street, includes a playground, baseball field, recreation center, and two basketball and tennis courts (NPC, 2011c). Located at the corner of 20th and Vermont Streets, McKinley Square features a playground with a sand pit, large grassy area, walking trail, and a community garden with benches (NPC, 2011d). The recently remodeled Potrero del Sol Park is located at 25th and Utah Streets. This park offers a new skate park, grassy areas for picnics, a performance space, and a community garden (NPC, 2011e). The Potrero Hill Recreation Center and Mini Park is located at 801 Arkansas Street and offers a playground, baseball field, two tennis courts, a basketball court, and a recreation center (NPC 2011f). The Arkansas and Connecticut Friendship Gardens are located on 22nd Street, just north of the Potrero Hill Recreation Center. South Park is a small neighborhood park located on South Park Street and Jack London Alley. This 1.1-acre park has a small playground with paths and picnic tables (NPC, 2011g). The Utah & 18th Mini Park is currently undergoing renovation with short- and long-term projects (NPC, 2011h).

The non-SFRPD facilities include AT&T Park, Yerba Buena Gardens, United Nations Plaza, Agua Vista Park, Warm Water Cove Park, Hallidie Plaza, Mission Creek Garden, and Woods Yard Park. AT&T Park is the San Francisco Giants' baseball stadium. The Giants lease the land from the Port of San Francisco. This 12-acre site is bounded by King Street, Second Street, Third Street, and China Basin (Ballparks, 2011). Agua Vista Park, owned by the Port Authority, is located at 800 Terry Francois Boulevard. It is a small landscaped park and fishing pier

Table 3.3-5: Parks and Related Facilities located in the Mission Bay Area

Facility	Park Acres	Ownership
Potrero Hill Neighborhood		
Jackson Playground	4.41	SFRPD
McKinley Square	2.81	SFRPD
Potrero Hill Recreation Center & Mini Park	10.29	SFRPD
James Rolph Jr. Playground	2.93	SFRPD
Potrero del Sol	4.36	SFRPD
South of Market Area (SOMA)		
South Park	1.12	SFRPD
Utah & 18th Mini Park	0.10	SFRPD
Connecticut Friendship Garden	0.14	SFRPD
Arkansas Friendship Garden	0.13	SFRPD
AT&T Park	11.96	Port
Dogpatch Neighborhood		
Esprit Park	1.83	SFRPD
Woods Yard Park	0.28	Muni
Mission Bay Neighborhood		
Agua Vista Park	0.62	Port
Mission Creek Garden	0.69	Port
Central Waterfront		
Warm Water Cove Park	0.57	Port

Notes:

Muni = San Francisco Municipal Railway; Port = Port of San Francisco; SFRPD = San Francisco Recreation and Park Department

Source: Stasio, pers. comm., 2011

with picnic benches and public art (NPC, 2011i). Warm Water Cove is located at the end of 24th Street and east of Illinois Street. This waterfront park is owned by the Port of San Francisco and sits adjacent to a power plant (SF Citizen, 2010). Mission Creek Garden is owned by the Port Authority and located at Channel and Sixth Streets. This park is a new green space on the creek with many trees and shrubs. A basketball court, volleyball court, and dog park were recently added (NPC, 2011j). Woods Yard Park is owned by the San Francisco Municipal Transit Authority and located at Tennessee and 22nd Streets. This park is a block-long miniature open space with two grassy areas and a sand pit (NPC, 2011k).

3.3.2 Regulatory Framework

National Fire Protection Association Fire Code

The NFPA is an international nonprofit organization established in 1896 that provides consensus codes and standards for fire protection. Specifically, the NFPA is responsible for 300 codes and standards designed to

minimize the risk and impacts of fire by establishing criteria for building, processing, design, service, and installation in the United States. The NFPA Fire Code provides the requirements to establish a reasonable level of fire safety and property protection in new and existing buildings. The NFPA Fire Code includes standards for the inspection of permanent and temporary buildings, processes, equipment, systems, and other fire and related life safety situations; investigation of fires, explosions, hazardous materials incidents, and other related emergency incidents; and review of construction plans, drawings, and specifications for life safety systems, fire protection systems, access, water supplies, processes, hazardous materials, and other fire and life safety issues.

Because the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is a federal property, the NFPA Fire Code requirements would apply to all new or modified buildings on-site. Building fire suppression system design and site fire water system improvements should be evaluated for each specific project in accordance with NFPA Fire Code requirements. These requirements vary depending on the type of construction and size (square feet) of new buildings.

2010 San Francisco Fire Code

The 2010 San Francisco Fire Code went into effect January 1, 2011 (SFFD, 2011c). The new San Francisco Fire Code replaced the 2007 Fire Code and consists of the 2010 California Fire Code and portions of the 2009 International Fire Code, together with San Francisco amendments. The San Francisco Fire Code is designed 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; and to provide for the issuance of permits, inspections, and other SFFD services, and the assessment and collection of fees for those permits (SFFD, 2011d).

Although the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is a federal property, SFFD is responsible for responding to emergency calls for fire, EMS, and other emergencies at the site. Because SFFD serves the Campus, any new development would need to meet the requirements in accordance with the latest edition of the NFPA Fire Code (i.e., the NFPA 1 Fire Code), with consideration of the San Francisco Fire Code. The buildings' fire flow requirements are adjusted individually for buildings with sprinkler systems whose designs meet the requirements of the NFPA Fire Code (Kennedy, pers. comm., 2011).

Golden Gate National Recreation Area Muir Woods National Monument Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement

The GGNRA operates under U.S. Department of the Interior and NPS policies and guidelines, in accordance with a general management plan (GMP), which was first published in 1980. The park GMP was revised to reflect new lands and responsibilities added since the park was established (NPS, 2014).

The 2014 *Golden Gate National Recreation Area Muir Woods National Monument Final General Management Plan* addresses the NPS-administered lands within the legislative boundaries of the GGNRA and Muir Woods National Monument. Although the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is under the jurisdiction of VA and outside the NPS boundaries, the Campus is surrounded on three sides by these national parklands (specifically Lands End and Fort Miley). Furthermore, the SFVAMC LRDP has taken as a core design principle integration of

the site into the surrounding park and pedestrian systems to the extent possible. Because VA is an adjacent landowner, the GGNRA land management objectives are referenced in this document.

In the Fort Miley area, the GMP advocates “better connections to the surrounding community, nearby Land’s End site, and the Veteran’s Administration hospital campus.” The area is also under management for the preservation of dark night skies (NPS, 2014). The following summarizes the GMP mitigation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts on natural ambient lightscapes (NPS, 2014):

- Limiting the use of artificial outdoor lighting to that which is necessary for basic safety requirements
- Shielding all outdoor lighting to the maximum extent possible
- Keeping light on the intended subject and out of the night sky to the greatest degree possible
- Working with park partners and visitors on education and best management practices to minimize their impacts on lightscapes

These GMP mitigation measures are summarized in this document because under NEPA, all relevant reasonable mitigation measures that could improve the project are to be identified, even if such measures are outside the jurisdiction of the lead agency or the cooperating agencies, and thus would not be committed to as part of these agencies’ records of decision (CEQ, 2011).

The existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus itself is not NPS property; however, through the LRDP, SFVAMC attempts where possible to take into consideration the GGNRA policies to minimize effects on adjacent NPS parklands. See Section 3.1, “Aesthetics,” for a discussion of LRDP lighting impacts. See Section 3.9, “Land Use,” for a discussion of land use impacts.

San Francisco General Plan Recreation and Open Space Element

The City General Plan provides the following description for the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus:

East and West Fort Miley (GGNRA)

Develop public open space area for continued recreational use and preserve natural and historic features in conjunction with the GGNRA. Maintain picnic areas and create an historic interpretive center and facilities for day camp use. Fort Miley Veteran’s Administration hospital parking should be provided on the hospital grounds.

Although the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is not subject to City General Plan policies, the LRDP aims to integrate the site into the surrounding park and pedestrian systems.

Western Shoreline Area Plan

The Western Shoreline Area Plan is a part of the City General Plan that covers the San Francisco Coastal Zone, which extends approximately 6 miles along the western shoreline from the Fort Funston cliff area to the Point Lobos recreational area. The Western Shoreline Area Plan consists of 10 subareas and contains transportation policies for the entire Coastal Zone and specific policies relating to the subareas (SF Planning, 2014b). The Western Shoreline

Area Plan does not specifically mention the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus, although the site lies within the boundaries of the plan. The following policies are referenced in the LRDP:

- **Policy 1.1:** Improve crosstown public transit connections to the coastal area, specifically Ocean Beach, the zoo, and the Cliff House.
- **Policy 1.2:** Provide transit connections amongst the important coastal recreational destinations.
- **Policy 1.3:** Connect local transit routes with regional transit, including BART [Bay Area Rapid Transit], Golden Gate Transit, and the Golden Gate National Recreation Transit.
- **Policy 1.4:** Provide incentives for transit usage (VA, 2010).

Even though the *Western Shoreline Area Plan* does not directly apply to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus (because the Campus is under federal jurisdiction), these policies are relevant because the LRDP would maintain San Francisco Municipal Railway (i.e., Muni) access by way of the traffic circle and a stop near the Patient Welcome Center.

3.3.3 Environmental Consequences

Significance Criteria

A NEPA evaluation must consider the context and intensity of the environmental effects that would be caused by, or result from, the EIS Alternatives. There is currently no Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) guidance related to the analysis of park resources, police, and fire services. Therefore, other environmental assessment documents were reviewed and the following criteria were selected for evaluation.

Park Resources and Recreational Facilities

National thresholds for park resources exist in the form of the NPS Management Guidelines. The NPS Management Guidelines value the importance of leaving “park resources and values unimpaired unless a particular law directly and specifically provides otherwise” (NPS, 2006). The NPS Guidelines go on to say that impairment of park resources can be triggered by activities operating within the park but may also result from “sources or activities outside the park” (NPS, 2006). The impact threshold at which impairment occurs is not readily apparent; therefore, NPS has established policies that protect against unacceptable impacts within a park’s environment. Park managers must not allow uses that would cause unacceptable impacts; they must evaluate existing or proposed uses and determine whether the associated impacts on park resources and values are acceptable. Therefore, for the purposes of these policies, unacceptable impacts are impacts that, individually or cumulatively, would do any of the following (NPS, 2006):

- be inconsistent with a park’s purposes or values;
- impede the attainment of a park’s desired future conditions for natural and cultural resources as identified through the park’s planning process;
- create an unsafe or unhealthful environment for visitors or employees;

- diminish opportunities for current or future generations to enjoy, learn about, or be inspired by park resources or values;
- unreasonably interfere with:
 - park programs or activities;
 - an appropriate use;
 - the atmosphere of peace and tranquility, or the natural soundscape maintained in wilderness and natural, historic, or commemorative locations within the park; or
 - NPS concessioner or contractor operations or services;
- increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated or the construction or expansion of recreational facilities would be required; or
- substantially inhibit access to and use of existing recreational facilities.

Police and Fire Services

As described above, no national thresholds exist for police and fire services from an individual project. CEQ states that the significance of an effect is determined by the context and intensity of the resulting change relative to the existing environment (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 1508.27). Other environmental assessment documents and the aforementioned NPS thresholds were reviewed and the following criteria were selected for the evaluation.

Thus, an Alternative analyzed in this EIS is considered to result in an adverse impact related to community services if it would:

- result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or need for, new or physically altered fire or police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for police and fire protection;
- result in inadequate fire access and circulation; or
- result in the need for expanded fire-flow infrastructure.

Assessment Methods

The evaluation of potential community service and recreation impacts was based on a review of documents pertaining to the project area including the SFVAMC LRDP and the GGNRA GMP, consultation with appropriate agencies and City staff members, and review of the project area and surroundings. The EIS Alternatives do not involve proposals for new residential structures and would not directly generate new residents in the project area. Because the Alternatives would not generate new residents, they would not substantially increase citywide demand on community services. However, localized impacts resulting from increases in daily population (personnel, patients, visitors) may occur and are analyzed below.

For purposes of this analysis, impacts on fire and police services consider whether the EIS Alternatives would result in an increase in daily population such that fire and police services would experience inadequate staffing levels, increased response times, 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. With regard to fire flow adequacy, it is assumed that all temporary and permanent improvements would be designed and constructed in compliance with all applicable building and fire codes, which include requirements for fire alarms, smoke detectors, sprinkler systems, fire extinguishers, and the number and location of exits.

In determining whether the EIS Alternatives would have an adverse impact on recreational facilities, this analysis considers the surrounding recreational facilities, the existing capacity (usage) of those facilities, and the expected recreational improvements that would be included as part of the EIS Alternatives.

Alternative 1: SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus Buildout Alternative

Short-Term Projects

The construction of Alternative 1 short-term projects would involve 17 development and retrofitting projects occurring over approximately 7 years (Table 2-1). Alternative 1 short-term projects would involve construction of 600,992 gross square feet (gsf) (384,452 gsf of which would be net new) at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus.

Construction

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

Alternative 1 short-term projects would involve new development and/or retrofitting of patient care, research, administrative, hospital, and parking structures on the existing 29-acre SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus through 2020. The existing Campus is already served by SFFD, with the nearest fire station (Station 34) located only 0.3 mile southeast of the Campus. Three other fire stations—Stations 14, 23, and 31—are located within approximately 2 miles of the Campus and could provide backup in an emergency.

Construction of Alternative 1 short-term projects would increase the potential for accidental on-site fires from such sources as the operation of mechanical equipment and use of flammable construction materials. In most cases, implementation of “good housekeeping” procedures and best construction practices by the construction contractors and work crews would minimize such hazards.

Construction activities also have the potential to affect fire protection services, such as emergency vehicle response times, by adding construction traffic to the street network and potentially requiring partial land closures during street improvements and utility installations. Access to all buildings by fire trucks and emergency vehicles would be maintained during construction; however, slow-moving, construction-related traffic near the site could reduce traffic flows and delay emergency vehicles traveling through the area, thereby potentially affecting emergency response times. However, given the current traffic levels of surrounding streets, impacts related to response times are expected to be less than in other more congested areas. (See Section 3.13, “Transportation,

Traffic, Circulation, and Parking,” for more information about traffic flow and street closures.) More importantly, Station 34 is within close range of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus (only 0.3 mile southeast of the Campus), indicating that response times would not likely be affected.

Any on-site street closures or temporary obstruction would be subject to NFPA emergency access standards, requirements, and review (with consideration of the San Francisco Fire Code), which would further reduce construction-related effects on response times. Thus, construction-related impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects on fire protection services are expected to be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Construction activities may result in temporary blockages of internal roadways. However, access to all buildings by fire trucks and emergency vehicles would be maintained at all times during construction. Management Measures TRANS-1 through TRANS-3 (see Section 3.13, “Transportation, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking”) would alleviate construction-related effects on traffic, transit, and pedestrian circulation, ensuring coordination between construction activities and the timing of projects. Therefore, impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects related to fire truck access and circulation would be minor.

Fire Hazards

Certain construction equipment, materials, and activities, such as welding, may increase the risk of fire on the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus during construction of Alternative 1 short-term projects. This would be a potentially adverse impact. However, in accordance with VA Specification Section 010000, “General Requirements,” the construction contractor would be required to prepare a fire safety plan (prepared in accordance with 29 CFR 1926) before the initiation of work. The plan would provide detailed project-specific fire safety measures. In addition, all workers would be required to undergo a safety briefing in accordance with Occupational Safety and Health Administration requirements. Compliance with the fire safety plan and safety measures conveyed at the worker safety briefing would ensure that the potential fire-related impacts during construction would be minor.

Law Enforcement Services

Because the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is under federal jurisdiction, VA Police would continue to provide police service during construction. The Campus currently maintains a police force of 22 officers, who are responsible for providing law enforcement and security services to Veterans, staff members, and visitors at department facilities and grounds.

Construction sites can be sources of attractive nuisances, providing hazards and inviting theft and vandalism. Therefore, the additional activity associated with construction of Alternative 1 short-term projects has the potential to increase the number of calls regarding minor incidents. To properly secure the site, VA Police may have to hire additional personnel and/or acquire equipment to serve the project site during construction. The need for additional staff and/or equipment would not in itself constitute an adverse environmental effect related to police protection services unless it would “result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or need for, new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.”

Because any increase in police activity would be limited to the construction period and would not result in the need for a new police station, impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects during construction would be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

The existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is bounded on three sides by a contiguous system of parklands consisting of Lands End, Fort Miley, and Lincoln Park. Immediately east and west of the hospital is Fort Miley, part of the GGNRA managed by NPS. Under the proposed LRDP, there would be no taking of adjacent parklands; all future modifications would occur entirely within the hospital's existing footprint. East Fort Miley and West Fort Miley are currently accessible from the Campus via paved roadways on the project site. These roadways provide access through the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus to NPS land for NPS vehicles only. Although these access roads are not the primary entry points into adjacent Fort Miley, pedestrians (hospital-related staff members and recreationists) are allowed to pass through on these roadways to access the parklands unless the Campus is in a secure status. The only vehicles allowed to use these two roadways are those operated by NPS. To the extent practicable, the access roads would be kept open during construction. Should temporary closure of the roadways be necessary, VA would make every attempt to continue to provide notification of the closure. Notification would occur at least 2 weeks in advance.

Although temporary closure of these roads could potentially restrict access to the surrounding parklands from the hospital, it is not expected to affect overall recreational use of Fort Miley. There are multiple access points into the Lands End–Fort Miley–Lincoln Park system within blocks of the Campus (i.e., Merrie Way trailhead/parking lot and Camino del Mar parking lot). These access points are considered the primary entrances into Lands End–Fort Miley–Lincoln Park system, and they likely experience higher usage than the Campus's access roads.

Because the primary access points into the Lands End–Fort Miley–Lincoln Park system would remain open, temporary closure of the Campus's access roads is not expected to inhibit access to and use of these parks. Access to the parklands would not be substantially disrupted because recreationalists could still visit these areas via other nearby park entrances. For these reasons, impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects related to park accessibility during construction would be minor.

Park Usage

Construction of Alternative 1 short-term projects would be performed by a temporary workforce consisting of approximately 72 persons derived from the local labor pool, depending on the concurrent project(s) for LRDP construction on the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. Although construction workers would be within walking distance of nearby parks and open space areas such as adjacent Fort Miley, Lands End, or Lincoln Park, the increase in park usage would be minimal. The temporary influx of construction workers on the Campus would not be expected to substantially increase the demand for surrounding parks and recreational facilities. In addition, all of these workers would be expected to already reside in San Francisco or the greater Bay Area. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects on park usage would be minor.

Operation

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

By 2020, there would be a net increase in daily population at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus of 642 people (approximately 18 percent) as a result of the increase in VA employees and services. This increase in personnel, patients, and visitors is expected to occur incrementally over a period of 7 years as the short-term projects of Alternative 1 are completed; therefore, additional fire and EMS demand is expected to be minimal.

As described previously, SFFD (Stations 34 and 14) currently responds to calls at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus an average of 50 times per year, which represents less than 0.01 percent of total calls for EMS or fire service in San Francisco. Using the conservative assumption that calls for service would double to 100 calls per year by 2020, these additional calls would continue to make up less than 0.01 percent of the total call volume for fire or EMS services in San Francisco. SFFD has indicated that the EIS Alternatives would not increase demand for fire protection, equipment, and services beyond its ability to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives (Schultheis, pers. comm., 2011). In addition, SFFD conducted fire drills at the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus in 2014 and found no obstructions, delays, or compromise to the response times of Stations 34 and 14 (Castellanos, pers. comm., 2014). Therefore, any increase in demand would be considered minimal and is not expected to compromise response times. Operational impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects related to fire and EMS response times are expected to be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Alternative 1 short-term projects would result in alterations to the circulation within the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. Fire vehicles and related equipment would continue to use the two designated entrances at 42nd Avenue or 43rd Avenue and would have access along the full perimeter of the Campus site along Veterans Drive and Fort Miley Circle. Because the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus's Emergency Department is not a trauma center and does not expect to receive patients who have experienced major trauma, ambulance transports to the Campus do not constitute a high percentage of SFFD's patient clientele. Emergency vehicles would be directed to enter through the 43rd Avenue entrance, and proceed to the new Ambulatory Care Center (VA, 2012, 2014). Pursuant to the SFVAMC LRDP, the circulation system would "provide clear access and mobility for multiple modes of transportation: pedestrians, private vehicles, public transit, and shuttles, as well as emergency and delivery vehicles" (VA, 2014). Vertical and horizontal clearance would be sufficient under the proposed parking garages extensions, and turning radii would be sufficient within the Campus to allow for fire access in compliance with code requirements (VA, 2014). Operational fire access and circulation impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects are expected to be minor.

Water and Fire Flow Systems

Implementing Alternative 1 short-term projects would require making improvements to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus's water distribution system. Water system improvements necessary to support development of Alternative 1 short-term projects would require moving the water tower; removing and/or abandoning portions of the existing water system where new water mains, service laterals, and fire hydrants could be located; and establishing new domestic water connections to provide potable water to the buildings.

The fire system and water system improvements would be thoroughly assessed as a part of the design process to satisfy the NFPA Fire Code requirements. Operational impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects related to water and fire flow systems are expected to be minor.

Fire Hazards

As described previously, the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is located at the wildland urban interface and surrounded on three sides by forested public land. Droughts and extreme temperature events could result in dry vegetation, intensifying the existing threats of the wildland urban interface. Thus, operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects could result in potential wildfire risk where the Campus borders the forested public lands. This would represent a potentially adverse effect. Potential hazards to persons, property, and operations related to wildfire risk would be reduced to a minor level with the implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1, which requires maintenance of foliage on campus and coordinating with other jurisdictions to maintain the foliage adjacent to campus (see Section 3.7, “Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change”).

Law Enforcement Services

Because the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is under federal jurisdiction, VA Police would continue to provide police service. Implementing Alternative 1 short-term projects would increase the number of personnel at the Campus by 642; therefore, the additional activity associated with the new population has the potential to increase the number of calls for service. However, any increase in demand for police services is not expected to substantially affect response times because VA Police officers are stationed on-site. Although VA Police may have to hire additional personnel and acquire equipment to serve the Campus, the need for additional staff members and/or equipment would not in itself result in changes to service levels such that new police protection facilities would need to be built. Operational impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects on law enforcement services are expected to be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

Implementing Alternative 1 short-term projects would not inhibit access to or use of adjacent GGNRA recreational areas. Proposed Alternative 1 short-term projects would develop various existing open space areas of the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus along with proposed buildings, including the Mental Health Clinic Expansion and the Hoptel Addition. A new landscape area would be developed within the drop-off circle that is proposed as part of the Patient Welcome Center and drop-off area, and a healing garden would be integrated with the Welcome Center. Sidewalks and walkways for pedestrians would be modified to improve connectivity and flow between facilities. Future Veterans and hospital personnel would benefit from these additional park spaces and connections to the surrounding federal park system. Operational impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects related to park accessibility would be beneficial.

Park Usage

Implementing Alternative 1 short-term projects would result in new and additional medical space. No permanent housing component is proposed; therefore, the area’s population density would not be affected directly. However,

the number of personnel at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is projected to increase by 642 (an 18 percent increase) between 2015 and 2020. Some of these people might use adjacent Fort Miley within the GGNRA (e.g., on their lunch breaks), but this additional usage is not expected to result in a substantial increase in demand for nearby recreational facilities. Furthermore, these employees would have lunch breaks at different times because they would work various shifts, and only a fraction of daytime employees might use park grounds for lunch or before or after work.

The use of nearby recreational spaces by Campus employees is expected to be concentrated on lunch hours during weekday shifts, when resident usage might be lower than during the evening and weekend hours. Visitors and patients are not expected to use nearby parks because their visits to the Campus would be focused on health care services. Finally, because there are existing open space areas on Campus for passive recreation and new open space amenities would be provided as part of Alternative 1 short-term projects, it is expected that access to on-site open space would help offset any potential deterioration of nearby parks caused by Campus personnel and visitors. For the reasons stated above, operational impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects on park usage would be minor.

Long-Term Projects

The Alternative 1 long-term project would involve construction of 170,000 gsf (all of which would be net new) at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus.

Construction

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

Construction of the Alternative 1 long-term project would require equipment and construction activities similar to those required by short-term projects for Alternative 1. The long-term project for Alternative 1 would have a smaller development program than the short-term projects for this alternative, and its construction activities and duration would be less. This project would require the same construction practices and compliance with the same applicable standards and requirements as Alternative 1 short-term projects. Therefore, construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on fire and EMS response times would be similar to those of Alternative 1 short-term projects. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on response times would be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on fire truck access and circulation would be similar to those of short-term projects for this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on fire truck access and circulation would be minor.

Fire Hazards

Construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project related to fire hazards would be similar to those of Alternative 1 short-term projects identified above. Therefore, construction impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project related to fire hazards would be minor.

Law Enforcement Services

Construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on law enforcement services would be similar to those of short-term projects for this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on law enforcement services would be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

The impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on park accessibility would be similar to those of short-term projects for this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on park accessibility would be minor.

Park Usage

The impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on park usage would be similar to those of short-term projects for this alternative. Therefore, construction-related impacts of the Alternative 1 long-term project on park usage would be minor.

Operation

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

Implementation of the Alternative 1 long-term project would involve one development project occurring over approximately 2 years, with completion anticipated by March 2026. By 2027, there would be a net increase in the daily employee population at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus of 616 persons. This represents an increase of 15 percent between 2020 and 2027. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, the increase in daily population levels would not generate substantial demand on fire or EMS services. Impacts of the operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project on fire and EMS response times are expected to be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Under the Alternative 1 long-term project, no major changes would be made to SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus access and circulation. Access for emergency medical and fire vehicles would continue to be provided internally. As described above for short-term projects under this alternative, VA would be required to comply with all applicable access and circulation requirements of the NFPA Fire Code (with consideration of the San Francisco

Fire Code) during implementation of the Alternative 1 long-term project. Therefore, impacts of the operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project on fire truck access and circulation are expected to be minor.

Water and Fire Flow Systems

Improvements to the water distribution system for the Alternative 1 long-term project would be similar to those implemented for Alternative 1 short-term projects. VA would be required to comply with all applicable fire flow regulations of the NFPA Fire Code (with consideration of the San Francisco Fire Code) during implementation of the Alternative 1 long-term project. Therefore, impacts of the operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project on water and fire flow systems are expected to be minor.

Fire Hazards

Operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project would result in impacts related to fire hazards similar to those identified above for operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects. Therefore, impacts of operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project related to fire hazards would be minor with mitigation.

Law Enforcement Services

Because the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is under federal jurisdiction, VA Police would continue to provide police service during operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project. Although daily employee population levels are expected to increase by 616 persons between 2020 and 2027, this increase is not expected to generate substantial demand on police services. Therefore, impacts of the operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project on law enforcement services are expected to be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

Implementing the Alternative 1 long-term project would not inhibit access to or use of adjacent GGNRA recreational areas. Impacts of operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project on park accessibility are expected to be minor.

As part of the Alternative 1 long-term project, a Central Green park area would be completed with permanent landscaping, walkways, and gardens to serve employees, patients, visitors, and the surrounding community. Adding new park facilities and connections to surrounding parklands would provide a recreational benefit to the personnel and patients at the Campus.

Park Usage

In the long term, the number of personnel at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is projected to increase by 616 persons (a 15 percent increase) between 2020 and 2027. This increase in daily population levels would not lead to a substantial increase in usage of nearby recreational facilities. Therefore, impacts of the operation of the Alternative 1 long-term project on park usage are expected to be minor.

Alternative 2: SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus Buildout Alternative

Short-Term Projects

Alternative 2 short-term projects at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus would be the same as Alternative 1 short-term projects, with one exception. Specifically, retrofitting of the existing Buildings 1, 6, and 8 would not occur as part of Alternative 2 short-term projects (Table 2-3 and Figure 2-3), but instead would be accomplished in the long term. Alternative 2 short-term projects include construction of a total of 485,445 gsf, which is 115,547 gsf less than for short-term projects under Alternative 1. Therefore, impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects would be similar to or less than those of Alternative 1 short-term projects.

Construction

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

Like construction of the short-term projects for Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 2 short-term projects would increase the potential for accidental on-site fires from such sources as the operation of mechanical equipment and use of flammable construction materials. Construction activities also have the potential to affect fire protection services, such as emergency vehicle response times, by adding construction traffic to the street network and potentially requiring partial land closures during street improvements and utility installations. As under Alternative 1 short-term projects, access to all buildings by fire trucks and emergency vehicles would be maintained during construction. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects on fire protection services are expected to be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

As described above, access to all buildings by fire trucks and emergency vehicles would be maintained during construction. Therefore, impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects related to fire truck access and circulation would be minor.

Fire Hazards

As with short-term projects for Alternative 1, construction activities for Alternative 2 short-term projects may increase the risk of fire. The measures to reduce impacts related to fire hazards during construction of Alternative 2 short-term projects would be the same as those described for construction of Alternative 1 short-term projects, and the potential impacts would be similar. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects related to fire hazards would be minor.

Law Enforcement Services

As under Alternative 1 short-term projects, the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus would continue to be served by VA Police during construction of Alternative 2 short-term projects. The additional activity associated with construction of Alternative 2 short-term projects has the potential to increase the number of calls regarding minor incidents. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects on law enforcement services are expected to be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

Like construction of the short-term projects for Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 2 short-term projects could result in temporary closure of access roads to East Fort Miley and West Fort Miley from the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. However, as under Alternative 1 short-term projects, the primary entrances into the Lands End–Fort Miley–Lincoln Park system would remain open. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects on park accessibility during construction would be minor.

Park Usage

Like construction of the short-term projects for Alternative 1, construction of Alternative 2 short-term projects would be performed by a temporary workforce consisting of approximately 64 persons derived from the local labor pool, depending on the concurrent project(s) for LRDP construction on the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects on park usage would be minor.

Operation

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

By 2020, there would be a net increase in daily population at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus of 642 people as a result of the increase in VA employees. Because approximately 3,545 employees currently work at the Campus, this would represent an 18 percent net increase in employees at the Campus between 2015 and 2020. It should be noted that this increase in personnel, patients, and visitors is expected to occur incrementally over a construction period of 6 years as the short-term projects of Alternative 2 are completed.

Alternative 2 short-term projects would result in less overall development, but would have the same net new gross square footage as short-term projects for Alternative 1 (384,452 gsf). Therefore, for the same reasons as described for the operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects would be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Under Alternative 2 short-term projects, the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus's circulation would be altered slightly, and would be the same as described previously for short-term projects under Alternative 1. For the same reasons as described for the operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects, operational fire access and circulation impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects are expected to be minor.

Water and Fire Flow Systems

As with the short-term projects for Alternative 1, implementing Alternative 2 short-term projects would require making improvements to the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus's water distribution system because of utility

conflicts with proposed facilities and other site improvements. For the same reasons as described for the operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects related to water and fire flow systems are expected to be minor.

Fire Hazards

Operation of Alternative 2 short-term projects would result in impacts related to fire hazards similar to those of Alternative 1 short-term projects, and the measures to reduce operational fire hazard impacts would be the same. Therefore, impacts of operation of Alternative 2 short-term projects related to fire hazards would be minor with mitigation.

Law Enforcement Services

As with the short-term projects for Alternative 1, because the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is under federal jurisdiction, VA Police would continue to provide police service during Alternative 2 long-term projects. Implementing Alternative 2 short-term projects would increase the number of personnel at the Campus by 642. For the same reasons as described for the operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects on law enforcement services are expected to be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

As with the short-term projects for Alternative 1, implementing Alternative 2 short-term projects would not inhibit access to or use of adjacent GGNRA recreational areas. For the same reasons as described for the operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects related to park accessibility are expected to be beneficial.

Park Usage

As with the short-term projects for Alternative 1, implementing Alternative 2 short-term projects would result in new and additional medical and medical office uses. No permanent housing component is proposed; therefore, the area's population density would not be affected directly. However, the number of personnel at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is projected to increase by 642 (an 18 percent increase) between 2015 and 2020. For the same reasons as described for the operation of Alternative 1 short-term projects, operational impacts of Alternative 2 short-term projects on park usage would be minor.

Long-Term Projects

Alternative 2 long-term projects at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus would be the same as the Alternative 1 long-term project, with one exception. Specifically, three additional existing buildings—Buildings 1, 6, and 8—would be retrofitted as part of Alternative 2 long-term projects (Table 2-4 and Figure 2-4). Alternative 2 long-term projects include construction of a total of 285,487 gsf, which is 115,487 gsf more than under the Alternative 1 long-term project, because Alternative 2 includes construction of Building 213 along with the seismic retrofit of Buildings 1, 6, and 8. Therefore, construction impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects would be similar to, although slightly greater than, those of the Alternative 1 long-term project.

Construction

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

Construction of Alternative 2 long-term projects would require equipment and construction activities similar to those required by short-term projects for Alternative 1. Alternative 2 long-term projects would have a larger development program and may have greater construction activities and duration than the Alternative 1 short-term projects, but would implement the same construction practices and comply with the same applicable standards and requirements. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on fire and EMS response times would be similar to those of the short-term projects for Alternative 1. Construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on response times would be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on fire truck access and circulation would be similar to those of short-term projects for Alternative 1. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on fire truck access and circulation would be minor.

Fire Hazards

The impacts of construction of Alternative 2 long-term projects related to fire hazards would be similar to those of short-term projects for Alternative 1. Therefore, construction impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects related to fire hazards would be minor.

Law Enforcement Services

Construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on law enforcement services would be similar to those of short-term projects for Alternative 1. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on law enforcement services would be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

The impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on park accessibility would be similar to those of short-term projects for Alternative 1. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on park accessibility would be minor.

Park Usage

The impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on park usage would be similar to those of short-term projects for Alternative 1. Therefore, for the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, construction-related impacts of Alternative 2 long-term projects on park usage would be minor.

Operation

Fire Protection Services

Fire and EMS Response Times

Implementation of Alternative 2 long-term projects would involve four development and retrofitting projects occurring over approximately 5 years and 5 months, with completion anticipated by March 2026. By 2027, there would be a net increase in daily employee population at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus of 616 persons. This represents an increase of 15 percent between 2020 and 2027. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, the increase in daily population levels would not generate substantial demand on fire or EMS services. Impacts of the operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects on fire and EMS response times are expected to be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Under Alternative 2 long-term projects, no major changes would be made to SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus access and circulation. Access for emergency medical and fire vehicles would continue to be provided internally. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of the operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects on fire truck access and circulation are expected to be minor.

Water and Fire Flow Systems

Improvements to the water distribution system for Alternative 2 long-term projects would be similar to those implemented for short-term projects under Alternative 1. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of the operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects on water and fire flow systems are expected to be minor.

Fire Hazards

Operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects would result in impacts related to fire hazards similar to those identified above for short-term projects under Alternative 1. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of the operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects associated with hazards would be minor with mitigation.

Law Enforcement Services

Because the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is under federal jurisdiction, VA Police would continue to provide police service during operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of the operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects on law enforcement services are expected to be minor.

*Parks and Recreation*Park Accessibility

Implementation of Alternative 2 long-term projects would be similar to implementation of short-term projects under this alternative and would not inhibit access to or use of adjacent GGNRA recreational areas. Impacts of operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects on park accessibility are expected to be beneficial.

Park Usage

In the long term, the number of personnel at the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus is projected to increase by 616 persons (a 15 percent increase) between 2020 and 2030. This increase in daily population levels would not lead to a substantial increase in usage of nearby recreational facilities. For the same reasons as described above for Alternative 1 short-term projects, impacts of the operation of Alternative 2 long-term projects on park usage are expected to be minor.

Alternative 3: Fort Miley Campus Plus Mission Bay Campus Alternative***Short-Term Projects***

Alternative 3 short-term projects (during both construction and operation) would be the same as short-term projects for Alternative 1 (Table 2-1 and Figure 2-1); thus, all Alternative 3 short-term projects would be located at the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus. The impacts of Alternative 3 short-term projects would be the same as the impacts of Alternative 1 short-term projects. These impacts would be minor or minor with mitigation.

Long-Term Projects

Alternative 3 long-term projects (during both construction and operation) would involve development of 170,000 gsf for ambulatory care and parking structure uses at a potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus. See Figure 2-5 for the location of Alternative 3 long-term projects.

It is assumed that all off-site development in Mission Bay would consist of four-story buildings (or other multi-story buildings consistent with other proximate buildings) in a development area totaling approximately 0.98 acre. Alternative 3 long-term projects at the potential new Mission Bay Campus would be constructed roughly between 2024 and 2027. See Table 2-5 for detailed square footage and phasing for implementation of the long-term projects of Alternative 3 at the potential new Mission Bay Campus. Note that the actual footprint and concept plan and site location within Mission Bay has not been determined at this time.

Construction*Fire Protection Services*Fire and EMS Response Times

Three fire stations operate in the Mission Bay area: Stations 8, 29, and 37. A fourth station will be incorporated into the Public Safety Building at Third Street and Mission Rock in early 2015. As of the writing of this

document, construction was estimated to be completed in December 2014, with targeted move-in of January/February 2015 (DPW, 2014). All three existing stations have response times that surpass both the City and State standards (Table 3.3-3).

Construction of Alternative 3 long-term projects in the Mission Bay area would increase the potential for accidental on-site fires from such sources as the operation of mechanical equipment and use of flammable construction materials. In most cases, implementation of “good housekeeping” procedures by the construction contractors and work crews would minimize such hazards. Construction activities also have the potential to affect fire protection services, such as emergency vehicle response times, by adding construction traffic to the street network and potentially requiring partial street closures during street improvements and utility installations. Because Alternative 3 would involve an alternate site, any street closures or temporary obstruction would be subject to the NFPA standards (with consideration of the local SFFD emergency access standards, requirements, and review), which would further reduce construction-related effects on response times. Thus, construction-related impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on fire protection services are expected to be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

Construction related to development of the potential new 170,000-square-foot SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus under Alternative 3 long-term projects has the potential to require temporary lane closures or detours for fire and emergency personnel. Partial lane closures, if determined to be necessary, would not greatly affect emergency vehicles; the drivers of these vehicles normally have a variety of options for avoiding traffic, such as using their sirens to clear a path of travel or driving in the lanes of opposing traffic. Additionally, should there be partial closures of streets surrounding the potential new Campus, flagmen would be used to facilitate the traffic flow until construction is complete. Although a specific site for the potential new Campus in the Mission Bay area has not been selected, it is assumed that access to all surrounding buildings by fire trucks and emergency vehicles would be maintained during construction. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on fire truck access and circulation would be minor.

Fire Hazards

Alternative 3 long-term projects would involve new construction at a potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus. The potential impacts related to fire hazards during construction of Alternative 3 long-term projects would be similar to the impacts of construction of short-term projects under Alternative 1, and the measures to reduce those impacts would be the same. Therefore, impacts would be minor.

Law Enforcement Services

As under Alternative 1, because the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus would be under federal jurisdiction, VA would need to provide police service during construction of Alternative 3 long-term projects. Construction sites can be sources of attractive nuisances, providing hazards, and inviting theft and vandalism. Therefore, the additional activity associated with construction of Alternative 3 long-term projects has the potential to increase the number of calls for minor incidents. To properly secure the project site, VA Police would need to hire additional personnel and/or acquire equipment to serve the site during construction. The need for additional staff and/or equipment would not in itself constitute an adverse environmental effect related to police protection services unless it would “result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or need

for, new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.” Because any increase in police activity would be limited to the construction period and would not result in the need for a new police station, construction-related impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on law enforcement services would be minor.

Construction-related impacts on traffic and circulation are identified in Section 3.13, “Transportation, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking.” Traffic would be generated by construction workers and trucks primarily during off-peak hours. Although minor traffic delays could result from construction activities at times, these impacts would be temporary and would be coordinated ahead of time with local police and emergency officials. Impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects are expected to be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

Because a specific site has not yet been selected for the potential new 170,000-square-foot SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus, it is unclear whether construction activities for Alternative 3 long-term projects would affect park accessibility. A project-level NEPA analysis would be required once a specific location and site plan for the potential new Campus is determined. However, the Alternative 3 long-term projects would be built in a concentrated area of Mission Bay and construction is not anticipated to adversely affect the accessibility of parkland. Best management practices would be followed to ensure compliance with local codes and regulations. Therefore, the impact of Alternative 3 long-term projects on park accessibility during construction would be minor.

Park Usage

Construction of Alternative 3 long-term projects at the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus would be performed by a temporary workforce consisting of approximately 54 persons derived from the local labor pool, depending on the concurrent project(s) for construction for Alternative 3 long-term projects. Although construction workers would be within walking distance of nearby parks and open space areas, an increase in park usage is expected to be minimal and temporary. The temporary influx of construction workers in the Mission Bay area would not be expected to substantially increase the demand on surrounding parks and recreational facilities. Therefore, construction-related impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on park usage would be minor.

Operation

Fire and EMS Response Times

Adding 170,000 square feet of new development in the Mission Bay area under Alternative 3 long-term projects has the potential to result in an increase in fire demand in the Mission Bay area. Under these projects, there would be an increase in the daily employment population of 1,268 employees at the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus (Table 3.11-7). Three fire stations operate in the Mission Bay area, with a fourth station that is being incorporated into the Public Safety Building at Third Street and Mission Rock (plans to be completed in early 2015). All three existing stations have response times that surpass both the City and State standards (Table 3.3-3). Thus, operational impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on fire and EMS response times would be minor.

Fire Truck Access and Circulation

In implementing Alternative 3 long-term projects at the 170,000-square-foot space in the Mission Bay area, SFVAMC would be required to comply with all applicable access and circulation requirements of the NFPA Fire Code (with consideration of the San Francisco Fire Code). For the same reasons as described for Alternative 1, operational impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on fire truck access and circulation are expected to be minor.

Water and Fire Flow Systems

As described above, SFVAMC would be required to comply with all applicable provisions related to water and fire flow in the NFPA Fire Code (with consideration of the San Francisco Fire Code) during implementation of Alternative 3 long-term projects at the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus. Therefore, operational impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on water and fire flow systems are expected to be minor.

Fire Hazards

The Mission Bay area is characterized as an urbanized area with no or low wildland fire threat, according to CAL FIRE. Operation of Alternative 3 long-term projects would be consistent with existing urbanized land uses and the wildland fire threat would not increase.

Law Enforcement Services

As a federal entity, the potential new SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus would be served by VA Police during operation of Alternative 3 long-term projects. Although daily employee population levels are expected to increase by 100 percent between 2020 and 2027, this increase is not expected to affect public police (SFPD) resources. For the same reasons as described for Alternative 1, operational impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on law enforcement services are expected to be minor.

Parks and Recreation

Park Accessibility

Because a specific site has not yet been selected for the potential new 170,000-square-foot SFVAMC Mission Bay Campus, it is unclear whether operation of Alternative 3 long-term projects would affect park accessibility. A project-level NEPA analysis would be required once a specific location and site plan for the potential new Campus is determined. However, it is anticipated that project components would include open space for passive recreation and that the new Mission Bay Campus would be designed fit within the Mission Bay area while complying with local codes and regulations. Therefore, the impact of Alternative 3 long-term projects on park accessibility would be minor.

Park Usage

As described in Section 3.11, “Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice,” implementing Alternative 3 long-term projects would result in new and additional medical and medical office uses. No permanent housing component is proposed; therefore, the area’s population density would not be affected directly. Thus, the demand on recreational facilities resulting from implementation of Alternative 3 long-term projects would not be substantial in the context of existing citywide demand for these facilities.

Although medical personnel, and to a lesser extent, patients and visitors might use surrounding parks and recreational facilities (e.g., on their lunch breaks), the incremental increase in demand associated with operation of Alternative 3 long-term projects is not expected to result in the need to expand existing recreational facilities or construct new facilities, or to cause the physical deterioration of nearby parks and open spaces. Implementing Alternative 3 long-term projects would intensify the activity and uses on-site and could generate more trips to local nearby parks than under current conditions. Although some of these people might visit recreational facilities in the vicinity of the proposed new Campus, such usage is not expected to result in substantial physical deterioration of nearby facilities or facilities areawide. The use of nearby recreational spaces by employees is expected to be concentrated on lunch hours during weekday shifts, when resident usage might be lower than during the evening and weekend hours. Therefore, operational impacts of Alternative 3 long-term projects on park usage would be minor.

Alternative 4: No Action Alternative

Short-Term and Long-Term Projects

Construction

Under Alternative 4, there would be no new construction or retrofitting of existing buildings. However, ongoing maintenance repairs of the existing SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus would be completed. No impacts on community services (fire protection services, law enforcement services, or parks/recreation) would occur as a result of ongoing maintenance repairs under Alternative 4.

Operation

Under Alternative 4, the LRDP would not be implemented and no additional facilities would be operated. Thus, no impacts on community services (fire protection services, law enforcement services, or parks/recreation) or fire hazards would occur under this alternative.

3.3.4 References

- Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). 2015a. Wildland Urban Interface Fire Threat Map for San Francisco. Available: <http://gis.abag.ca.gov/Website/Fire_Threat_WUI/viewer.htm>. Accessed January 8, 2015.
- . 2015b. Fire Threat Map for San Francisco. Available: <http://gis.abag.ca.gov/Website/Fire_Threat/viewer.htm>. Accessed January 8, 2015.
- Baczek, Robert. Chief of Police. San Francisco Veterans Affairs Police, San Francisco, CA. February 24, 2011—e-mail to SFVAMC regarding police services.
- Ballparks. 2011. AT&T Park. Available: <<http://www.ballparks.com/baseball/national/pacbel.htm>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.

- Bandit Notes, The. 2000. Lands End–Fort Miley–Lincoln Park. Available: <<http://www.josephstubbsscreations.com/Home2/sf/sfparks/lincoln/lincoln.html>>. Last updated April 2000. Accessed March 10, 2011.
- California Department of Finance (DOF). 2010. Demographic Research Unit, E-4 Population Estimates for Cities, Counties and the State, 2001–2010, with 2000 Benchmark. Sacramento, CA.
- Castellanos, Rudy. Battalion Chief. San Francisco Fire Department, San Francisco, CA. September 25, 2014—letter to James Greenwell and Hussam Alkhadra of the SFVAMC Fort Miley Campus regarding fire services.
- Coastwalk. 2011. Welcome to California Coastal Trail - Info. Available: <<http://www.californiacoastaltrail.info/cms/pages/main/index.html>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 2011. *CEQ Regulations and Guidance*. NEPA’s Forty Most Asked Questions. Mitigation Measures. Available: <<http://ceq.hss.doe.gov/nepa/regs/40/11-19.HTM#19>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco (FAMSF). 2011. About the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco. Available: <<http://legionofhonor.famsf.org/about/about-fine-arts-museums-san-francisco>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy (GGNPC). 2011. Lands End. Available: <<http://www.parksconservancy.org/visit/park-sites/lands-end.html>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- Golden Gate National Recreation Area (GGNRA). 2011. *Draft Dog Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement*. Volume I. San Francisco, CA. Page 277. Available: <<http://parkplanning.nps.gov/document.cfm?parkID=303&projectID=11759&documentID=38106>>. Accessed January 14, 2015.
- Kennedy, Matt. Winzler & Kelly. PE, TE Project Manager. Santa Rosa, CA. July 12 and July 14, 2011—e-mail and telephone call with Stephanie Klock of AECOM regarding fire flow requirements and adequacy.
- Myers, Jeff. Assistant Deputy Chief. Emergency Medical Services. San Francisco Fire Department, San Francisco, CA. April 5, 2011—telephone call with Stephanie Klock of AECOM regarding emergency patient transports to the SFVAMC.
- National Park Service (NPS). 2006. *Management Policies*. Section 1.4.4, “The Prohibition of Impairment of Park Resources and Values.” Page 11.
- . 2010. Lands End Improvements Continue with New Major Gift. Available: <<http://www.nps.gov/goga/parknews/2010-0407.htm>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011. Fort Miley Military Reservation. Available: <<http://www.nps.gov/history/nr/travel/wwIIBayarea/mil.htm>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2014. *GGNRA and Muir Woods National Monument Final General Management Plan/Environmental Impact Statement*. Volume I.

- Neighborhood Parks Council (NPC). 2011a. ParkScan San Francisco: Esprit Park. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=178>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011b. ParkScan San Francisco: Jackson Playground. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=182>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011c. ParkScan San Francisco: James Rolph Playground. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=1>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011d. ParkScan San Francisco: McKinley Square. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=188>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011e. ParkScan San Francisco: Potrero del Sol Park. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=189>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011f. ParkScan San Francisco: Potrero Hill Playground and Recreation Center. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=190>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011g. ParkScan San Francisco: South Park. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=92>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011h. ParkScan San Francisco. Fallen Bridge/Utah & 18th Mini Park. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=216>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011i. ParkScan San Francisco: Agua Vista Park. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=329>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011j. ParkScan San Francisco: Mission Creek Garden. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=359>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011k. ParkScan San Francisco: Woods Yard Park. Available: <<http://www.parkscan.org/parks?parkId=380>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- Pacific Leadership Institute (PLI). 2009. Fort Miley Adventure Challenge Course. Available: <http://www.pliprograms.org/pli_fort_miley_challenge_course.html>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- San Francisco Citizen (SF Citizen). 2010. Warm Water Cove Update. Available: <<http://sfcitizen.com/blog/2010/04/07/warm-water-cove-update-a-fascinating-public-document-explains-why-the-graffiti-is-gone/>>. Last updated April 7, 2010. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- San Francisco, City and County of (CCSF). 2008 (September). *San Francisco Hazard Mitigation Plan*. Wildfire Hazard Area Map C-13. San Francisco, CA.
- . 2010. *California Pacific Medical Center Long Range Development Plan Draft Environmental Impact Report*. San Francisco, CA. Prepared by AECOM, San Francisco, CA.
- . 2014. *Hazard Mitigation Plan*. San Francisco, CA. Page 55. Available: <<http://www.sfdem.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentID=2328>>. Accessed January 8, 2015.

-
- San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD). 2011a. Division of Fire Prevention and Investigation. 5.01 Street Widths for Emergency Access. Available: <<http://38.106.4.187/index.aspx?page=1144>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011b. Learn More about the EMS Division. Available: <<http://38.106.4.187/index.aspx?page=1017>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011c. Division of Fire Prevention and Investigation. 2010 Administrative Bulletins. Available: <<http://38.106.4.187/index.aspx?page=1080>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011d. Proposed 2010 San Francisco Fire Code Ordinance to be Presented to the SF Board of Supervisors. Available: <<http://www.sf-fire.org/index.aspx?page=1072>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- San Francisco Nonprofit Golf Foundation (SFNGF). 2007. *Operational Review and Recommendations for City of San Francisco Golf Operations*. Palo Alto, CA. Prepared by NGF Consulting, Jupiter, FL. Page 102.
- San Francisco Planning Department (SF Planning). 2014a. *General Plan Recreation and Open Space Element (ROSE) Draft Update*. Page 4. Available: <http://openspace.sfplanning.org/docs/Recreation-and-Open-Space-Element_APRIL-2014-ADOPTED.pdf>. Accessed January 8, 2015.
- . 2014b. *Western Shoreline Area Plan*. Available: http://www.sf-planning.org/ftp/General_Plan/Western_Shoreline.htm. Accessed November 6, 2014.
- San Francisco Department of Public Works (DPW). 2014. Earthquake Safety and Emergency Response Bond Program 2010 & 2014 Quarterly Status Report. Available: <http://www.sfearthquakesafety.org/uploads/1/9/4/3/19432507/eser_quarterly_status_report_september_2014.pdf>. Accessed December 8, 2014.
- San Francisco Veterans Affairs Police (SFVA Police). 2011a. Office of Operations, Security, and Preparedness. Available: <http://www.osp.va.gov/Police_Services.asp>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- . 2011b. San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center: Police and Security. Available: <<http://www.sanfrancisco.va.gov/visitors/>>. Accessed August 29, 2011.
- Schultheis, Barbara. Fire Marshal. San Francisco Fire Department, San Francisco, CA. April 7 and April 20, 2011—e-mails to Stephanie Klock of AECOM regarding fire services.
- Stasio, Sean. Analyst, GIS/Web–MIS Division, City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA. March 2011—e-mail to AECOM regarding parks.
- U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). 2011. San Francisco VA Medical Center Parking and Emergency Response Structure Project No. 662-611 Final Environmental Assessment and Response to Comments. Prepared by Winzler and Kelly.
- . 2014 (July 3). SFVAMC Plan Review Meeting Minutes with the San Francisco Fire Department.
- . 2014. *San Francisco Veterans Affairs Medical Center Fort Miley Campus Long Range Development Plan*. San Francisco, CA.

This page intentionally left blank.