

# San Francisco Fire Department Training Facility 1236 Carroll Avenue

## California Environmental Quality Act Findings

### PREAMBLE

In determining to approve the project described in Section I, Project Description below, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (“Board”) makes and adopts the following findings of fact and decisions, based on substantial evidence in the whole record of this proceeding and under the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code Sections 21000 et seq. (“CEQA”), particularly Sections 21081 and 21081.5, the Guidelines for Implementation of CEQA, California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Sections 15000 et seq. (“CEQA Guidelines”), particularly Sections 15091 through 15093, and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administration Code. The Board adopts these findings in anticipation of the Approval Actions described in Section I(c), below, as required by CEQA.

These findings are organized as follows:

**Section I** provides a description of the project (the “Proposed Project”) as analyzed in the Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for the Project (“Final MND” or “FMND”), the environmental review process for the Project, the approval actions to be taken, and the location of records;

**Section II** identifies the impacts found not to be significant that do not require mitigation;

**Section III** identifies potentially significant impacts that can be avoided or reduced to less-than-significant levels through mitigation and describes the mitigation measures.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (“MMRP”) for the mitigation measures that have been proposed for adoption is incorporated by reference into the Board’s motion. The MMRP is required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15074. The MMRP provides a table setting forth each mitigation measure listed in the FMND that is required to avoid a significant adverse impact. The MMRP also specifies the person, party, or agency responsible for implementation of each measure and establishes monitoring actions and a monitoring schedule. The full text of the mitigation measures is set forth in The MMRP. These findings are based upon substantial evidence in the entire record before the Board. The references set forth in these findings to certain pages or sections of the FMND are for ease of reference and are not intended to provide an exhaustive list of the evidence relied upon for these findings.

## **I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

### **A. Project Description**

The San Francisco Department of Public Works acting on behalf of the San Francisco Fire Department (fire department or project sponsor) proposes to acquire the property at 1236 Carroll Avenue and construct a new fire-training facility that would be on two city blocks bounded by Carroll Avenue, Hawes Street, Armstrong Avenue, and Griffith Street. Bancroft Avenue, which bisects the project site between Hawes and Griffith streets, would be vacated, and the parcels would be merged to form a contiguous site of 317,300 square feet (7.28 acres). Following acquisition of the property, the project sponsor would develop detailed plans for the project site and would seek project approvals for the proposed fire-training facility. The proposed fire-training facility would provide necessary training facilities for effective firefighting, including live-fire training, classroom training, equipment training, and emergency medical services training. The proposed fire-training facility would also consolidate and replace the fire department training facilities that are currently at 19th and Folsom streets and on Treasure Island.

The proposed project would grade and improve the soil of the project site and construct three buildings—an administration building, an apparatus building, and a maintenance building (also referred to as “shops”)—a training tower, various burn rooms, training props, simulated structures, and associated site improvements.

More specifically, the proposed fire-training facility would include the following:

- A three-story (50-foot-tall), approximately 70,000-square-foot fire-training and administration building for classroom instruction and administrative functions
- A one-story (50-foot-tall), approximately 27,000-square-foot apparatus building for apparatus training and storage
- A one-story (40-foot-tall), approximately 19,200-square-foot shop/maintenance building that would house metal and wood shops for building and maintaining training props

In addition to classroom instruction and apparatus training and storage, fire training that involves controlled burns and simulated rescue operations would occur at the following prop buildings on site:

- A seven-story (110-foot-tall) training tower
- A four-story (60-foot-tall) condo-apartment-style building
- Several structures and equipment up to 40 feet tall, including a Victorian house, a commercial prop burn room, a container burn room, a mock BART station, a vehicle fire prop, an apparatus training “hill,” and other simulation props.

### **B. Project Approvals**

The project sponsor is seeking to acquire and purchase the property to develop a fire-training facility. Following acquisition of the property, the project sponsor would submit detailed plans of the proposed project to the Planning Department (“Department”) for additional project-level review. This additional environmental review would be subject to all applicable public notice and appeal procedures in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and Chapter 31 of the Administrative Code.

The project sponsor expects to seek approvals for the proposed fire-training facility, including but not limited to the following:

- San Francisco Port Commission
  - Approval of jurisdictional transfer of Port property.
- San Francisco Board of Supervisors
  - Approval to vacate Griffith Street and incorporate it into the project site.
  - Approval of jurisdictional transfer of Port property.
- San Francisco Planning Commission
  - Special Use District or Planning Code Text Amendment/Zoning Map Amendment.
- San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
  - Approval of a new construction permit.
- San Francisco Department of Public Health
  - Approval of site mitigation plan and final project report or no further action letter in compliance with San Francisco Health Code article 22A (Maher Ordinance).
  - Construction dust control plan in compliance with San Francisco Health Code article 22B (Construction Dust Control Ordinance).
- San Francisco Public Works
  - Approval of erosion and sediment control plan (San Francisco Public Works Code section 146.7.)
  - Approval of street improvement permits.
  - Approval of street tree permit.
  - Approval of nighttime construction permit (San Francisco Police Code section 2908), if necessary.
- San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
  - Approval of street improvements.
  - Construction-related approvals, as applicable.
- San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
  - Approval of connection to the existing combined sewer within Bancroft Street.
  - Approval of discharge permit for construction-period dewatering and discharge to the combined sewer system.
- Actions by Other Government Agencies
  - Bay Area Air Quality Management District – approval of any necessary air quality permit for installing, operating, and testing (e.g., Authority to Construct/Permit to Operate) of individual air pollutant sources, such as the proposed emergency backup generator.
  - California State Lands Commission – approval of value of Port property for jurisdictional transfer
  - California State legislation – approval of Port property for jurisdictional transfer.

### **C. Environmental Review**

The City and County of San Francisco, acting through the Planning Department (hereinafter “department”) fulfilled all procedural requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Cal. Pub. Res. Code section 21000 et seq., hereinafter “CEQA”), the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code. Regs. Title 14, section 15000 et seq., hereinafter “CEQA Guidelines”), and Chapter 31 of the San Francisco Administrative Code (hereinafter “Chapter 31”).

The Planning Department commenced environmental review for the proposed project following receipt of the Public Project Application, dated May 11, 2021. On July 23, 2021, the Department mailed a notification of project receiving environmental review to owners of properties within 300 feet of the project site, adjacent occupants, neighborhood groups, and other interested parties. Two comments were received. One individual noted that a previous grade change on site resulted in a berm along Armstrong Avenue; this is addressed in FMND Section A.1, Project Location and Site Characteristics, Section A.2, Proposed Project Characteristics, and Section E.16, Geology and Soils, of this initial study. The other individual requested clarification of the site location, which is provided in FMND Section A.1, Project Location and Site Characteristics, of this initial study.

On November 10, 2021, the Planning Department distributed a Notice of Availability and Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration. The notice was circulated to state and local agencies, interested organizations and individuals, and property owners and residents within 300 feet of the project site. Notices were also posted at multiple locations around the project site. No written comments were received during the 30-day comment period.

One comment email from the California Department of Fish and Wildlife was received after the close of the comment period. The commenter recommended that pre-construction surveys occur multiple times per year if nests are found during the initial survey. Even though these comments were received outside of the comment period, staff-initiated text changes were made to Mitigation Measure M-BI-2a to address these comments.

On December 30, 2021, the Planning Department issued a Final Mitigated Negative Declaration for the proposed project.

Prior to considering approval of the proposed project, the Board must determine that the project proposed for approval has been sufficiently assessed under CEQA.

#### **D. Content and Location of Record**

The record upon which all findings and determinations related to the adoption of the proposed project are based include the following:

- The FMND, and all documents referenced in or relied upon by the FMND;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) provided by City staff to the Planning Department relating to the FMND, the proposed approvals and entitlements, the Project;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the Board by the environmental consultant and subconsultants who prepared the FMND, or incorporated into reports presented to the Board;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented to the City from other public agencies relating to the Project or FMND;
- All applications, letters, testimony, and presentations presented to the City by the Project Sponsor and its consultants in connection with the Project;
- All information (including written evidence and testimony) presented at any public hearing related to the FMND;
- The MMRP; and,
- All other documents comprising the record pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e).

Any public hearing transcripts and audio files, a copy of all letters regarding the FMND received during the public review period, the administrative record, and background documentation for the FMND are located at the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, San Francisco. The Planning Department, Jonas P. Ionin, is the custodian of these documents and materials.

#### **E. Findings About Significant Environmental Impacts of the Project and Mitigation Measures**

The following Sections II and III set forth the Board's findings about the FMND and the mitigation measures proposed such that potentially significant impacts can be avoided or reduced to less-than significant levels. These findings provide the written analysis and conclusions of the Board regarding the environmental impacts of the Project and the mitigation measures included as part of the FMND and adopted by the Board as part of the Project. To avoid duplication and redundancy, and because the Board agrees with, and hereby adopts, the conclusions in the FMND, these findings will not repeat the analysis and conclusions in the FMND, but instead incorporates them by reference herein and relies upon them as substantial evidence supporting these findings.

In making these findings, the Board has considered the opinions of Planning Department and other City staff and experts, other agencies, and members of the public. The Board finds that: the determination of significance thresholds is a judgment decision within the discretion of the City and County of San Francisco; the significance thresholds used in the FMND are supported by substantial evidence in the record, including the expert opinion of the FMND preparers and City staff; and the significance thresholds used in the FMND provide reasonable and appropriate means of assessing the significance of the adverse environmental effects of the Project.

These findings do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact contained in the FMND. Instead, a full explanation of these environmental findings and conclusions can be found in the FMND and these findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the FMND supporting the determination regarding the Project impacts and mitigation measures designed to address those impacts. In making these findings, the Board ratifies, adopts and incorporates in these findings the determinations and conclusions of the FMND relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these findings.

As set forth below, the Board adopts and incorporates the mitigation measures set forth in the FMND and the attached MMRP to avoid the potentially significant and significant impacts of the Project. The Board intends to adopt the mitigation measures proposed in the FMND. Accordingly, in the event a mitigation measure recommended in the FMND has inadvertently been omitted in these findings or the MMRP, such mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated in the findings below by reference. In addition, in the event the language describing a mitigation measure set forth in these findings or the MMRP fails to accurately reflect the mitigation measures in the FMND, due to a clerical error, the language of the policies and implementation measures as set forth in the FMND, shall control. The impact numbers and mitigation measure numbers used in these findings reflect the information contained in the FMND.

In the Sections II and III below, the same findings are made for a category of environmental impacts and mitigation measures. Rather than repeat the identical finding dozens of times to address each and every significant effect and mitigation

measure, the initial finding obviates the need for such repetition because in no instance is the Board rejecting the conclusions of the FMND or the mitigation measures recommended in the FMND for the Project.

## **II. IMPACTS OF THE PROJECT FOUND NOT TO BE SIGNIFICANT AND THUS DO NOT REQUIRE MITIGATION**

Under CEQA, no mitigation measures are required for impacts that are less than significant (Pub. Resources Code, § 21002; CEQA Guidelines, §§ 15126.4, subd. (a)(3), 15091.). Based on the evidence in the whole record of this proceeding, the Board finds that, the Project described in the FMND will not result in any significant impacts in the below areas and that these impact areas therefore do not require mitigation.

### **Land Use/Planning**

- **Impact LU-1:** The proposed project would not physically divide an established community. (No Impact)
- **Impact LU-2:** The proposed project would not cause a significant physical environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-LU-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative impact related to land use. (Less than Significant)

### **Aesthetics**

- **Impact AE-1:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact AE-2:** The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway. (No Impact)
- **Impact AE-3:** The proposed project would not conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact AE-4:** The proposed project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-AE-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not have a significant cumulative effect on aesthetics. (Less than Significant)

### **Population and Housing**

- **Impact PH-1:** The proposed project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth in an area. (No Impact)
- **Impact PH-2:** The proposed project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing units, necessitating the construction of replacement housing. (No Impact)
- **Impact C-PH-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not induce substantial population growth or displace substantial numbers of people or housing units. (Less than Significant)

### **Cultural Resources**

- **Impact CR-1:** The proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an on-site or adjacent historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, including those resources listed in article 10 or 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. (No Impact)
- **Impact C-CR-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in cumulative impacts on cultural resources. (Less than Significant)

### **Tribal Cultural Resources**

- **Impact C-TCR-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources. (Less than Significant)

### **Transportation and Circulation**

- **Impact TR-1:** Operation of the proposed project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, driving or public transit operations. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact TR-2:** Operation of the proposed project would not interfere with accessibility of people walking or bicycling to and from the project site, and adjoining areas, or result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact TR-3:** Operation of the proposed project would not substantially delay public transit. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact TR-4:** Operation of the proposed project would not cause substantial additional VMT. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact TR-5:** Operation of the proposed project would result in a loading deficit, but the secondary effects of that deficit would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, or driving, or substantially delay public transit. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact TR-6:** Operation of the proposed project would not result in a parking deficit. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-TR-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant cumulative construction-related transportation impacts. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-TR-2:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not create potentially hazardous conditions for people walking, bicycling, driving or public transit operations. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-TR-3:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not significantly interfere with accessibility. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-TR-4:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not substantially delay public transit. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-TR-5:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not cause substantial additional VMT or substantially induce automobile travel. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-TR-6:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant cumulative impacts to loading. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-TR-7:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant cumulative parking impacts. (Less than Significant)

### **Noise**

- **Impact NO-3:** Operation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity in excess of applicable standards. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact NO-4:** Operation of the proposed project would not result in excessive groundborne vibration levels. (No Impact)
- **Impact C-NO-2:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant cumulative vibration impact. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-NO-3:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant cumulative operational noise impacts. (Less than Significant)

### Air Quality

- **Impact AQ-1:** The proposed project would not conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the clean air plan. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact AQ-2:** The proposed project's construction activities would generate fugitive dust and criteria air pollutants, but would not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of non-attainment criteria air pollutants within the air basin. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact AQ-3:** During project operations, the proposed project would result in emissions of criteria air pollutants, but not at levels that would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase in non-attainment criteria air pollutants. (Less than Significant)

### Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- **Impact C-GG-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would generate greenhouse gas emissions, but not at levels that would result in a significant impact on the environment or conflict with any policy, plan, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing greenhouse gas emissions. (Less than Significant)

### Wind

- **Impact WI-1:** The proposed project would not create wind hazards in publicly accessible areas of substantial pedestrian use. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-WI-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts on wind. (Less than Significant)

### Shadow

- **Impact SH-1:** The proposed project would not create new shadow that substantially and adversely affects the use and enjoyment of publicly accessible open space. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-SH-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in significant cumulative shadow impacts. (Less than Significant)

### Recreation

- **Impact RE-1:** The proposed project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that



substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated or the construction of new facilities would be required. (Less than Significant)

- **Impact C-RE-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would result in less-than-significant impacts on recreational resources. (Less than Significant)

### Utilities and Service Systems

- **Impact UT-1:** The proposed project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded, water, wastewater treatment, or stormwater drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, nor would it result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it has inadequate capacity to serve the proposed project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact UT-2:** Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the proposed project and reasonably foreseeable future development in normal, dry, and multiple dry years unless the Bay-Delta Plan Amendment is implemented; in that event the public utilities commission may develop new or expanded water supply facilities to address shortfalls in single and multiple dry years, but this would occur with or without the proposed project. Impacts related to new or expanded water supply facilities cannot be identified at this time or implemented in the near term; instead, the public utilities commission would address supply shortfalls through increased rationing, which could result in significant cumulative effects, but the proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to impacts from increased rationing. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-UT-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative impact on utilities and service systems. (Less than Significant)

### Public Services

- **Impact PS-1:** The proposed project would increase demand for police protection, fire protection services, and other government services, but not to an extent that would require new or physically altered government facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental impacts. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-PS-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative impact on public services. (Less than Significant)

### Biological Resources

- **Impact BI-1:** The proposed project would not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any special-status species (Less than Significant)
- **Impact BI-3:** The proposed project would not conflict with the City's local tree ordinance. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-BI-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative impact related to biological resources. (Less than Significant)

### Geology and Soils

- **Impact GE-1:** The proposed project would not expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death

involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure, or landslides, and would not be located on unstable soil that could result in lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. (Less than Significant)

- **Impact GE-2:** The proposed project would not result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact GE-3:** The project site would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that could become unstable as a result of the project. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact GE-4:** The proposed project would not create substantial risks to life or property as a result of being located on expansive soil. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact GE-5:** The proposed project would not directly or indirectly destroy a unique geologic feature of the site. (No Impact)
- **Impact GE-6:** The proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-GE-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative impact related to geology and soils. (Less than Significant)

### Hydrology and Water Quality

- **Impact HY-1:** The proposed project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact HY-2:** The proposed project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact HY-3:** The proposed project would not result in altered drainage patterns that would cause substantial erosion or flooding or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact HY-4:** The proposed project would not risk release of pollutants due a project inundation in flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-HY-1:** The proposed project, in combination with the cumulative projects, would result in less than significant cumulative impacts on hydrology and water quality. (Less than Significant)

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials

- **Impact HZ-1:** The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact HZ-2:** The proposed project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact HZ-3:** The proposed project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact HZ-4:** The proposed project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency

evacuation plan and would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires. (Less than Significant)

- **Impact C-HZ-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would not result in a cumulative impact related to hazards and hazardous materials. (Less than Significant)

### Mineral Resources

- The California Division of Mines and Geology under the Surface Mining and Reclamation Act of 1975 designates all land in San Francisco, including the project site, as Mineral Resource Zone 4 (MRZ4). This designation indicates that there is inadequate information available for assignment to any other mineral resource zone, and thus, the project site is not a designated area of significant mineral deposits. Further, according to the general plan, no significant mineral resources exist in San Francisco. No operational mineral resource recovery sites exist in the project area. Therefore, Topics E.19(a) and E.19(b) are not applicable to the proposed project.

### Energy

- **Impact EN-1:** The proposed project would result in increased energy consumption but would not encourage activities that result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, or energy or use these in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)
- **Impact C-EN-1:** The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would increase the use of energy, fuel and water resources, but not in a wasteful manner. (Less than Significant)

### Agriculture and Forestry Resources

- The project site is within an urbanized area of San Francisco. No land in San Francisco County has been designated by the California Department of Conservation Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program as agricultural land. Because the project site does not contain agricultural uses and is not zoned for such uses, the proposed project would not require the conversion of any land designated as prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide importance to non-agricultural use. The proposed project would not conflict with any existing agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts, because no lands in San Francisco are zoned agricultural or are under Williamson Act contracts. No land in San Francisco is designated as forest land or as timberland production by the California Public Resources Code or Government Code. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with zoning for forest land, cause a loss of forest land, or convert forest land to a different use. For these reasons, Topics E.21(a), E.21(b), E.21(c), E.21(d), and E.21(e) are not applicable to the proposed project.

### Wildfire

- The City and County of San Francisco and bordering areas within San Mateo County do not have any state responsibility areas for fire prevention or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones; therefore, this topic is not applicable. See Section E.18, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, for a discussion of wildland fire risks.

### **III. FINDINGS OF POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS THAT CAN BE AVOIDED OR REDUCED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL THROUGH MITIGATION**

CEQA requires agencies to adopt mitigation measures that would avoid or substantially lessen a project's identified significant impacts or potential significant impacts if such measures are feasible (unless mitigation to such levels is achieved through adoption of a project alternative). The findings in this Section III concern mitigation measures set forth in the FMND. These findings discuss mitigation measures identified in the FMND to mitigate the potentially significant impacts of the proposed project. The full text of the mitigation measures is contained in the FMND and in the MMRP. The Board finds that the impacts of the Project identified in this Section III would be reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of the mitigation measures contained in the FMND for the reasons specified therein, and imposed as conditions of approval as set forth in the MMRP.

The Board recognizes that some of the mitigation measures are partially within the jurisdiction of other agencies. The Board urges these agencies to assist in implementing these mitigation measures, and finds that these agencies can and should participate in implementing these mitigation measures.

**Impact CR-2: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

**Impact CR-3: The project could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Based on the results of the Department's preliminary archeological review, the proposed project could disturb significant historical and prehistoric archeological resources given ground disturbance to a maximum depth of 100 feet. Such an impact would be considered significant. Further, while there are no known human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries, located in the immediate vicinity of the project site, human remains may be present in archeological deposits and may potentially be found in isolation. If human remains are encountered during construction, any inadvertent damage to human remains would be considered a significant impact.

#### *Mitigation Measure M-CR-2, Archeological Testing Program*

For the reasons set forth in the FMND and based on substantial evidence in the administrative record, the Board finds that implementing **Mitigation Measure M-CR-2, Archeological Testing Program**, as described and set forth in the MMRP, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact TCR-1: The proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in Public Resources Code section 21074. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Based on tribal consultation undertaken by the City and County of San Francisco in 2015 with Native American tribal representatives, prehistoric archeological resources are presumed to be potential tribal cultural resources. Impact CR-2 determines that the proposed project's ground disturbance could result in a significant impact to prehistoric archeological resources, should any be encountered.

*Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1, Tribal Cultural Resources Archeological Resource Program*

For the reasons set forth in the FMND and based on substantial evidence in the administrative record, the Board finds that implementing **Mitigation Measure M-TCR-1, Tribal Cultural Resources Archeological Resource Program**, as described and set forth in the MMRP, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact NO-1: Construction activities associated with the proposed project could result in a significant temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity in excess of established standards. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

**Impact C-NO-1: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, could result in significant cumulative construction noise impact. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

Construction noise from the proposed project was modeled in three phases—building foundation and shoring work (including site preparation), building construction, and paving. The construction noise analysis evaluated the simultaneous operation of the two noisiest pieces of equipment.<sup>43</sup> The noisiest phase of construction would be the building foundation and shoring work. During the building foundation and shoring work, deep foundations for buildings would be installed with a mix of vibratory and impact hammers. Assuming use of impact pile drivers, the highest CNEL construction noise levels at 1110 Donner Avenue would be 69 dBA, and the peak hour would be 71 dBA, which would exceed ambient noise levels at 1110 Donner Avenue by more than 10 dB, and the impact would be significant.

Construction of cumulative projects, particularly those in CPHPS Phase II, will include pile-driving. Because pile-driving activities will be periodic over a 20-year period and may overlap with other nearby construction activities during project development, construction-related temporary increases in ambient noise levels will be considered cumulatively significant and unavoidable, reaching levels of 107 dBA Leq. As indicated, the proposed project would include impact pile-driving and would generate substantial construction noise of more than 10 dB above ambient noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors. Therefore, construction of the proposed project would considerably contribute to significant cumulative construction noise impacts.

*Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control*

For the reasons set forth in the FMND and based on substantial evidence in the administrative record, the Board finds that implementing **Mitigation Measure M-NO-1: Construction Noise Control**, as described and set forth in the MMRP, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact NO-2: Construction of the proposed project could generate excessive groundborne noise or vibration levels. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

A stormwater transport/storage box traverses the project site, from east to west, beneath unbuilt Bancroft Street. If piles are driving within 4 feet of this transport/storage box, damage to this utility could occur. Given the location of the piles is not known at this time, this would be considered a significant impact.

*Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Protection of Utility Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction*

For the reasons set forth in the FMND and based on substantial evidence in the administrative record, the Board finds that implementing **Mitigation Measure M-NO-2: Protection of Utility Structures and Vibration Monitoring During Construction**, as described and set forth in the MMRP, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact AQ-4: The proposed project's construction and operational activities would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, that would expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

**Impact AQ-5: The proposed project would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

**Impact C-AQ-1: The proposed project, in combination with cumulative projects, would contribute to cumulative air quality impacts. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

The project site is not within an air pollutant exposure zone; therefore, existing background health risks at the project site are not substantial. However, the project site is adjacent to an area that already experiences poor air quality, and project construction activities would temporarily generate additional air pollution, affecting nearby sensitive receptors. The unmitigated excess cancer risk and highest PM<sub>2.5</sub> concentration from existing background sources and construction and operation of the proposed project that would occur outside of the air pollutant exposure zone is at the corner of Carroll Avenue and Giants Drive (Alice Griffith Housing Project). In scenarios analyzed in the FMND, the proposed project would not bring the sensitive receptor area into the air pollutant exposure zone. However, proper design and implementation of the scrubbers to meet specific performance criteria cannot be guaranteed. As such, the impact is considered significant.

Exposure to smoke and odors from wood and hay combustion from live-fire training exercises would be controlled by the implementation of exhaust capture and control systems; however, proper design and implementation of the scrubbers to meet specific performance criteria cannot be guaranteed. Therefore, smoke generated during live-fire training operations has the potential to be objectionable and affect nearest sensitive receptors. As such, impacts during operations would be significant.

*Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Design and Maintenance Standards for Exhaust Capture Control Systems for Live-Fire Training Operations*

For the reasons set forth in the FMND and based on substantial evidence in the administrative record, the Board finds that implementing **Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4: Design and Maintenance Standards for Exhaust Capture Control Systems for Live-Fire Training Operations**, as described and set forth in the MMRP, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact BI-2: The proposed project could interfere with the movement of native resident or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)**

The stands of trees and shrubs within the Candlestick Point State Recreation Area to the east of the project site may provide suitable habitat for common migratory birds. Nearly all nesting birds are protected under the California Fish and Game Code and the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. As such, disturbance of these nesting birds could result in a significant impact.

*Mitigation Measure M-BI-2a: Nesting Bird Protection*

*Mitigation Measure M-BI-2b: Wildlife Exclusion*

For the reasons set forth in the FMND and based on substantial evidence in the administrative record, the Board finds that implementing **Mitigation Measure M-BI-2a: Nesting Bird Protection** and **Mitigation Measure M-BI-2b: Wildlife Exclusion**, as described and set forth in the MMRP, would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level.

### **Mandatory Findings of Significance**

As discussed in FMND Section E.15, Biological Resources, with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-BI-2a, M-BI-2b, M-NO-1, and M-AQ-4, the proposed project would not substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, or reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal.

As discussed in FMND Section E.4, Cultural Resources, implementation of the proposed project would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource or a tribal cultural resource and would not disturb human remains, with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-CR-2 and M-TCR-1. For these reasons, the proposed project would not eliminate important examples of major periods of California history or prehistory.

As discussed in FMND Section 7, Noise, the proposed project would not have adverse effects on human beings. Construction noise and vibration impacts would be addressed with implementation of Mitigation Measures M-NO-1 and M-NO-2. As discussed in FMND Section 8, the proposed project would have less-than-significant impacts on human health due to air pollutant emissions, with implementation of Mitigation Measure M-AQ-4.

As discussed in FMND Section E, Evaluation of Environmental Effects, the proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to any other cumulative environmental impacts.