

# Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement



*The Public Health Service Hospital  
at the Presidio of San Francisco*

*August 2004*

# Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

## Public Health Service Hospital, The Presidio of San Francisco, CA

### LEAD AGENCY

The Presidio Trust (Trust), a federal corporation and executive agency created by Congress in 1996, is the lead agency for the proposed action under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The Trust maintains jurisdiction over the interior 80 percent of the Presidio of San Francisco (Area B), while the National Park Service has jurisdiction over the coastal areas of the former army post (Area A). The Trust must preserve and enhance the Presidio and also become financially self-sufficient by the year 2013.

### ABSTRACT

The Trust is proposing to rehabilitate and reuse buildings within the Public Health Service Hospital (PHSH) district of the Presidio, to re-introduce residential uses to the district, and to undertake related site improvements. This Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) evaluates the environmental impacts of the proposed action by supplementing and tiering from the Final EIS for the Presidio Trust Management Plan (PTMP), the Trust's comprehensive land use plan and policy framework for Area B, adopted in August 2002. The PTMP Final EIS analyzed a range of land use alternatives for the Presidio's seven planning districts, including development of a residential and educational community in the PHSH district. Consistent with the PTMP, the Trust is now proposing to undertake leasing and development within the district. This Draft SEIS evaluates five alternatives, including a publicly requested "no action" alternative and the PTMP baseline alternative. The alternatives propose different treatments for the main hospital (Building 1801) and different amounts of demolition and replacement construction within the project site. Potential impacts associated with each alternative are described, together with mitigation measures that would reduce or eliminate those impacts.

### PUBLIC COMMENTS

The Trust is requesting comments on the adequacy of the Draft SEIS and/or the merits of the alternatives. Oral comments on the Draft SEIS will be accepted from the public at a Trust public meeting on October 7, 2004 beginning at 6:30 PM, at the Officers' Club, 50 Moraga Avenue, on the Main Post in the Presidio. Written comments may be submitted to John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Manager at 415/561-2790 (fax), [phsh@presidiotrust.gov](mailto:phsh@presidiotrust.gov), or the Trust Post Office address specified below, and must be received by the end of the comment period on October 12, 2004. The Trust will respond to all substantive comments received in the Final SEIS.

### FOR MORE INFORMATION

Contact John Pelka, NEPA Compliance Manager, Presidio Trust, 34 Graham Street, P.O. Box 29052, San Francisco, CA 94129-0052, 415/561-5300 (phone).

# Contents

## COVER SHEET

<b>SUMMARY</b>	<b>1</b>
Purpose	1
Planning Context	1
Previous Environmental Review and Expanded Analysis	4
Alternatives	4
Major Conclusions	6
Next Steps	7
<b>1 PURPOSE AND NEED</b>	<b>27</b>
1.1 The Presidio of San Francisco	27
1.2 From Military Post to National Park	28
1.3 The Presidio Trust and Its Mandate	28
1.4 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action	29
1.5 Project Objectives	35
<b>2 ALTERNATIVES</b>	<b>37</b>
2.1 Characteristics Shared by The Alternatives	37
2.2 Related Activities Common to All Alternatives	39
2.3 Requested No Action Alternative	43
2.4 Alternative 1: PTMP Alternative	45
2.5 Alternative 2: Infill Alternative	50
2.6 Alternative 3: No Infill Alternative	54
2.7 Alternative 4: Battery Caulfield Alternative	57
2.8 Park Presidio Boulevard Access Variant	61
2.9 Other Alternatives	63
2.10 Preferred Alternative	68
<b>3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES</b>	<b>73</b>
3.1 Land Use, Housing, and Schools	73
3.2 Transportation	85
3.3 Historic Resources	133
3.4 Archaeological Resources	147
3.5 Air Quality	151
3.6 Noise	158
3.7 Visual Resources	166
3.8 Visitor Use	180
3.9 Utilities and Services	186
3.10 Geology and Soils	205
3.11 Hydrology, Wetlands, and Water Quality	209
3.12 Biology	221

<b>4</b>	<b>CONSULTATION AND REFERENCES</b>	<b>245</b>
4.1	Concurrent Leasing and Environmental Review Process	245
4.2	Interagency Coordination	251
4.3	List of Persons and Agencies Consulted	255
4.4	List of Preparers and Contributors	258
4.5	Agencies and Organizations to Whom Copies of the Draft SEIS Were Sent	260
4.6	References	262
	<b>LIST OF ACRONYMS</b>	<b>271</b>
	<b>GLOSSARY</b>	<b>275</b>
	<b>INDEX</b>	<b>289</b>
	<b>Appendices</b>	
A	Responses to Comments	
B	Transportation Technical Memoranda	

## Figures

1	PHSH District and Project Site Boundaries	3
2	Existing Conditions at the PHSB	31
3	Related Ongoing Activities	40
4	Alternative 1: PTMP Alternative	48
5	Alternative 2: Infill Alternative	51
6	Alternative 3: No Infill Alternative	55
7	Alternative 4: Battery Caulfield Alternative	58
8	Park Presidio Access Variant	62
9	Study Intersections	87
10	Existing Transit Routes	92
11	Trails and Bikeways	95
12	Historic Buildings and Archaeological Resources	135
13	Park Presidio Boulevard Access, Circa 1932	144
14	Building 1801, Existing Conditions	167
15	View Looking North from the Central Green, Existing Conditions	169
16	View Looking Toward Battery Caulfield, Existing Conditions	170
17	Important Views to and from the PHSB District	171
18	Building 1801, Alternative 2 (Non-historic Wings Remain at their Current Height)	173
19	Building 1801, Alternative 2 (Non-historic Wings Reduced in Height)	174
20	View Looking North from the Central Green, Alternatives 2 and 4	176
21	Building 1801, Alternative 3 and 4 (Non-historic Wings Removed)	177
22	View Toward Battery Caulfield, Alternative 4	179
23	Existing Site Hydrology	211
24	Conceptual Cross Section of Hydrologic Conditions at Battery Caulfield	213
25	Biological Resources	223

## Tables

1	Summary of Alternatives for the PHSB Project	6
2	Summary of Environmental Consequences and Mitigation	8
3	Presidio Trust Federal Appropriations, Fiscal Years 1999 to 2005 (in Millions of Dollars)	34
4	Range of Alternatives under Consideration for the PHSB Project	47
5	Existing and Projected Employee Housing Demand at the Presidio	76
6	Projected Land Use, Population, Employment, and School Enrollment at the PHSB District by Alternative	78
7	Intersection Levels of Service – Weekday AM and PM Peak Hours Existing Conditions	90
8	Existing MUNI Passenger Loads	93
9	Trip Generation Rates by Land Use	99
10	Estimated Trip Generation <sup>a</sup> by Mode of Travel and by Alternative Weekday Daily, AM and PM Peak Hour	101
11	Intersection Levels of Service – Weekday AM Peak Hour Year 2020 Conditions	103
12	Intersection Levels of Service – Weekday PM Peak Hour Year 2020 Conditions	104
13	Comparison of Peak Hour Traffic Volumes <sup>a</sup> through 14 <sup>th</sup> /15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Gates	112
14	Peak Hour Transit Trips to/from Project Site by Service Provider and Alternative	115
15	Parking Demand (Spaces) by Time of Day and Alternative	120
16	Comparison of Construction and Demolition Activities	123
17	Summary of Adverse and Beneficial Impacts on Historic Resources	138
18	Predicted Localized Carbon Monoxide (CO) Concentrations at Congested Intersections	154
19	Estimated Average Weekday Emissions from Vehicle Trips and Area Sources	155
20	FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (Hourly dBA)	159
21	Summary of Short-Term Noise Measurements, PHSB District	160
22	Traffic Noise Levels in the Vicinity of PHSB Gates by Alternative	162
23	Annual Utility Demands	191
24	Known Occurrences of Special-Status Plant Species Near the Project Site	225
25	Occurrences of Special-Status Wildlife Species Near the Project Site	227
26	Public Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Commenting on the PHSB EA	249
27	Public Agencies, Organizations, and Individuals Commenting during Scoping for the PHSB Draft SEIS	251