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INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Overview

The South San Francisco Unified School District (SSFUSD) proposes to implement the El Camino High School Athletic Field Lighting Project (project). The project includes updates to the existing athletic field proposed to enhance both the experience of student athletes and the community. The focus of the project includes the addition of field lighting to replace temporary lighting that has been used to facilitate night athletic events.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

This document is an Initial Study/Mitigated Negative Declaration (IS/MND) that analyzes the potential environmental impacts from implementation of the proposed project. This IS/MND is prepared in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) of 1970 (as amended), and Title 14, Chapter 3 of the California Administrative Code. In accordance with the CEQA Guidelines, California Code of Regulations Title 14, Chapter 3, Section 15070, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared if the following criteria are met:

- There is no substantial evidence that the project will have a significant effect; or
- Where there may be a potentially significant effect, revisions to the project would avoid or mitigate the effects to a point where clearly no significant effects would occur.

In accordance with Section 15073 of the CEQA Guidelines, this document is available for local, state, and federal agencies and interested organizations and individuals who may wish to review and comment on the document. Written comments may be forwarded to:

Michael Krause  
Assistant Superintendent of Business Services  
South San Francisco Unified School District  
398 B Street, South San Francisco  
California, 94080  
650.877.8700

1.3 Project Planning Setting

The project site is located on the existing El Camino High School campus, specifically in the northwestern region of the City of South San Francisco, California. Residential, commercial, transit, and public uses are located within the project vicinity. The campus is located at the intersection of McLellan Drive, Mission Road, and Lawndale Boulevard. Major streets
surrounding the campus include El Camino Real, Lawndale Boulevard, and Hillside Boulevard. El Camino High School is bordered by the South San Francisco Bart Station on its southwestern side, a low density residential neighborhood (Sunshine Gardens) on its eastern and northern sides, and the Holy Cross Cemetery on its northwestern side. Surface parking lots, administrative, and academic buildings are located in the southwest half of the campus. Athletic facilities are in the northeast half of the campus.

1.4 Public Review Process

In accordance with CEQA, a good-faith effort has been made during the preparation of this IS to contact affected agencies, organizations, and persons who may have an interest in this project.

In reviewing the Initial Study (IS), affected public agencies and the interested public should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the project’s possible impacts on the environment. A copy of the draft Initial Study and related documents are available for review at:

Main Office
South San Francisco Unified School District
398 B Street, South San Francisco
California, 94080
650.877.8700

South San Francisco Public Library
840 W Orange Avenue, South San Francisco
California 94080

Comments on the Initial Study may be made in writing before the end of the public review period. A 30-day review and comment period from November 14, 2017 to December 13, 2017 has been established in accordance with Section 15072(a) of the CEQA guidelines. Following the close of the public comment period, the South San Francisco Unified School District will consider this IS and comments thereto in determining whether to approve the proposed project.
2 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST INTRODUCTION

1. **Project title:**
   El Camino High School Athletic Field Lighting

2. **Lead agency name and address:**
   South San Francisco Unified School District
   398 B Street
   South San Francisco, CA 94080

3. **Contact person and phone number:**
   Michael Krause
   (650) 877-8707

4. **Project location:**
   1320 Mission Road,
   South San Francisco, CA 94080

   APN is 011160110.

   The project site is located on the existing El Camino High School campus, specifically in the City of South San Francisco, California (see Figure 1, Regional Map). The campus is located at the intersection of McLellan Drive, Mission Road, and Lawndale Boulevard. Major streets surrounding the campus include El Camino Real, Lawndale Boulevard, and Hillside Boulevard (see Figure 2, Vicinity Map). Surface parking lots, administrative, and academic buildings are located in the southwest half of the campus (see Figure 3, Site Map). Athletic facilities are in the northeast half of the campus.

5. **Project sponsor’s name and address:**
   South San Francisco Unified School District
   398 B Street
   South San Francisco, CA 94080

6. **General plan designation:**
   Public

7. **Zoning:**
   School, Public and Semi-Public Use Districts

8. **Description of project.**
   El Camino High School is part of the South San Francisco Unified School District (SSFUSD) and has an enrollment of 1,486 students for the 2014-2015 school year. The El Camino High
School campus is 29 acres in size and includes academic facilities (classrooms, multi-purpose room, and library) and athletic fields (football field and surrounding track, swimming pool, tennis and basketball courts, baseball field, and gymnasium). As shown in Figure 3, the academic facilities are located in the southwestern portions of the campus and the athletic facilities are located in the northeastern portions of the campus. The main parking lot is located in the southern corner of the campus with access from both Mission Road and Evergreen Drive.

The updates to the existing athletic field are proposed to enhance both the experience of student athletes and the community. The focus of the project includes the addition of field lighting at the north and south perimeters to illuminate the field in order to hold night athletic events (see Figure 4, Project Plan). Night events have been held in the past using temporary lighting. This project would install four light-emitting diode (LED) light poles that are each 90 feet high. Each light would have 19 fixtures, 17 of which are for the sports field lighting and two of which are for egress lighting. Minor excavation would be required to construct the concrete foundations for the light poles and underground trenching would be required for electrical conduits. The four light pole foundations would be 18’ deep and 48” wide. The 18” deep electrical trench would wrap around the northern half of the field, congruent with the path to the bleachers to allow for the installation of egress lighting.

Other upgrades to the field include the addition of emergency egress lighting to the existing pedestrian walkway. The proposed project would temporarily allow public parking on existing paved sport courts (basketball and tennis). This extended parking would be accessible through the existing driveway entrance on Evergreen Drive. The project would be constructed before the 2018 season and would consist of 60 days of construction. The field is proposed to be available for lighted use during the fall 2018 sports season.

There are eight home football game events, which would require lighting. On game nights, the full power athletic lights operate until 9:45 pm, the latest lights are allowed to run any night of the week. Safety egress lighting would remain on to provide safe egress for guests up to 30 minutes after the main athletic field lights shut off. Depending on the popularity of the events, the number of attendees range from 50 to 1400 spectators. For team practices, the lights may be used until 8:30 p.m., from Monday through Thursday. Beyond sporting events, the lights may be used for up to four additional activities per school year, such as graduation or other special events.

The new parking proposal for football games would include the use of the adjacent basketball courts and tennis courts, accessible through an entrance on Evergreen Drive. The vehicle capacity would be 125 cars on the basketball court and 100 cars on the tennis court. This supplemental parking would promote the use of the lower parking lots and reduce neighborhood parking congestion at the upper entrance to the athletic fields. The Crestwood
Drive entrance remain the primary entrance for the athletic field as well as the entrance for ADA, emergency, bus, visiting team, and coaching staff.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting (Briefly describe the project’s surroundings):

The project site is located at El Camino High School, in the northwestern region of South San Francisco. Residential, commercial, transit, and public uses are located within the project vicinity. El Camino High School is bordered by the South San Francisco Bart Station on its southwestern side, a low density residential neighborhood (Sunshine Gardens) on its eastern and northern sides, and the Holy Cross Cemetery on its northwestern side.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

Division of the State Architect
ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a “Potentially Significant Impact,” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

☐ Aesthetics ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources ☐ Air Quality
☐ Biological Resources ☐ Cultural Resources ☐ Geology and Soils
☐ Greenhouse Gas Emissions ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials ☐ Hydrology and Water Quality
☐ Land Use and Planning ☐ Mineral Resources ☐ Noise
☐ Population and Housing ☐ Public Services ☐ Recreation
☐ Transportation and Traffic ☐ Utilities and Service Systems ☐ Mandatory Findings of Significance
DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature ___________________________  Date ____________
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3 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1 Aesthetics

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact

A scenic vista can be defined as a viewpoint that provides expansive views of a highly valued landscape for the benefit of the general public. There are no publicly accessible vista points in the nearby vicinity of the project that would be impacted by the installation of the proposed four 90-foot mounted lights. The boundary of San Bruno Mountain State Park, the closest scenic vista, is a half mile away. The proposed light fixtures and poles would be visible from various points within the vicinity of the site but would not impact scenic vistas.

b) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact

There are no adjacent highways within the project site vicinity (Caltrans 2015). Therefore, the project would not substantially damage scenic resources including rock outcrops or historic buildings within a state scenic highway. No impact would occur.
c) **Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Visual quality of a site is based on the physical appearance and characteristics of the environment, such as the proximity and balance of man-made structures with open space or landscaping, and views of public open space or of more distant landscape features, such as hills and water bodies, or built landmarks, such as bridges or buildings. These elements help define a sense of place and a physical orientation in a visual setting. The proposed project is located within the suburban high school setting with adjacent academic structures, open spaces, parking lots, and sports fields.

Construction related activities would be visible by the public from adjacent roadways, including Evergreen Drive and Crestwood Drive. These construction activities would result in a temporary visual change by removing or altering existing visual elements that contribute to the existing visual environment. Examples of visual changes include temporary trenching, grading, and the presence of construction equipment, materials, signs, and staging areas. Since these activities and changes are temporary and short-term in nature and would not be present following completion of construction, they are considered to have a less-than-significant impact on the visual character of the campus and surrounding area.

When completed, the proposed project would minimally alter the visual appearance of the existing El Camino High School athletic field. After construction, the site would remain consistent with the nature of the surrounding recreational and campus activity land uses, including the adjacent track and baseball field. The proposed 90-foot field lighting poles have been arranged as close to the field as possible. These poles and the associated light fixtures would be visible from adjacent roadways, such as Evergreen Drive and Crestwood Drive. The poles would blend into the existing visual setting of the adjacent track and field, baseball field, and general campus visual setting during daytime hours. During evening hours, the height combined with the number of lights would make the site visible from both nearby and somewhat distant roadways and viewers.

The proposed project would not substantially alter the existing visual character or quality of the site. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.
d) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

Less Than Significant Impact

The existing sources of nighttime lighting within the vicinity of the project site are typical of low-density residential and urbanized areas, and include lighting sources such as street lights on power poles, building lights, vehicle headlamps, and interior lighting visible through windows.

During the 2015, 2016, and 2017 fall football season, temporary lighting was used to host nighttime football games.

Under the proposed project, two of the four 90-foot field light poles would be mounted on each side of the athletic field. The proposed light pole locations and the orientation of the light fixtures are designed to minimize potential light spill beyond the perimeter of the sports field. Each pole would have 19 light fixtures, 17 of which are for the sports field lighting and 2 of which are for egress lighting. These are going to be LED lights which were chosen and designed to minimize glare and light spill, compared to standard high-intensity discharge fixtures. According to the lighting analysis, there are select areas along the residential property line with a 0.2 footcandle. This is the estimated lighting equivalent to a full moon and thus is minimally intrusive. Therefore, the project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would affect day or nighttime views in the area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?</td>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
<td>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</td>
<td>Less Than Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

a) **Would the project convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?**

   No Impact

b) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?**

   No Impact
c) **Would the project conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?**

   No Impact
d) **Would the project result in the loss of forestland or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?**

   No Impact
e) Would the project involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use?

No Impact

The proposed project site is currently zoned Public/Semi-Public on the South San Francisco zoning map (Zoning Ordinance 2011). Therefore, it would not conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of agricultural use, a Williamson Act contract, forest land, timberland, or a timberland zoned Timberland Production. Furthermore, the project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest uses. The proposed project would not involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use or conversion of forestland to non-forest use. Therefore, no impact would occur.

III. AIR QUALITY – Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3 Air Quality

a) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?

No Impact

Regulation of air pollution is achieved through both national and State ambient air quality standards and emission limits for individual sources of air pollutants. As required by the federal Clean Air Act (CAA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) has identified criteria pollutants and has established the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) to protect public health and welfare. NAAQS have been established for the following pollutants: ozone (O₃); carbon monoxide (CO); nitrogen dioxide (NO₂); sulfur dioxide (SO₂); particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter (PM₁₀); particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM₂.₅); and lead (Pb). These pollutants are called “criteria” air pollutants because standards have been established for each of them to meet specific public health and welfare criteria. The State of California has also established its own more stringent set of air quality standards, commonly referred to as the California Ambient Air Quality Standards (CAAQS). In addition to the criteria pollutants identified above, CAAQS have been established for sulfates, hydrogen sulfide, visibility-reducing particles, and vinyl chloride.

The project site is located within the SFBAAB, which is currently designated as a nonattainment area for state and national ozone and PM₂.₅ standards and as a nonattainment area for the state PM₁₀ standards. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD)'s Final Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan outlines control strategies to reduce emissions of ozone and ozone precursors to help the Bay Area achieve attainment for the State 1-hour ozone standard.

The clean air strategy of the BAAQMD includes the preparation of plans for the attainment of ambient air quality standards, adoption and enforcement of rules and regulations concerning sources of air pollution, issuance of permits for stationary sources of air pollution, inspection of stationary sources of air pollution and response to citizen complaints, monitoring of ambient air quality and meteorological conditions, and implementation of programs and regulations required by the CAA and California Clean Air Act.

BAAQMD adopted the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan (BAAQMD 2010), in cooperation with the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), which sets forth a plan to achieve compliance with the State
one-hour ozone standard as expeditiously as practicable, and how the region will reduce transport of ozone and ozone precursors to neighboring air basins. The control strategy includes stationary source control measures to be implemented through BAAQMD regulations; mobile source control measures to be implemented through incentive programs and other activities; and transportation control measures to be implemented through transportation programs in cooperation with the MTC, local governments, transit agencies, and others. Currently, the BAAQMD, the MTC, and ABAG are working on the 2016 Clean Air Plan/Regional Climate Protection Strategy, which is an update to the current Clean Air Plan.

BAAQMD guidance states that if approval of a project would not result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts, after the application of all feasible mitigation, the project would be considered consistent with the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan. As indicated in the discussion of criteria “b”, “c”, and “d” below, the project would not result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts. As such, the proposed project would be consistent with the assumptions contained within the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan and would not result in an impact.

b) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated

Based on the following analysis, construction and operation of the proposed project would not result in a violation of an air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation.

Construction

Construction of the proposed project would include site preparation, excavation, installation, backfilling, and restoration of the site. These activities would have the potential to affect air quality through the use of construction equipment, and vehicles used by workers to travel to and from the construction site. In addition to exhaust emissions caused by the use of mobile equipment, trenching and earthmoving activities would result in emissions of fugitive dust including PM10. BAAQMD recommends implementation of a set of feasible fugitive PM10 control measures for construction projects of all sizes. According to BAAQMD, fugitive dust impacts from construction would be considered less than significant if all applicable recommended measures are applied (BAAQMD, 2012). Inclusion of these measures as part of the Mitigation Measure
AIR-1 below would reduce construction impacts from fugitive dust emissions to less-than-significant levels.

Project construction would involve use of equipment and materials that would cause ozone precursor emissions (ROG and NOx) as well as emissions of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$. Construction activities would also result in the emission of other criteria pollutants from equipment exhaust, construction-related vehicular activity, and construction worker vehicle trips. Since installation of field lights would require minimal equipment use for trenching and pole installation over a short-term duration of activity, exhaust criteria pollutant emissions would be minimal.

**Operation**

Operation of the completed project would not create any significant changed circumstances when compared to current operations. Night games would either replace games that are currently being played in the daytime or at nearby facilities, thus no new pollutant sources would be generated by operation of the night lighting.

**Mitigation Measure AIR-1:** The following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for fugitive dust control will be required for all construction activities within the project area. These measures will reduce fugitive dust emissions primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities, but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites:

1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.

2. All visible mud or dirt track-out onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.

3. Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of CCR). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.

4. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.
5. A publicly visible sign shall be posted with the telephone number and person to contact at the Lead Agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. BAAQMD’s phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.

c) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions, which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

Less Than Significant Impact

According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, for a project to have a less-than-significant cumulative impact on air quality it must not have an individually significant operational air quality impact and it must be consistent with the local general plan as well as the regional air quality plan (BAAQMD, 2012). As demonstrated in a) and b) above, the proposed project would be consistent with the adopted Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan and would not result in a significant operational air quality impact. Emissions from the proposed construction activities would be short-term and minimal, below the levels considered by BAAQMD to represent a cumulatively considerable increase. As such, the cumulative impacts would be less than significant.

d) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

Less Than Significant

In addition to regional impacts from criteria pollutants, the project would have the potential of resulting in localized impacts from emissions of pollutants identified by the state and federal government as toxic air contaminants (TACs) or hazardous air pollutants (HAPs), respectively, as well as carbon monoxide (CO) hotspots.

Toxic Air Contaminants

State law has established the framework for California’s TAC identification and control program, which is generally more stringent than the federal program and is aimed at TACs that are a problem in California. Health effects from carcinogenic air toxics are usually described in terms of cancer risk. “Incremental cancer risk” is the net increased likelihood that a person continuously exposed to concentrations of TACs resulting from a project over a 9, 30, and 70-year exposure period will contract cancer based on the use of
standard Office of Environmental Health Hazard Assessment (OEHHA) risk-assessment methodology (OEHHA, 2015).

The greatest potential for TAC emissions during construction would be limited diesel particulate emissions from heavy equipment operations and heavy-duty trucks and the associated health impacts to sensitive receptors. However, the proposed project would not require the extensive use of heavy-duty construction equipment, which is subject to a CARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure for in-use diesel construction equipment to reduce diesel particulate emissions, and would not involve extensive use of diesel trucks, which are also subject to a CARB Airborne Toxics Control Measure. Total active construction of the proposed project would take approximately 60 days, after which project-related diesel exhaust emissions would cease. According to OEHHA, “due to the uncertainty in assessing cancer risk from very short-term exposures, we do not recommend assessing cancer risk for projects lasting less than two months” (OEHHA, 2015).

In regards to long-term operations, the project would not result in sources of TACs. Overall, no residual diesel exhaust TAC emissions and corresponding cancer risk are anticipated after construction, nor are any long-term sources of TAC emissions anticipated during operation of the proposed project. As such, the exposure of project-related TAC emission impacts to sensitive receptors would be less than significant.

**Carbon Monoxide Hotspots**

Due to the temporary operation of equipment in any one area, construction would not emit CO in quantities that could pose health concerns. In regards to operations, the project would not result in increased vehicle trips or other sources of CO. Overall, exposure of sensitive receptors to CO would be less than significant

**e) Would the project create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Odors are a form of air pollution that are most obvious to the general public and can present problems for both the source and surrounding community. Although offensive odors seldom cause physical harm, they can be annoying and cause concern. Construction and operation of the proposed project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

Potential sources that may emit odors during construction activities include diesel equipment and gasoline fumes. Odors from these sources would be short-term, localized and confined to the project site. Potential project-generated construction odors would be
temporary, as construction would occur over approximately 60 days. Section 20.300.010 of the South San Francisco Municipal Code states odors from temporary construction and vehicles that enter and leave the project site (e.g., construction equipment, trucks, etc.) are exempt. Furthermore, the operation of the field lighting would not create objectionable odors. Therefore, this impact would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4 Biological Resources

a) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?

Less Than Significant Impact

Both the project site and surrounding area are completely developed with urban land uses. The existing sports field facility consists of artificial turf grass, synthetic running track, bleachers, and fencing. Between physical education classes, sports practices and games, and general use, there is considerable foot traffic in and around the project site throughout the day. There is a limited amount of landscaping on the site, and due to the urban location, these trees are unlikely to provide suitable habitats for special-status bird species. Common wildlife species that are adapted to urban environments would continue to use the site after project implementation. The site is not occupied by or suited for, any special-status species.

San Bruno Mountain, the adjacent state park, is home to four butterfly species of concern. These include the mission blue butterfly, Callippe silverspot butterfly, San Bruno elfin, and Bay checkerspot butterfly. However, the boundaries of the state park are approximately a half mile away, and none of these butterflies are likely to emigrate from San Bruno Mountain due to the urbanization barriers surrounding the Mountain (San Bruno HCP 2008).

The high school campus and surrounding neighborhood currently have a considerable amount of artificial night lighting, primarily street and parking lot lamps, and interior lighting visible from windows. Although the proposed field light fixtures would be pointed at a downward angle toward the field, and designed to minimize the amount of light spilling over to adjacent land uses, the light would contribute to the amount of artificial light in the area. The wildlife species occurring on-site are relatively common urban species that have adapted to artificial night lighting. For this reason, the increase in ambient lighting would not substantially affect biological resources on or adjacent to the project site. Therefore, potential impacts to any species or habitat would be less than significant.
b) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?**

No Impact

The project site is completely developed with urban land uses and does not contain any riparian habitats or other sensitive natural communities. The project would involve redevelopment on an existing field and adjacent dirt areas that are currently graded, leveled, and developed with the existing athletic field. The nearest light poles would be located approximately one half mile from the edge of the sensitive natural community of San Bruno Mountain State Park. Therefore, the project would not impact sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or regulated by CDFW or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

c) **Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?**

No Impact

The project site is entirely developed with urban land uses and supports an existing synthetic running track and turf field. There are no waters of the United States, including wetlands, drainages, or water bodies as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, on the project site. Therefore, no impacts to these federally protected resources would occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed project.

d) **Would the project interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?**

No Impact

The project area is a developed, landscaped habitat that supports wildlife species typically associated with urban areas. Because the project site is located in an urban environment, there are no major wildlife movement corridors that pass through the site. There are sparse numbers of existing ornamental trees behind both the home and visitor bleachers. Trees and other landscape vegetation generally have the potential to support nests of common native bird species. All native birds and their nests, regardless of their regulatory status, are protected under the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the
California Fish and Game Code. Because most of the birds and other wildlife species at the site are characteristic of urban settings and would readily inhabit the surrounding area once installation of the proposed project is completed, potential impacts to nesting birds would be less than significant. Therefore, the proposed project would not substantially interfere with the movement of wildlife species or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

**e) Would the project conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?**

No Impact

South San Francisco adopted a Tree Preservation Ordinance to protect and preserve the City’s variety of trees. However, as the proposed project does not include the removal or pruning of any protected trees as outlined in the Ordinance, the project would have no impact.

**f) Would the project conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?**

No Impact

There is a Habitat Management Plan for the nearby San Bruno Mountain to provide management and monitoring for the overall native ecosystem. However, the project site falls approximately a half mile outside the protected San Bruno Mountain boundaries (San Bruno Mountain Habitat Management Plan 2008). Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with the provisions of a Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or State habitat conservation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Cultural Resources

a) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?

No Impact

CEQA defines a “historical resource” as one that is eligible for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, listed in a local register of historical resources (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)), identified as significant in a historical resource survey meeting the requirements of Section 5024.1(g) of the Public Resources Code, or determined to be a historical resource by a project’s lead agency.

The sports field facility on the high school campus is not considered a historical resource as defined by Section 15064.5 of the CEQA Guidelines. The project site is located in a low density residential area, and soils in the project area were previously disturbed during the original construction of the high school campus (early 1960s) and from the recent reconstruction of the sports field facility in 2013. As a result, the potential for surface resources to be present at the project site is considered low and the likelihood of discovering resources during the minor excavation is unlikely. Therefore, the proposed project would not cause a substantial adverse change in significance of a known historical resource.

b) Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?

Less-Than-Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated

The potential for surface and subsurface archaeological resources to be present at the project site is considered to be low and unlikely that resources would be discovered during the minor excavation. However, if any archaeological resources are discovered during construction of the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measure
CULT-1 would ensure that potential impacts to archaeological resources would be reduced to a less-than-significant level:

**Mitigation Measure CUL-1:** Should a cultural resource be encountered during project construction activities, excavation shall stop and the SSFUSD Project Manager shall be notified. The discovery shall be evaluated by a qualified archaeologist, and if the discovery is significant treatment recommendations shall be developed and implemented.

c) **Would the project directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?**

A unique paleontological resource includes any fossils or assemblage of fossils, as well as collection localities and the geologic formations containing those localities. Although the entire project site is composed of disturbed areas that are not known to contain paleontological resources, the nearby Colma Formation may contain significant vertebrate fossils (Brabb, 1998).

As a result, the likelihood of discovering such resources during the excavations for the light poles and electrical conduits is unlikely. However, if any paleontological resources are discovered, impacts to paleontological resources could be potentially significant; therefore, mitigation is provided (see Mitigation Measure CUL-2) to ensure impacts to paleontological resources are less than significant.

**Mitigation Measure CUL-2:** In the event that paleontological resources are discovered during initial ground-disturbing activities, all construction work shall cease in the vicinity of the discovery until a qualified paleontologist can visit the site and assess the significance of the potential paleontological resource. Specifically, the qualified paleontologist shall conduct on-site paleontological monitoring for the project site to include inspection of exposed surfaces to determine if fossils are present. The monitor shall have the authority to divert grading/ground disturbance away from exposed fossils temporarily in order to recover the fossil specimens.

d) **Would the project disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?**

**Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated**

The potential to uncover human remains exists in locations throughout the Bay Area, even in urbanized areas. Because of minor ground-disturbing activities associated with
the proposed project, the probability of uncovering such remains on the project site is unlikely. However, the high school campus does directly border Holy Cross Cemetery. If any human remains are discovered during construction of the proposed project, implementation of Mitigation Measure CUL-3 would ensure that potential impacts to human remains would be reduced to a less-than significant level:

**Mitigation Measure CUL-3:** Consistent with California Health and Safety Code, Section 7050.5, if human remains are encountered at any point during construction activities, work shall stop and the San Mateo County Coroner shall be notified immediately. In addition, a qualified archeologist shall be contacted to examine the situation and consult with the appropriate agencies. If the human remains are of Native America origin, the Coroner must notify the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours of this identification. The Native American Heritage Commission will identify a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) to inspect the site and provide recommendations for the proper treatment of the remains and associated grave goods. The construction contractor shall abide by these recommendations. Upon completion of the assessment, the archaeologist shall prepare a report documenting the methods and results, and provide recommendations of the treatment of the human remains and any associated cultural materials, as appropriate and in coordination with the recommendations of the MLD. The report shall be submitted to the SSFUSD and the Northwest Information Center.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslides?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 Geology and Soils

a) Would the project expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault?

Less Than Significant Impact

The Department of Conservation, Division of Mines and Geology, maintains all Official Maps of Earthquake Fault Zones delineated by the California Geological Survey through December 2010 under the Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act. As of December 2010, the project site is not identified on any Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zones maps (Fault Zone Map). Therefore, construction and operation of the project would not expose construction workers, student-athletes, or facility occupants to risks associated with any known earthquake faults delineated on the state’s Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map and the County’s Seismic and Geotechnical Hazard Zones map.

Although there are no known faults traversing the project site, the project is located within the San Andreas Fault Zone (SAFZ), an area of active seismicity where numerous moderate to strong historic earthquakes have been generated in northern California. As there are known faults within the region, there is the
potential for seismic activity to occur that could expose people or structures on the project site to injury or loss. Due to the location-sensitive nature of the project site, impacts related to seismic ground shaking would be potentially significant. However, the proposed additions would be constructed subject to the current California Building Code seismic standards, to ensure that all structures provide an acceptable level of earthquake safety. Compliance with the California Building Code would help to offset potential risks to structures and people associated with a major earthquake event.

ii) **Strong seismic ground shaking?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project site is located in a seismically active region; moderate to strong ground shaking could occur at the site as a result of an earthquake on any of the faults in the region. In the event of a major earthquake, ground shaking and ground failure are usually the principal causes of structure damage. The project site would be susceptible to damage from ground shaking in the event of an earthquake. The proposed project would be constructed to meet the acceptable level of earthquake safety, per the California Building Code. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

iii) **Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Liquefaction of soils can occur when ground shaking causes saturated soils to lose strength due to an increase in pore pressure. These geological and ground-water conditions are widespread in the San Francisco Bay area, most notably in some densely populated valley regions and alluviated floodplains. In addition, the opportunity for strong ground shaking is high because of the many nearby active faults. The combination of these factors constitutes a significant seismic hazard especially in areas marginal to the San Francisco Bay in general, as well as in the City and County of San Francisco (California Department of Conservation, 2000).

The project site itself is in an area of low liquefaction susceptibility. However, the immediate area down the hill surrounding Colma Creek is at a high risk for liquefaction. Therefore, the proposed project would be constructed to meet the acceptable level of earthquake safety, per the California Building Code. Impacts would be less than significant.
b) **Would the project result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would be performed by qualified contractors. Plans and specifications would incorporate stipulations regarding standard South San Francisco Municipal Code requirements and acceptable construction practices, including, grading and demolition, safety measures, vehicle operation and maintenance, excavation stability, and erosion control measures. The project site is flat, and the synthetic turf and track overlay minimizes erosion. However, placement of the light poles would necessitate trenching and soil stockpiling which may cause soil erosion or the loss of topsoil around the field. Upon completion of the project, the turf field and existing impermeable surfaces would eventually cover any soils exposed during construction; thus, no long-term new erodible soils would be exposed as a result of the proposed project.

During construction, the project would be required to comply with erosion BMPs as outlined in South San Francisco Municipal Code Section 14.04.180 item d) BMPs for New Developments and Redevelopments. Therefore, during construction and over the life of the project, erosion control measures and pollutant discharges would be reduced to levels that are less than significant.

c) **Would the project be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Landslide hazards are generally located in sloped topography. The athletic field is located on the terraced high school campus; the project site was graded, leveled, and compacted during original construction. Compliance with the current California Building Code would ensure that the proposed project is designed and built to current standards to minimize impacts associated with unstable soils, lateral spreading, subsidence, or collapse. See impact discussion response (a.iii) for a discussion of risk of effects from liquefaction. Therefore, compliance with existing regulations would ensure that any impact would be reduced to less than significant.
d) Would the project be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

No Impact

Expansive soils are those containing relatively high levels of clay, which can expand or shrink depending on the water content of the soil. The soils that characterize the project vicinity are comprised primarily of sand and fine-grained deposits rather than clay and as such are not at risk of expansion (Brabb, 1997). The project would have no impact related to risks associated with expansive soil.

e) Would the project have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?

No Impact

The proposed project does not include the installation of septic tanks or on-site wastewater disposal systems, and would not change the current sanitary sewer system at the school. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impacts associated with soils incapable of supporting alternative wastewater disposal systems.
3.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

a) *Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?*

b) *Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?*

As the proposed project would be consistent with the assumptions contained within the Bay Area 2010 Clean Air Plan and neither construction nor operation of the proposed project would result in a violation of an air quality standard or contribute significantly to an existing or projected air quality violation, the project would not result in GHG emissions that would significantly affect the environment or conflict with applicable plans, policies, or regulations adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The project would have less-than-significant impacts related to GHG emissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project would not include the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous waste. Although small quantities of commercially available hazardous material could be used during project construction activities (e.g., diesel fuels, oils, and lubricants), these materials would not be used in sufficient quantities to pose a threat to human or environmental health. The amount of these hazardous materials present during construction would be limited, would be in compliance with existing federal, State, and local regulations, and would not be considered a significant hazard. Therefore, development of 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, and impacts associated with these activities would be considered less than significant.

b) Would the project 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

Operation of the proposed project would not require the use of significant quantities of hazardous materials. Although small quantities of chemicals for landscaping and maintenance purposes would likely be stored and used at the site, the proper use of such materials would not be anticipated to result in any upset or accident conditions. As previously described, hazardous materials, including commercially available fuels could
be used temporarily during construction activities. SSFUSD would comply with all State, local and regulatory agency requirements when using hazardous materials.

c) **Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The project is located on El Camino High School campus. The project site is not listed on the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (RWQCB) leaking underground storage (LUST) database or the RWQCB spills, leaks, investigations, and cleanups database, two of the component databases that comprise the State Cortese List of known hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The project site also is not listed on other components of the Cortese List, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) hazardous waste and substances list.

One off-site property, Hillside Nursery, appears on the DTSC EnviroStor Database due to residual DDT contamination. The cleaned up former nursery site is located 0.8 mile east of the project. Beyond the nursery, no unauthorized releases or violations appear on the database search. Based on available information, it is unlikely that the site has been significantly environmentally impaired by any unauthorized releases of hazardous materials or hazardous waste.

As stated in sections a) and b), the proposed project would handle limited amounts of hazardous materials during construction activities on the high school campus. Construction activities would occur over a short duration of 60 days. Therefore, the potential for hazardous emissions are less than significant.

d) **Would the project be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

**No Impact**

The project site is not listed on the Regional Water Quality Control Board’s (Water Board) leaking underground storage (LUST) database or the RWQCB spills, leaks, investigations, and cleanups database, two of the component databases that comprise the State Cortese List of known hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The project site also is not listed on other components of the Cortese List, including the California Department of Toxic Substances Control hazardous
waste and substances list. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact to the public or the environment with respect to a reported release or disposal of hazardous materials related to a listed site.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact

The project site is not located within the planning area of any airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airport is the San Francisco International Airport, located approximately 5 miles southeast from the project site. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard to people working or residing in the area due to the proximity of an airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?

No Impact

The project site is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a safety hazard to people working or residing in the area due to the proximity of a private airstrip.

g) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?

No Impact

Implementation of the proposed project would not interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. The project also includes construction of egress lighting along the path of arrival and departure from the field, which would facilitate the safe exit of spectators and players from the sports field facility. Emergency access to the facility would be provided via the Crestwood Drive driveway entrance and the Evergreen Drive driveway along the southwestern portion of the high school campus that leads to additional (existing) visitor parking. Therefore, it is not expected that the proposed project would impair the ability of either entrance of the high school campus to function as an emergency route.
Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project site is located in a low density residential neighborhood a half mile from the boundary of San Bruno Mountain State Park. Although the park has had wildfires in the past, the development of the project does not subject people or structures to a significant risk related to wildfires. Therefore, the proposed project has a less than significant impact associated with wildfires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 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 (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.9 Hydrology and Water Quality

a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

Less Than Significant Impact

The State Water Resources Control Board and nine Regional Water Quality Control Boards regulate water quality of surface water and groundwater bodies throughout California. The project site is under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

However, because the construction activity would not result in a land disturbance of one acre or more, the project would not require a construction stormwater permit issued by the State Water Resources Control Board. The project would fully comply with South San Francisco Municipal Code 14.04.133, which outlines site design and stormwater treatment requirements. The proposed project would be within already paved areas and would not substantially increase stormwater runoff from the project site.

In order to preserve the water quality at the projection site during construction, the project would also fully comply with Municipal Code 14.08.210 General discharge regulations.

Once construction is complete, the majority of the project site would remain pervious, with water infiltrating through the grass of the football field. Any runoff from updated pervious areas continues to drain to the south and be absorbed by the field and adjacent green space. All impacts to water quality would be less than significant.
b) Would the project 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 (i.e., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

No Impact

The proposed project would not require the use or extraction of groundwater to support potable or irrigation water needs. Although implementation of the project would minimally increase the amount of impervious surface, on-site groundwater recharge would continue through the permeable field. Therefore, the proposed project would not interfere with groundwater recharge or deplete groundwater supplies and no impact to groundwater would occur.

c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact

No hydrologic features such as streams or rivers transverse the site. The project would be constructed and operated within the already paved high school, and drainage patterns would remain unchanged on the project site. The project would also be fully compliant with South San Francisco Municipal Code Section 14.04.180 (d) Reduction of Pollutants in Stormwater, which requires construction sites to implement year round effective erosion control, run-on and runoff control, and sediment control.

Furthermore, the excavation sites from the installation of the concrete foundations for the light fixtures and electrical conduits would be returned to pre-project conditions following construction activities. Therefore, less than significant impact on the existing drainage pattern of the site would occur.
d) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

Less Than Significant Impact

No hydrologic features such as streams or rivers transverse the site. During construction activities, runoff from any pavement or re-surfaced trenches would be infiltrated and absorbed into the surround turf and landscaping, thus would likely not enter the storm drain system under typical weather conditions. Nevertheless, the project would be in full compliance with South San Francisco Municipal Code Section 14.04.180 (f) Reduction of Pollutants in Stormwater, Compliance with BMPs and use runoff control devices to ensure that flooding on or off site would not occur during construction. Therefore, less than significant impact on surface runoff would occur.

e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project would not substantially contribute runoff water, alter existing drainage, or result in flooding. The project site is on developed land, and surface runoff is directed into the existing storm drainage system. The project would be fully compliant with Municipal Code Chapter 14.04 Stormwater Management and Discharge Control.

The proposed project would not increase the rate or amount of surface runoff; therefore, the project would have a less-than-significant impact on the existing drainage system of the project area.

f) Would the project otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

No Impact

Operation of the proposed project would not result in substantial changes to on-site water quality. Therefore, there would be no impact on water quality.
g) **Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

No Impact

Pursuant to Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map number 06081C0037E, the project site is not located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area or any other flood hazard zone (FEMA 2012). Therefore, the project would not entail construction or placement of housing within such a hazard area. No impact would result.

h) **Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

No Impact

Pursuant to Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Map number 06081C0037E, the project is located within Zone X (Other Areas), which is defined as being outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain (FEMA, 2012). Furthermore, the project site is not located within a designated 100-year flood hazard area or any other flood hazard zone (FEMA, 2012). Therefore, the project would not result in introduction of facilities into such a hazard area. No impact would result.

i) **Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

ii) **No Impact**

Failure of a levee or dam is considered to be a remote possibility that would likely only occur during extremely severe seismic shaking conditions. The proposed project does not fall within a Dam Failure Inundation Area for any of the dams in San Mateo County (County of San Mateo, 2005). San Andreas Dam is located approximately 5 miles south of the project site. Flooding from other sources is not expected; thus, the minimal risk of flooding from potential dam or levee failure would not be exacerbated by the proposed project. As such, there would be no risk of exposure of people or structures to a significant hazard associated with dam failure.
Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

Seiche: Seiche is generally associated with oscillation of enclosed bodies of water typically caused by ground shaking associated with a seismic event. The proposed project is not located adjacent to an enclosed body of water, and would not face the risk of inundation from seiche.

Tsunami: According to the California Emergency Management Agency’s Tsunami Inundation Map for South San Francisco, the project site is not within a tsunami inundation zone (CalEMA, 2009). Therefore, the proposed project would not be susceptible to flooding hazards associated with a tsunami event and no impacts would occur.

Mudflow: Debris and mudflows are rivers of rock, earth, and other debris saturated with water that develop when water rapidly accumulates in the ground (e.g., during a heavy rainfall), changing earth into a flowing river of mud or “slurry.” Mudflows typically occur on steep slopes where vegetation is not sufficient to prevent rapid erosion, but can also occur on gentle slopes if other conditions are present. Other conditions include heavy precipitation in a short period of time and an easily erodible source material. Mudflows can be generated in any climatic regime, but are most common in arid and semiarid areas like Southern California. During extremely wet weather, soils may become oversaturated on the adjacent hillsides, causing mudflow conditions. The high school campus has been previously graded and terraced; therefore, impacts associated with mudflows would be less than significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.10 Land Use and Planning

a) Would the project physically divide an established community?

No Impact

The proposed project consists of installing field lighting, egress lighting on existing walkways, and designating additional temporary parking at the existing El Camino High School sports field facility in an area adjacent to a residential neighborhood. Therefore, no dividing features would be added to the campus and no impact would occur.

b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?

The project site falls within the jurisdiction of the City of South San Francisco. The high school campus is designated as Public/Semi-Public under the City’s General Plan and zoned as Public under the City’s Zoning Ordinance (City of South San Francisco, 1999). Land use at the site would remain the same and no land use incompatibilities or conflicts with existing plans or policies would result from the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?

No Impact

The adjacent San Bruno Mountain Park does have a Habitat Conservation Plan but the proposed project site does not fall within its boundaries (San Mateo County Parks Department, 2008). Therefore, the project would not conflict with any habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plans.
3.11 Mineral Resources

a) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?

No Impact

According to the California Department of Conservation report on the South San Francisco Bay Production-Consumption Region Report, the proposed project site is located in an area designated as Mineral Resource Zone (MRZ) 3 (Mineral Land Classification 1987). MRZ-3 is defined as an area containing mineral deposits of which the significance cannot be evaluated from available data. The project site is developed and has been previously disturbed; therefore, the proposed project would not result in the loss of MRZ-3 land. Therefore, there would be no impact on a known mineral resource.

b) Would the project result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

There are no mines, mineral plants, oil, gas, or geothermal wells located at the project site (USGS, 2003; CDC, 2016). Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would not result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site. No impact would result.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
El Camino High School Athletic Field Lighting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.12 Noise

a) Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact

When noise levels are reported, they are expressed as a measurement over time in order to account for variations in noise exposure. Levels also account for varying degrees of sensitivity to noise during daytime and nighttime hours. The Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) and Day-Night Noise Level (Ldn) both reflect noise exposure over an average day with weighting to reflect this sensitivity. The CNEL is the reference level for State noise law and is used to express major continuous noise sources, such as aircraft or traffic.

The South San Francisco General Plan Section 9.2 Noise Sources and Projections sets the CNEL range for residential areas at less than 65dB. Section 8.32.050 of the South San Francisco Municipal Code establishes allowable hours of operation for construction-related activities. The allowable hours of construction activities on weekdays are between the hours of 8am and 8pm, Saturdays between 9am and 8pm, and Sundays/holidays between 10am and 6pm. The noise level at any point outside of the property plane of the project shall not exceed 90dB. Implementation of the proposed project would result in noise levels from construction activities (operation of heavy equipment) and operational noise sources (from traffic noise, spectators) that would not exceed the standards noted above.

Once the upgrades are complete, noise levels would be comparable to the existing condition. The primary source of noise would continue to be the El Camino High School
football and soccer games, as well as associated announcers, players, and spectators. The project would not increase the intensity of noise from the games on site. Although the games may go later into the evenings due to the proposed lighting, all noise associated with operations would be infrequent (El Camino High School estimates the field would be utilized approximately eight times per year). Therefore, no significant associated noise impacts are anticipated. Therefore, the project would result in a less than significant impact.

b) **Would the project result in exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Construction activity can result in varying degrees of ground vibration, depending on the equipment and methods employed. Operation of construction equipment causes ground vibrations that spread through the ground and diminish with distance. The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) collected information on groundborne vibration information related to construction activities (Caltrans 2004). Information from Caltrans indicates that continuous vibrations with a peak particle velocity of approximately 0.1 inch/second begin to annoy people. Groundborne vibration is typically attenuated over short distances. The closest permanent structures to the project site are the residences approximately 175 feet to the southeast of the project site.

Heavier pieces of construction equipment, such as large bulldozers and loaded trucks, would have peak particle velocities of approximately 0.089 inch/second or less at a distance of 25 feet (FTA, 2006). At these distances and with the anticipated construction equipment, the peak particle velocity would be below 0.1 inch/second at 25 feet—much closer than the adjacent residences located 175 feet or more away. Vibration is very subjective, and some people may be annoyed at continuous vibration levels near the level of perception (or approximately a peak particle velocity of .01 inch/second) during construction. However, construction activities that result in vibration levels that typically annoy people would not be discernable; therefore, construction-generated vibration impacts would be less than significant.

Furthermore, Section 20.300.010 of the South San Francisco Municipal Code also states that vibration from temporary construction and vehicles that enter and leave the project site are exempt from standards. Groundborne vibration would not be associated with the proposed project following construction activities.
Table 1
Construction Equipment Vibration Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Peak Particle Velocity at 50 Feet (inches per second)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Large Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loaded Truck</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Bulldozer</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auger/Drill Rig</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Hammer</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vibratory Compactor/Roller</td>
<td>0.074</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FTA 2006

c) Would the project result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact

Once operational, noise that would be generated from the renovated athletic field would be similar to the following existing noise sources: cheering spectators, sports team members conversing, and general human activity coming and going on and around the field. Due to the proposed addition of field lighting, these noise sources would continue later into nighttime hours. It is anticipated that nighttime games would last until approximately 9:45 p.m., and would occur approximately 8 days per year. While this noise would result in a permanent increase, its infrequency would render this increase unsubstantial. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would occur.

d) Would the project result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?

Less Than Significant Impact

Construction of the proposed project is expected to commence in early 2017 and last for approximately 60 days. As previously stated in section (a), all construction activities would comply with the South San Francisco Municipal Code allowable construction hours and noise limitations.

Once operational, noise levels at the project site would not increase above existing levels. However, they would occur at later hours approximately 8 times per year. Therefore, although the games may go later in the evenings due to the proposed lighting, all noise associated with operations would be infrequent. Therefore, a less than significant impact would occur.
e) Would the project be located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact

The project site is not located within the planning area of any airport land use plan, or within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. The nearest airports include the San Francisco International Airport, located approximately 5 miles southeast from the project site. While aircraft noise is occasionally audible on the project site, due to the distance from the airports and the orientation of runways and flight patterns the project site does not lie within the 60 dB CNEL noise contours of any airport. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels related to a public airport.

f) Would the project be within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

No Impact

See impact discussion response (e). The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip. Therefore, the proposed project would not expose people to excessive noise levels, and no impact would occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.13 Population and Housing

a) Would the project induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

No Impact

The proposed project does not include housing and would be located in a developed area of the high school campus. The project would neither directly or indirectly affect the residential population of the City of South San Francisco. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on population increase or population projections.

b) Would the project displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact

No permanent housing is located within the project site and the proposed project would not remove existing housing nearby. Therefore, the proposed project does not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

c) Would the project displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

No Impact

The proposed project would not displace any people and would not require the construction of replacement housing. Therefore, no impact would occur.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.14 Public Services

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

Fire protection?

Less Than Significant Impact

South San Francisco Fire Department current has five stations. Specifically, Station 65, Engine 65 is the primary responder to fire and emergency medical calls for the campus. Station 65 is located at 1151 South San Francisco Drive, directly off Hillside Blvd. Average response times to the campus vary, depending on the location of the incident and available resources.

The proposed project would not entail a change of use, so no additional people would move to the surrounding neighborhoods as a result of the enhanced athletic field. The proposed project would allow existing daytime practices and games to be held during evening hours. Changing the time of day that practices and games are currently held and hosting additional sporting event games would incrementally increase demand for fire protection and life safety services. However, it would not increase existing response times to the project site. Therefore, the project is not anticipated to increase the need for fire protection or emergency medical services in a substantial way, or delay response times of such services. Impacts on fire protection, life safety services, and facilities would be less than significant.

Police protection?

Less Than Significant Impact

The South San Francisco Police Department (SSFPD) provides police services to the community. The SSFD headquarters are located at 33 Arroyo Drive, approximately 1.3 miles south of the project site.

The proposed project would not result in adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities. However, changing the time of day that games are currently held and hosting nighttime sporting event games could incrementally increase demand for police services. The high school used temporary
lighting to host sports games during the 2015, 2016, and 2017 season, so any potential impact already exists. Events not sponsored by the high school would be subject to the District’s facility use permit application process, which considers the need for additional supervision. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on police services and facilities.

**Schools?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

Implementation of the proposed project would not directly affect the existing school population or increase school enrollment at El Camino High School, or at local schools such that new school facilities would have to be physically altered or newly constructed. While the installation of the fixtures, poles, and electrical conduits may require that student or community use of the sports field facility be suspended for a short period of time, such a temporary closure would not require replacement of facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on school facilities.

**Parks?**

**No Impact**

San Bruno Mountain State Park and Sign Hill Park are both located within the vicinity of El Camino High School. The parks include hiking trails, picnic and barbecue facilities, and habitats for birds and butterflies. Implementation of the proposed project would allow existing daytime practices and games to be held during evening hours, and would not have a long term effect on either park. During project construction, use of the existing sports field facility may be temporarily interrupted, which could increase the use of the nearby park facility. However, the proposed project would not result in increased demand for park facilities such that new park facilities would have to be constructed. Therefore, the proposed project would have no measurable impact on local or regional parks.

**Other public facilities?**

**No Impact**

Implementation of the proposed project would not directly affect the existing school population, and would not result in an increase of the local resident population. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in increased demand for other public facilities such as libraries and community centers, such that new facilities would have to be physically altered or newly constructed. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on other public facilities.
3.15 Recreation

a) Would the project 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?

Less Than Significant Impact

El Camino High School currently holds daytime practices and games at the existing sports field facility. The proposed project at the sports field facility would allow some daytime practices and games to be held during evening hours, allow for the high school to extend practice time, and host up to eight home football games. Changing the time of day that practices and games are currently held would incrementally increase the overall use of the existing facility. However, implementation of the proposed project would not substantially degrade the facility or require the construction or expansion of other parks and recreational facilities. The proposed project would be an improvement to an existing recreational facility serving the school and community. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less than significant impact on existing neighborhood and regional parks, or other recreational facilities.

b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

No Impact

The proposed project would not require the construction or expansion of off-site recreational activities. Therefore, it would have no impact.
XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Level</th>
<th>Potentially Significant</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in inadequate emergency access?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.16 Transportation and Traffic

a) Would the project conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

Transportation in the project area has been examined and is regulated by the San Mateo County Transportation Authority/County Measure A Strategic Plan 2014-2019 and the South San Francisco General Plan (section 4.2.). The proposed improvements to the existing athletic field would not result in a change in use and would not conflict with
these plans. Although the lighting would allow games to be played later into the evening, this would not increase the use of the field, or significantly increase the amount of spectators or players at the games. Although this may shift the timing of trips made by players and spectators, the players and spectators would consist mostly of students and other personnel already on campus. Therefore, this shift in timing of the trips would not represent an increase in traffic on area roadways. Use of the surrounding circulation system, campus transit, and non-motorized travel would be similar to the existing condition. Impacts would be less than significant.

b) **Would the project conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

No Impact

In 2013, the County adopted the San Mateo Congestion Management Program (CMP) to assess the over performance of the regional roadway system. The CMP roadway system is comprised of 53 roadway segments and 16 intersections. Large development that is expected to generate a net 100 or more peak period trips on the CMP network require a Travel Demand Forecasting Model to determine the impact on the CMP network. The project is not anticipated to create an overall increase in peak period trips due to the infrequent use of the nighttime athletic facilities. Therefore, no conflict with CMP would occur.

c) **Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

No Impact

The nearest airport is the San Francisco International Airport, located approximately 5 miles southeast from the project site. The proposed project would not result in changes to air traffic patterns. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in a substantial safety risk associated with a change in air traffic patterns.

d) **Would the project substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?**

No Impact

The proposed project would not change the existing traffic and circulation system. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use.
e) **Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?**

No Impact

The project would not result in an increase in trips, or alter roadway segments or access routes to or from the athletic field. Therefore, emergency access to the site would remain the same as existing conditions. No impacts would occur.

f) **Would the project conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?**

No Impact

The proposed project would not alter any existing bicycle, pedestrian, or transit facilities. Therefore, the proposed project would not conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.17 Utilities and Service Systems

a) **Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?**

**No Impact**

The proposed project includes the construction of four 90-foot light poles and additional egress lighting on the project site. The type and intensity of the proposed project would be minimal and would not likely affect the current wastewater disposal and treatment system that serves El Camino High School. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

b) **Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**No Impact**

The project site is located in an area served by existing sewer and water lines. The City of South San Francisco is responsible for the City’s wastewater collection system and treatment services, respectively. The type and intensity of the proposed project would be minimal and would not affect the current water or wastewater treatment facilities that serve El Camino High School. Therefore, the proposed project would not have an impact on water or wastewater treatment facilities, and would not require the construction of new facilities.

c) **Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?**

**Less Than Significant Impact**

The proposed project would not generate a substantial quantity of stormwater runoff that would exceed the current stormwater drainage system that serves El Camino High School. Therefore, the proposed project would have a less-than-significant impact on stormwater drainage systems, and would not require the construction of new facilities.
d) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

Less Than Significant Impact

The Hetch Hetchy reservoir on the Tuolumne River, in Tuolumne County, flows to Crystal Springs Reservoir and San Andreas Lake, both of which are located in San Mateo County. Water from this reservoir supplies San Francisco County and 85% of the water in the eastern part of San Mateo County (Soil Survey, 1991).

The City of South San Francisco manages the City’s water. The proposed project would not affect the current water facilities or require any changes to the water supply system that serves El Camino High School. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

e) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments?

Less Than Significant Impact

The proposed project would not affect the current wastewater disposal and treatment systems that serve El Camino High School or increase users of this system. Therefore, the proposed project would not exceed the capacity of the existing wastewater treatment systems and would have a less than significant impact on wastewater treatment services.

f) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?

Less Than Significant Impact

The South San Francisco Scavenger Company provides solid waste collection, disposal, and recycling services in the City of South San Francisco. The proposed project would generate minimal solid waste (beyond whatever small quantities of construction waste could not be reused or recycled). Existing landfills have sufficient capacity to accommodate this potential minor increase in construction and events-related waste and impacts associated with landfill capacity would be less than significant.

g) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

No Impact

The proposed project would comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance

a) *Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, 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, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal, or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?*

No Impact

The project would add lighting to an existing field that has been significantly developed for some time. The project would not reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species. No impact would occur.
b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? Less

Than Significant Impact

The potential impacts that could result from this project are minimal and would primarily result from a short construction period. These minimal impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

Less Than Significant Impact

The project would add lighting to an existing field that has been significantly developed and impacts are minimal and temporary. The project would not cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly.
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