

APPENDIX I: HOSPITAL REPLACEMENT SITE SELECTION EVALUATION CRITERIA*

1. SITE / MASTER PLANNING CHARACTERISTICS

- 1a. To what extent are the site(s) included in the scenario sufficient to accommodate the core Hospital Replacement program needs?***
- 1b. To what extent do the site(s) included in the scenario provide proximity to future expansion space?***
- 1c. To what extent is the scenario supported by Community Groups, Governmental Departments, and Elected Officials?***
- 1d. To what extent would implementation of the scenario disrupt ongoing patient care?***
- 1e. Does UCSF currently control the site(s) required for the scenario, and if not, how difficult and costly will it be to gain site control?
- 1f. To what extent are the site(s) included in the scenario capable of accommodating efficient building footprints and flexible building layouts, including subsurface construction?
- 1g. To what extent would proposed development by UCSF be consistent with City zoning/policies?
- 1h. To what extent would proposed development by UCSF be compatible with surrounding uses, character and scale?
- 1i. To what extent does the scenario conflict with UCSF's current LRDP and/or other plans (e.g., Parnassus Heights Space Ceiling, New Toland Hall, Mission Bay plans)?
- 1j. To what extent do the site(s) included in the scenario require new or upgraded infrastructure to support proposed development (e.g., sewer)?
- 1k. How proximate are the site(s) included in the scenario to existing and new housing for UCSF personnel?
- 1l. To what extent could the site(s) included in the scenario accommodate attractive site features, such as open spaces and buffer zones?
- 1m. To what extent would development at the site(s) included in the scenario be consistent with pre-stated limits on University growth?

* Bold italic text indicates "Heavily Weighted Critical Considerations."

APPENDICES

- 1n. To what extent will the scenario affect surrounding neighborhoods (physical changes, economic impacts, traffic effects, provision of services)?
- 1o. To what extent could the scenario accommodate helicopter access?

2. ACADEMIC AND PROGRAMMATIC CONSIDERATIONS

- 2a. *To what extent does the scenario locate UCSF's medical facilities where they can efficiently serve as teaching facilities for the UCSF programs, including the professional schools and students, with which they are linked?*
- 2b. *How well does the scenario allow for proximity to, and/or capacity for, existing and new clinical research and faculty?*
- 2c. *To what extent does the scenario create one or more sustainable UCSF communities uniting the basic, clinical and social sciences?*
- 2d. To what extent is the scenario disruptive of UCSF's planned academic configuration?
- 2e. To what extent does the scenario help to sustain and enhance UCSF's academic excellence?
- 2f. How well does the scenario offer the ability to accommodate patient-family housing onsite or nearby?
- 2g. How well does the scenario meet the requirements of Senate Bill 1953 and successive legislation?

3. LOGISTICAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 3a. To what extent does the scenario require temporary surge space during phasing?
- 3b. To what extent would implementation of the scenario disrupt ongoing teaching and research activities?
- 3c. To what extent does the scenario provide the ability to accommodate efficient materiel receiving and distribution areas and facilities?

4. CIRCULATION / PARKING

- 4a. How well are the site(s) included in the scenario served by regional highways?
- 4b. How well are the site(s) included in the scenario served by public transit, in keeping with the City's Transit First policy?
- 4c. Do the site(s) included in the scenario provide sufficient capacity to develop adequate on-site parking?

- 4d. To what extent will the site(s) included in the scenario affect, and be affected by, projected surrounding traffic?
- 4e. How well do the site(s) included in the scenario accommodate well-organized and efficient site circulation (patient/emergency access; loading/delivery access)?
- 4f. How well does the scenario integrate parking needs and Transit First considerations in a rational manner?

5. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5a. To what extent would the scenario require unusually lengthy or complex CEQA Review relative to other scenarios?
- 5b. To what extent might the scenario create negative environmental impacts, e.g., noise (including noise from a helipad, if proposed), air quality, wind, congestion and access, etc.?
- 5c. To what extent does the scenario lend itself to environmentally sustainable and energy efficient site and building design?
- 5d. How does development proposed at the site(s) included in the scenario compare with previously approved plans for each site?

6. MARKET CONSIDERATIONS

- 6a. *Would the scenario be likely to affect the Medical Center's inpatient and outpatient market share (e.g., San Francisco west-side) in a negative, neutral or positive way?*
- 6b. Would the scenario be likely to affect the Medical Center's payor mix in a negative, neutral or positive way?
- 6c. To what extent is the scenario proximate to or duplicative of existing and anticipated inpatient facilities of other institutions?
- 6d. To what extent does the scenario provide the ability to develop a patient friendly hospital (convenient location and access, availability of parking, proximity of related patient services, etc.)?
- 6e. To what extent does the scenario provide the ability to develop a staff-friendly hospital (availability of parking, proximity to amenities, etc.)?

7. FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 7a. *How affordable would the capital and operational costs of the scenario be, relative to those of other scenarios?*

- 7b. *To what extent would the scenario replicate existing facilities and abandon or underutilize existing investments?*
- 7c. To what extent would the overall economic analysis for the scenario enhance the financial viability of the Medical Center?
- 7d. To what extent would the scenario affect the Medical Center's operational efficiency, both in its ability to provide patient care services and to operate its buildings?
- 7e. To what extent would the scenario appeal to donors?

8. ACCESS TO CARE

- 8a. *To what extent does the scenario contribute to the equitable Citywide distribution of health care, emergency and trauma service facilities, routinely and during citywide emergencies and disasters?*
- 8b. To what extent would the scenario enhance the Medical Center's accessibility to existing and future diverse and underserved populations, with multi-lingual capacity and multi-cultural competence?