

CHAPTER 5

CEQA Statutory Sections

5.1 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts

In accordance with Section 21067 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and with Sections 15040, 15081, and 15082 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the purpose of this section is to identify impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to an insignificant level by mitigation measures included as part of the project, or by other mitigation measures that could be implemented, as described throughout *Chapter 4 Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, of this EIR. This chapter is subject to final determination by The Regents as part of the certification process for the EIR. If necessary, this chapter will be revised in the Final EIR to reflect the findings of The Regents.

There would be significant and unavoidable environmental impacts as a result of the proposed UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay, as previously identified by the program-level analysis in the *2005 EIR*, with respect to the following environmental topics:

Air Quality and Climate Change

The proposed project, in the *Future Phase*, would result in significant and unavoidable impacts to air quality due to vehicular, stationary source, and helicopter-related criteria pollutant emissions, which would contribute to regional air pollution.

Criteria air pollutant emissions generated from the construction and operation of the proposed project would make a cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact on regional air quality.

Noise

Demolition and construction activities associated with the proposed project would elevate noise levels in and around the project site, and particularly at nearby sensitive receptors.

Operation of the helicopter landing site proposed as part of the project would lead to increased noise levels at nearby sensitive receptors. Operations at any time of day could cause speech interference. Nighttime helicopter operations could cause increased awakening of residents in the immediate vicinity of the helipad at the site.

5.2 Cumulative Impacts

5.2.1. Introduction

The *CEQA Guidelines* define a cumulative impact as one resulting from the combined effect of the proposed project plus all other reasonably foreseeable projects. CEQA requires the following:

- Cumulative impacts must be discussed when they could be significant.
- The discussion may be more general than that for the individual project impacts, but the discussion should reflect the potential extent, severity, and probability of the impact.
- The cumulative impact analysis can be based on a list of reasonably foreseeable projects or projections from a General Plan or a regional planning agency.
- Reasonable options for mitigating or avoiding the project's contribution to significant cumulative impacts must be proposed. For some cumulative impacts, the only feasible mitigation may involve the adoption of ordinances or regulations rather than the imposition of conditions on a project-by-project basis.

This chapter describes the methodology that was used to prepare cumulative impact analysis for the environmental topics addressed in Sections 4.1 through 4.7 of this EIR. The conclusions of these analyses and the cumulative effects that were found are presented under the discussion of impacts for each environmental category in Chapter 4.

The cumulative impact analyses consider the project's direct and indirect impacts (either significant or less than significant), as they combine with:

- 1) direct and indirect impacts from other identifiable UCSF projects that are similar to the proposed project (such as other ongoing UCSF Mission Bay campus projects), and
- 2) impacts, such as traffic generation or demand for public utilities, that are similar to project impacts, but which result from projects independent of the proposed project or UCSF (such as other projects in the Mission Bay Redevelopment Area, the larger neighborhood of San Francisco, or in the region).

The analyses then consider whether the interactions of these impacts create one or more significant cumulative impacts affecting the same geographic area as the impacts of the proposed project. Finally, if a significant cumulative impact is found, the analyses then assess whether the project's contribution to that significant cumulative impact is cumulatively considerable.

5.2.2 General and Regional Plans Considered in the Cumulative Analysis

To determine the effects of projects that are not well defined, the cumulative impact analysis in the 2005 EIR relied on various planning documents and forecasting models, including but not limited to the *San Francisco General Plan*, the *Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan*, the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) Forecast Model, Port of San Francisco plans, and regional planning documents from the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association (BASMAA), Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD), and California Department of Transportation (Caltrans). These local and regional plans or forecasting models are prepared to meet the requirements of state laws. These plans provide for the physical development of the city and the region. This EIR also considered these regional plans, in their current forms and current contexts, in the analysis of the potential cumulative impacts.

5.2.3 Specific Projects Considered in the Cumulative Analysis

Consistent with *CEQA Guidelines* Section 15130, this cumulative impact analysis considers applicable plans that could combine with potential project impacts within the same geographic area. For potentially significant project impacts, planned projects for both UCSF and the local area were also expressly considered. These include the UCSF projects under the 1996 LRDP, and Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan (North and South) projects. Specific concurrent LRDP projects and other foreseeable projects in the Mission Bay vicinity are described in *Chapter 3 Project Description*, and were part of the cumulative development context for assessing the cumulative environmental impacts of the proposed project.

If, for any of the environmental topics examined, other projects and/or Citywide growth outside the boundaries of the project site might also contribute to a particular cumulative impact, those projects or their effects have been noted within the impact discussion, under that particular environmental topic or issue.

It should also be noted that the transport sewer is being moved by the master developer, as a part of development under the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan. Cumulative construction effects of this action are considered in the analysis of construction air quality and noise impacts. No other aspect of this action would contribute to a cumulative impact.

5.3 Growth-Inducing Impacts

Projects are considered growth-inducing if they foster economic or population growth or the construction of additional housing, directly or indirectly. Typically, growth inducement occurs when a project extends urban services or transportation infrastructure to previously un-served or under-served areas, or removes major barriers to development.

The proposed project would not result in a change to the growth inducement analysis discussed in the *2005 EIR*. Specifically, as described in the *2005 EIR*, the proposed project would not extend utilities or transportation infrastructure to previously undeveloped areas, as the proposed project would be an in-fill development implemented in an already-built environment of one of the Bay Area's central cities. Moreover, the proposed project would not increase employment such that it would result in significant increases in regional population or housing demand that could not be accommodated by planned and potential housing supply within the regional market area.

As discussed in Section 4.9 of the *2005 EIR* and again in the 2008 Initial Study, some of the increase in employment and economic activity at UCSF would be expected to result in other employment growth and population growth in the region, as well as in the vicinity of the project site, particularly employment and economic activity associated with biotechnical and related research and development (R&D) and commercial activities. The plan for such development, however, is already anticipated in plans for the Mission Bay area and for adjacent areas, as indicated in the *1998 Mission Bay Subsequent EIR*, and in other long-term projects and plans, including those prepared by the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG). No additional growth-inducing impacts would result from the proposed project that were not already considered in the *2005 EIR* and determined to be not growth-inducing.

Since the *2005 EIR*, UCSF established the UCSF Mission Bay Community Task Force to provide a forum for community discussion and input regarding UCSF's presence in neighborhoods adjacent to Mission Bay. As part of this planning process, an analysis was prepared to examine the extent to which private development may locate in the Mission Bay area due to UCSF's presence at Mission Bay, and whether there would be a sufficient supply of properly zoned land to accommodate these uses. The analysis concluded that there would be sufficient development opportunities to accommodate this demand by private development without displacing other land uses.

The economic stimuli and the population, employment and housing effects are discussed in *2005 EIR* Section 4.9 as well as in the 2008 *Initial Study*. Other specific identifiable secondary environmental effects of projected future development in the vicinity of the project site are analyzed in the appropriate topical sections of *Chapter 4 Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures*, cumulative impacts are discussed in those topical sections of *Chapter 4*. Other than the specific economic effects previously identified, there are no other growth-inducing effects of the project.

5.4 Effects Found Not to Be Significant

The Initial Study, which was published on January 19, 2008, examined the potential impacts of the proposed project. The Initial Study determined that the project would not cause additional or substantially more severe significant environmental impacts not already analyzed in the *2005 EIR* in the following environmental topic areas: Agricultural Resources, Biological Resources, Cultural Resources, Geology and Soils, Hazards and Hazardous Materials (with the exception of

Hazards associated with helicopter operations), Hydrology and Water Quality, Mineral Resources, Population and Housing, Public Services and Recreation.

Additional environmental effects of the proposed UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay project are identified and discussed in detail in Chapter 4. Based on this analysis, the following additional environmental effects of the project would be less than significant, or less than significant after implementation of the identified mitigation measures: Aesthetics, Helicopter Aeromedical Flight Operations and Public Safety, Land Use, and Utilities, Energy, and Service Systems.

5.5 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes That Would Be Caused by the Proposed Project

The UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay would intensely develop the project site, consistent with the UCSF LRDP and the Mission Bay Redevelopment Plan. The proposed project would commit future generations to the same land uses on the project site for at least the life of the project, which is anticipated to be long after the end of the *Future Phase*. Although the proposed project would incorporate energy-saving features into the project design, it would nevertheless result in an irreversible commitment of energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels, including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline or diesel fuel for construction equipment and automobiles during demolition, construction and ongoing use of the proposed sites. Because the proposed project includes energy conservation performance that would outperform California Energy Code Title 24 by at least 20%, it would not use energy in a wasteful, inefficient or unnecessary manner (see also the discussion of energy and sustainability in *Sections 4.7*, and *3.3.4*). The consumption or destruction of other non-renewable or slowly renewable resources would also result during construction, occupancy, and use of the proposed project sites. These resources include, but are not limited to, lumber, concrete, sand, gravel, asphalt, masonry, and metals. As with energy, even though the proposed project would incorporate water-saving features, it would nevertheless also irreversibly use water resources. However, the proposed project would not involve a large commitment of those resources relative to supply, nor would it consume any of those resources wastefully, inefficiently or unnecessarily.