

INITIAL STUDY AND ADDENDUM #4

**Block 20 Housing Project,
University of California San Francisco – Mission Bay**

LONG RANGE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Final Environmental Impact Report
University of California San Francisco
Certified January 17, 1997
SCH No. 1995123032

Lead Agency: The Regents of the University of California

Prepared by: UCSF Campus Planning
3333 California Street, Suite 11
San Francisco, CA 94143-0286

Contact: Environmental Coordinator
(415) 476-2911

December 3, 2002

I. PROJECT INFORMATION

1. Project title:
Block 20 Housing Project, UCSF – Mission Bay
2. Project location:
University of California, San Francisco, Mission Bay site
City and County of San Francisco
3. Lead Agency:
The Regents of the University of California
4. Project contact name and address:
UCSF Campus Planning
3333 California Street, Suite 11
San Francisco, CA 94143-0286
Attention: Environmental Coordinator (415) 476-2911
5. Location of the administrative record for this project:
UCSF Campus Planning
6. Identification of EIR amended by this Addendum:
 - Final Environmental Impact Report on the 1996 Long Range Development Plan (1996 LRDP and LRDP FEIR) certified by The Regents on January 17, 1997 (State Clearinghouse Number 1995123032)
 - Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (LRDP SEIR) on the Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. 1, Mission Bay Housing Program, certified by The Regents on January 17, 2002 (State Clearinghouse Number 1995123032).

Copies of the 1996 LRDP, LRDP FEIR, LRDP Amendment No. 1, and LRDP SEIR are available at UCSF Campus Planning.

II. INTRODUCTION

Environmental Review and Approval

This Initial Study and Addendum #4 provides the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) environmental analysis for the proposed development of a portion of the Mission Bay site of the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF). On January 17, 1997, The Regents of the University of California (The Regents) certified the Final Environmental Impact Report on the 1996 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP and LRDP FEIR) for UCSF in accordance with CEQA, CEQA Guidelines (Title 14, California Code of Regulations, Sections 15000 et seq.) and the University of California Procedures for Implementation of CEQA. At that time, The Regents also adopted the LRDP. The LRDP FEIR (State Clearinghouse Number 1995123032) is available for review during normal operating hours at UCSF Campus Planning, 3333 California Street, Suite 11, San Francisco. The LRDP FEIR is a program EIR, prepared pursuant to Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. The LRDP FEIR analyzed the implementation of UCSF uses and physical development at its existing sites and at potential new sites proposed under the LRDP through the year 2011-12. The LRDP FEIR also identified measures to mitigate the significant adverse project and cumulative impacts associated with the LRDP program for decompression, expansion and consolidation.

The LRDP FEIR analyzed the LRDP proposal for growth with the potential development of a major new UCSF campus site containing up to 2,650,000 gross square feet (gsf), at one of three possible sites in the Bay Area, including Mission Bay in San Francisco. In the Fall of 1998, the City and County of San Francisco (City), and the principal Mission Bay landowner, Catellus Development Corporation (Catellus), agreed to donate to The Regents approximately 43 acres of property in Mission Bay at the northwest corner of Sixteenth Street and Third Street. Two of three parcels of property have been transferred to The Regents, including five acres in November 1998 and 21.5 acres in July 1999. The remaining 16.5 acres are anticipated to be transferred to The Regents in July 2004.

Also in the Fall of 1998 the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (SFRA) and the City adopted two redevelopment plans for the entire 303-acre Mission Bay area, after jointly certifying the Mission Bay Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Mission Bay Subsequent EIR) on October 14, 1998.¹ The revised plans (Mission Bay North Plan and South Plan) call for the development of housing and retail space north of China Basin Channel; and development of housing, retail, commercial/industrial uses, a hotel, and the new UCSF site south of China Basin

¹ Mission Bay Subsequent Final Environmental Impact Report, certified by the City and County of San Francisco on

Channel.² These Plans replaced the 1990 Mission Bay Plan that was evaluated in the Mission Bay Final Environmental Impact Report (1990 Mission Bay EIR).³ The Mission Bay Subsequent EIR evaluated the environmental effects of implementing the Mission Bay North and South Plans as a subsequent EIR to the 1990 Mission Bay EIR. Information in the 1990 Mission Bay EIR is relied upon and referenced in the LRDP FEIR and in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR, particularly for the sections on Geology/Soils, Hydrology/Water Quality, and Cultural Resources.

In January 2002, Amendment No. 1 to the LRDP finalized the functional zoning of the UCSF Mission Bay site and re-distributed the 2,650,000 gsf program to include housing as a primary use. The amendment was analyzed in the LRDP Amendment No. 1, Mission Bay Housing Program, Supplemental EIR (LRDP SEIR). This Initial Study and Addendum #4 is based on and hereby incorporates by reference the LRDP FEIR and its approved addenda, the 1990 Mission Bay EIR, the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR, and the LRDP SEIR, as follows:

1. The 1990 Mission Bay EIR, certified in August 1990, which evaluates the 1990 Mission Bay Plan.
2. The Mission Bay Subsequent EIR, certified in October 1998, which evaluates the Mission Bay North and the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plans.
3. The LRDP FEIR, certified in January 1997, which evaluates UCSF's 1996 LRDP. It is a Program-level EIR for purposes of acquisition and site development of a major new UCSF campus site.

The LRDP FEIR Addendum No. 1, certified on March 19, 1999, which analyzes the construction and operation of Building 24A/B (Genentech Hall).

The LRDP FEIR Addendum No. 2, certified on May 17, 2000, which analyzes the construction and operation of Building 19B, Building 21B, Phase 1 Landscaping, Parking and Campus Infrastructure Improvements.

The LRDP FEIR Addendum No. 3, certified on March 14, 2002, which analyzes the construction and operation of the California Institute for Bioengineering, Biotechnology, and Quantitative Biomedical Research (QB3) Building on parcel 24C at Mission Bay, and the Building 21A Parking Garage.

October 14, 1998, Notice of Determination filed November 3, 1998 (State Clearinghouse Number 1997092068).

² San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, Redevelopment Plan for Mission Bay North and Redevelopment Plan for Mission Bay South, August 1998, adopted by the City and County of San Francisco on November 2, 1998.

³ Mission Bay Final Environmental Impact Report, certified by the City and County of San Francisco on August 23, 1990 (State Clearinghouse Number 1986070113).

4. The LRDP SEIR, certified in January 2002, which defines functional zones for UCSF Mission Bay and evaluates a Mission Bay Housing Program for UCSF.

This Initial Study and Addendum #4 is intended to serve two purposes. First, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c), this document analyzes the potential environmental effects that could result from construction and operation of student housing to determine, under the criteria of CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, whether these activities could cause any project-specific environmental effects that were not examined in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. If no new project-specific impacts would occur, and thus no new mitigation measures would be required, CEQA Section 15168(c) provides that the proposed project can be approved by The Regents as being within the scope of the project covered in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR.

Second, this document makes minor technical changes and additions to the LRDP SEIR in order to analyze the project-specific environmental effects of the proposed project, but it does not make major revisions to the LRDP SEIR analysis of on-site housing at Mission Bay. For the reasons set forth herein, the environmental analysis of the potential impacts of the proposed project falls within the standards set forth in CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 for the preparation of an addendum to the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR.⁴

The type of uses and buildings that were contemplated under the LRDP and analyzed in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR are relatively discrete, uniform and generic, i.e. research, instructional and support uses totaling 2,650,000 gsf. In particular, the LRDP SEIR contains an adequate project-level analysis for the construction of the Block 20 Housing Project. All feasible project-level mitigation measures were included in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, as summarized in Section VIII of this document.

This Initial Study and Addendum #4 determines that the proposed project development would not result in any environmental effects that were not examined in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, and that the environmental effects that would result from the proposed project fall within the range of environmental impacts analyzed in the LRDP FEIR and the LRDP SEIR.

The LRDP and LRDP FEIR descriptions contemplated substantial development during the first phase of major new site improvement, and the proposed project is thus within the envelope of the analysis contained in the LRDP FEIR. The LRDP FEIR was prepared during 1996 and certified in January 1997. It is therefore a recent environmental analysis of development of a UCSF site at Mission Bay, which is augmented by the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR prepared in 1998, the LRDP

⁴ As with CEQA Guidelines Section 15168(c), Section 15164 relies upon the criteria of Section 15162.

FEIR Addendum #1 analysis of Building 24A/B prepared in 1999,⁵ the LRDP FEIR Addendum #2 analysis of Buildings 19B, Building 21B, and Phase 1 Landscaping, Parking and Campus Infrastructure Improvements prepared in 2000,⁶ the LRDP SEIR analysis of LRDP Amendment No. 1, the Mission Bay Housing Program, and the LRDP FEIR Addendum #3 analysis of Building 24C and Parking Garage Building 21A in 2002.⁷ The information contained in these documents is current and reliable.

This document analyzes the potential environmental effects associated with the housing project at UCSF Mission Bay. The proposed project is the construction of Block 20 Housing containing 430 units in four structures. The project would also include about 14,600 gsf of retail space. The housing is part of the Phase 1 development of the UCSF Mission Bay site. Other developments previously approved under Phase 1 consist of Building 24A/B (Genentech Hall), Building 19B (Developmental Biology and Genetics Building), Building 21B (Campus Community Center), Building 21A Garage, and Building 24C (QB3). In addition, the functional zoning designation of Block 20 was revised to *housing* and *parking* use in January 2002, upon approval of LRDP Amendment No. 1.

Organization of Initial Study and Addendum # 4

This document is organized into the following sections.

Section I – Project Information: provides summary data about the proposed project.

Section II – Introduction: describes the criteria used in the Initial Study and Addendum.

Section III – Project Description: presents a description of the proposed project.

Section IV – Consistency with the 1996 LRDP and LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR: describes the relationship of the proposed project to development projections in the 1996 LRDP and LRDP FEIR and the relationship of the project to other referenced EIRs, particularly the LRDP SEIR.

Section V – Environmental Factors Potentially Affected: identifies any environmental factors that were determined to cause a new project-specific "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist.

⁵ Initial Study and Addendum #1 to the LRDP FEIR, March 5, 1999, certified by The Regents March 19, 1999.

⁶ Initial Study and Addendum #2 to the LRDP FEIR, May 5, 2000, certified by The Regents May 17, 2000.

⁷ LRDP Amendment #1 LRDP SEIR, certified by The Regents January 17, 2002; Initial Study and Addendum #3 to the LRDP FEIR, certified by The Regents March 14, 2002.

Section VI – Determination: indicates what, if any, additional environmental documentation is required for the proposed project.

Section VII- Environmental Checklist: contains the Environmental Checklist form. The form is used to assist in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project with respect to the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. The form identifies potential project effects as follows: (1) new potentially significant project impacts that were not adequately analyzed in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, or previously identified significant impacts for which new feasible mitigation measures are available; (2) new less-than-significant impacts with mitigation incorporated; (3) environmental impacts of the proposed project that were adequately analyzed and mitigated in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR; (4) less-than-significant impacts of the proposed project without mitigation, and (5) effects of the proposed project that would not result in any adverse environmental impact.

This section also contains a summary of LRDP FEIR standards of significance, followed by an explanation of all checklist answers, impacts, and recommended LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR mitigation measures, as appropriate.

Section VIII – Mitigation Measures: summarizes LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR mitigation measures.

Section IX – Alternatives to the Project: summarizes the alternatives to the proposed housing project that were analyzed in the LRDP SEIR.

Section X – Criteria for an Addendum: summarizes the conditions for preparing an addendum.

Section XI– References: lists materials used to prepare this report.

III. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1. Site Description

Mission Bay is located about one mile south of San Francisco's downtown Financial District along the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. The Mission Bay location will be one of a network of major UCSF sites in and around San Francisco. The Mission Bay area is divided by the China Basin Channel, with about 65 acres to the north and about 238 acres to the south. The Mission Bay South Plan area contains the 43-acre UCSF site, bounded by Third Street to the east, Sixteenth Street to the south, and Owens Street to the west. Mission Bay South, including the UCSF site, is set on a block grid similar in size and shape to the Vara Blocks north of Market

Street. For ease of reference, blocks within the UCSF site are numbered 14 through 25. UCSF's first building at the Mission Bay site, Genentech Hall on Block 24 parcel 24A/B, is complete. The Developmental Biology/Genetics building on Block 19 parcel 19B, the Campus Community Center / parking garage on Block 21, and the QB3 building on Block 24, parcel 24C are currently under construction.

2. Conditions of Land Transfer and Campus Master Plan

As a condition of the agreement to transfer the 43 acres to The Regents from Catellus and the City, The Regents and Catellus entered into Conditions, Covenants and Restrictions (CC&Rs) which govern the development of the campus site. (The agreement also applies to parcels directly owned by Catellus adjacent to the campus site.) The CC&Rs requirements address such issues as screening, utility undergrounding, view corridors, access, open space, building heights over percentage of area, building streetwalls, signs, lighting, building form/design, parking ratio and landscaping.

In addition, it is anticipated that all UCSF development at Mission Bay would follow the general concepts and guidelines of the Mission Bay Campus Master Plan and Design Guidelines (CMPDG). The CMPDG was drafted in April 1999 as an internal UCSF planning tool to provide an overall framework for the physical development of the UCSF Mission Bay site. It sets forth basic principles to guide the design of individual buildings and landscaping projects with the understanding that buildout of the site would include designs by many different architects over time. The basic parameters of the CMPDG are: creating building alignments by designing consistent expressions of a building base, body and rooftop; and, using simple building volumes that discourages excessive protrusions and ornamentation. Landscaping should be composed of a hierarchy of open spaces linked together to create pedestrian movement through the site.

Additionally, the 1996 LRDP provided for an illustrative layout for the basic distribution of land uses to guide physical development within the Mission Bay site. These "functional zones" were amended in the Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. 1 to include *housing* as a new on-site use at UCSF Mission Bay. The project architects have followed the CC&Rs and have designed Block 20 Housing to be consistent with CMPDG and functional zone concepts.

3. LRDP SEIR Program Description

The description of the housing program and tenant parking on Block 20 that was analyzed in the LRDP SEIR noted that the specific configurations of the buildings were to be finalized during the

architectural design process. The LRDP SEIR analyzed the maximum building height of the residential tower on the east portion of Block 20 adjacent to 3rd Street at 160 feet in height to the parapet with a portion of the rooftop up to 185 feet. In response to significant community concern over the height when the project was initially presented, some of the square footage was redistributed to the north and west buildings to lower the eastern building on 3rd Street to be a total of 155 feet in height (including roof top mechanical equipment). The revision also necessitated relocating tenant parking to an adjacent block. These changes increased the efficiency of the project from 403 units to 430 units and increased the total gsf from 400,000 gsf to 421,370 gsf. The housing program analyzed in the LRDP SEIR described a total of 910 residents including about 720 students and 190 student family members. The current population estimates remain at 910 total residents but the new breakout is 756 students and 154 student family members. This Initial Study and Addendum #4 covers these minor specific design details of the project as it is currently envisioned; however, none of the changes alters the conclusions of the LRDP SEIR.

4. Proposed Project

The proposed Block 20 Housing Project would consist of four separate buildings on Block 20 with apartment-style housing. Two of the structures would also contain ground-level retail. The total square footage of the housing project would be 421,370 gsf, with about 400,000 gsf residential use, about 14,595 gsf of retail and community services, and about 6,775 gsf of office/logistics support. Tenant parking would be provided in a separate project: development of the parking structure on parcel 23B as called for in the CMPDG.

The four buildings would be mid-rise and high-rise style with the tallest residential tower on the east side of the block at 140 feet in height to the parapet and 155 feet total to the top of the mechanical equipment penthouse. The structure on the north side would be 94 feet tall, the west structure would be 85 feet tall, and the south structure would be 68 feet tall.

Currently UCSF is providing housing for only 14% of the student body (370 of 2,650 students) and there is no formal program for housing postdoctoral scholars and postgraduate researchers (“postdocs”). The LRDP called for the development of 220 to 339 student spaces to meet a student housing goal of 25%. It also identified 105 to 130 units of affordable housing for non-Medical Center staff, including postdocs. As indicated in LRDP Amendment No. 1., UCSF has since acquired the Mission Bay site, allowing the campus to increase its student goal to 40%, and establish a housing goal of 25% for postdocs.

The project would contain up to 430 apartment style units with up to 756 beds for students and postdocs. Some units would be allotted to students/postdocs with families. The total population, including family members would be 910 residents. In the near term, it is anticipated that most of the students and postdocs residing in the Block 20 Housing would work at other UCSF sites and would likely travel by UCSF shuttle bus. In the long term as the UCSF Mission Bay program is more fully developed, most students housed on site would also likely work in nearby offices and labs at UCSF Mission Bay.

In addition, the proposed Block 20 housing would be offered as replacement housing to residents of two existing housing facilities operated by UCSF that are scheduled to be removed from operation. On a temporary basis at the Parnassus Aldea housing complex, five of the original apartment buildings from the 1950s are being occupied. A total of 65 Aldea apartments will be occupied until August 2005 at the latest when they will be vacated and demolished as originally planned. The second housing facility is the 3145 Turk Street Apartments, a single three-story, 12-unit apartment building located approximately one mile to the north of Parnassus Heights. The units are operated dormitory style to house up to 65 single students. This style of housing is not well suited to the advanced graduate level studies of UCSF students. If the Block 20 Housing Project is approved, the students in these outdated facilities would be offered the opportunity to relocate to UCSF Mission Bay housing.

5. Project Objectives

UCSF proposes to construct new housing facilities at UCSF Mission Bay. It is the objective of The Regents to develop affordable housing facilities to help meet the demand of students and postdocs, and to benefit the jobs/housing balance at UCSF. Specific project objectives are:

- Ensure Adequate Housing for Students.
 - Identify appropriate locations for housing within reasonable proximity to UCSF's academic sites.
 - Provide and maintain a variety of housing types for students.
 - Consider the access and affordability of both existing and new housing.

- Maintain Decent, Attractive University-Controlled Housing Stock.
 - Vacate and dispose of existing housing that is deteriorating or remotely located from UCSF sites.
 - Address the need for student housing by additions to the existing housing stock, while respecting existing neighborhood character.
 - Provide housing for students that is reasonably affordable.
 - Provide assistance to students in securing appropriate housing.
 - Investigate methods of financing development of campus housing to develop affordable housing for students and junior faculty.
- Arrange campus land uses on the site to reinforce academic and operational relationships. Optimize the design, placement and relationship of buildings on the site to meet the program needs of UCSF in the best way possible.
- Ensure that UCSF development is compatible with its physical surroundings in use, scale and density.
- Locate buildings on sites that conform to the functional zones identified in the LRDP Amendment No. 1, January 2002.

6. Project Schedule – Relocation, Demolition and Construction

Construction of Block 20 Housing would begin in the second quarter of 2003 and would be completed in mid 2005.

Hours of construction for all UCSF improvements would normally be from 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, with high-noise-level activity, such as pile driving, occurring between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday. Exceptions to the regular hours of construction would be made only with advance review and authorization by the UCSF Construction Manager. UCSF will use reasonable efforts to notify nearby neighbors by mail or by telephone in advance of any such exceptions. Extended hours of construction approved as exceptions could include high-noise-level generating activities such as pile driving until 6:00 p.m. and other low-noise construction until 8:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. With advance notice, weekend hours would be Saturday 7:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. and Sunday 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. High-noise-level activities on Saturdays would be limited to the hours between 9:00 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. and no high-noise-level work such as pile driving would occur on Sundays.

7. Other UCSF Activities

Hospital Replacement Planning

UCSF and its Medical Center are exploring options for the replacement of hospital facilities at UCSF's Parnassus Heights site to meet seismic and life safety code requirements imposed by Senate Bill 1953 (amendments to the Hospital Seismic Safety Act). A new hospital complex at one or two campus sites totaling 1.7 million gsf of space for 650 beds is needed to replace the existing Moffitt Long Hospital on the Parnassus campus. The existing facility must be replaced to meet these more stringent state seismic code requirements, as well as to replace functionally obsolete and inefficient space. The Hospital Replacement project will also include a central utility plant and associated parking (as feasible and acceptable with environmental mitigation).

Currently, various hospital replacement scenarios are being discussed that involve building new hospital facilities at one or more UCSF campus locations: Parnassus Heights, Mount Zion, and Mission Bay. UCSF is in the early stages of exploring these options, and has initiated meetings with community groups and the necessary government agencies. It is anticipated that a hospital replacement plan with a preferred alternative will be defined during a Long Range Development Plan (LRDP) Amendment and CEQA review process in 2003.

IV. CONSISTENCY WITH THE LRDP

In order to determine the proposed project's consistency with the LRDP and LRDP FEIR as amended, the following questions must be answered:

- Is the proposed project included in the scope of the development projected in the LRDP, as amended?
- Is the proposed location of the project in an area designated for this type of use in the LRDP, as amended?
- Are changes to campus population that would result from the proposed project included within the scope of the LRDP population projections, as amended?
- Are the objectives of the proposed project consistent with the adopted objectives for the LRDP, as amended?
- Is the proposed project within the scope of the cumulative analysis in the LRDP FEIR, as amended?

The following discussion describes the proposed project's relationship to development projections, population projections, land use designations, and objectives contained in the LRDP, as amended, and the proposed project's consistency with each of these items.

LRDP Revised Space Program Scope of Development

The LRDP included a number of development concepts that were designed to provide for decompression, consolidation and expansion of UCSF's programs and functions. Foremost of the concepts was acquisition of sufficient land to develop a single major new site with the capacity to meet projected space needs at a single location. The space program of 2,650,000 gsf identified types of space for the new site, including *Research*, *Instruction*, and *Support* such as *campus community* and *logistics*.

LRDP Amendment No. 1, Mission Bay Housing Program, revised the space program to include *housing* in the *Support* function. The LRDP SEIR analyzed a program of 390,000 gsf of *housing* and 10,000 gsf of *campus community* (retail) for a total program of 400,000 gsf. Detailed planning and design has progressed since publication of the LRDP SEIR and the current project now totals 421,370 gsf due to a more efficient development and better defined uses within the same footprint. The project uses within the *Support* functions now include about 400,000 gsf of residential, about 2,125 gsf of administration, about 14,600 gsf of campus community and about 4,650 gsf of logistics. The corresponding adjustments in future development of other uses have been made such that the total gross square footage of the planned space program at UCSF Mission Bay remains the same at 2,650,000 gsf.

The proposed project provides another increment of the identified space program as follows:

MAJOR NEW SITE SPACE PROGRAM (GSF) /a/

Type of Space	Buildout gsf	Approved Projects	Housing Bk 20	Total Phase 1 to 2005
Instruction	160,000	17,000	0	17,000
Research	1,220,000	568,000	0	568,000
Support:				
Academic Support	265,000	49,000	0	49,000
Administration	265,000	85,200	2,125	87,325
Campus Community	170,000	134,800	14,595	149,395
Logistics	170,000	16,000	4,650	20,650
Housing	400,000	0	400,000	400,000
Subtotal Support	1,270,000	285,000	421,370	721,370
TOTAL /b/	2,650,000	870,000	421,370	1,306,370

/a/ As revised by LRDP Amendment No. 1, Mission Bay Housing Program

/b/ Program Square Footage excludes parking.

LRDP Land Use Designation

The LRDP contains an illustrative site plan showing the campus site with functional zones of *Instruction/Research* in the central portion of the site and *Support* on the perimeters of the site. These functional zones were revised as part of the LRDP Amendment No. 1, approved by The Regents in January 2002, to provide *housing* use on the eastern edge of the site, in addition to previous designations of *Instruction*, *Research* and *Support* zones at the northern and southern portions of the site, and open space in the interior of the site. *Parking* zones are located on the western and eastern portions of the site. The LRDP and LRDP FEIR, along with LRDP Amendment No. 1 and the associated LRDP SEIR, contain the space program identifying the types of space to be located at the new site; and the organizing concepts that call for the site to be developed around a variety of bioscience research programs as the core, and supporting activities necessary to make a workable and attractive campus. The site boundaries and land use zones of the LRDP vary slightly from those depicted in the CMPDG. The adoption of LRDP Amendment No. 1, as analyzed in the LRDP SEIR, brings the LRDP illustrative plans up to date to be consistent with the CMPDG. The Mission Bay functional zones adopted in LRDP Amendment No. 1 maintain the 2,650,000 gsf space program of the LRDP through a reallocation of *Support* functions.

LRDP Population Projections

According to the LRDP, the average daily population at Mission Bay would grow to approximately 9,100 faculty, staff, students, patients, and visitors over the 15-year LRDP horizon. With LRDP Amendment No. 1 Mission Bay Housing Program, population projections were modified to include on-site residents. However, given adjustments in other types of uses, the overall population at UCSF Mission Bay would remain at approximately 9,100 people. The proposed housing is expected to accommodate a population of about 756 students or postdoctoral scholars. Some apartments would be family units, resulting in approximately 154 associated family members (spouses and children) for a total population of about 910 people. The proposed project would provide 27 more units than described in the LRDP SEIR; however, the ratio of single students to students with families remains the same and the total number of on-site occupants is unchanged. In total, approved Phase 1 structures through 2005, including the proposed projects, would house about 2,820 people.

The LRDP calls for a relocation over time of UCSF employees from Parnassus Heights to other UCSF sites, including Mission Bay. LRDP projects at Parnassus Heights include demolition of obsolete structures such as UC Hall and new construction of smaller research facilities. It is anticipated that new and released space at Parnassus Heights will be refilled through recruitment of new faculty but presumably at a lesser density ratio than the current overcrowded conditions.

LRDP FEIR Cumulative Analysis

The LRDP FEIR and the LRDP SEIR contain cumulative analyses of future changes at Mission Bay over a 15-year planning horizon. These analyses were based upon projections for cumulative development contained in San Francisco's General Plan and Regional Studies, as well as a consideration of reasonably foreseeable projects where appropriate. The proposals in the LRDP and the revised program in LRDP Amendment No. 1 included several actions that would add new facilities. The proposed project contributes to the cumulative impacts evaluated in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, but will not result in those impacts being more severe than as described in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. Other than the adoption of the LRDP Amendment No. 1, UCSF has not made any significant changes to its proposals in the LRDP as they relate to the major new site at Mission Bay. Therefore all of the analyses in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR remain valid.

V. ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

<input type="checkbox"/>	Land Use & Planning	<input type="checkbox"/>	Traffic/Circulation/Parking	<input type="checkbox"/>	Air Quality
<input type="checkbox"/>	Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	Hazardous Materials	<input type="checkbox"/>	Geology & Soils
<input type="checkbox"/>	Hydrology & Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Vegetation & Wildlife	<input type="checkbox"/>	Public Services
<input type="checkbox"/>	Utilities & Infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	Visual Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	Cultural Resources
<input type="checkbox"/>	Population & Housing	<input type="checkbox"/>	Mandatory Findings of Significance		

As discussed in Section VII below, none of the environmental factors that were analyzed for this project would have a project impact that would be a “Potentially Significant Impact” as indicated by the checklist on the following pages. Therefore none of the boxes above has been checked.

The Initial Study prepared for the LRDP SEIR focused out a number of environmental topics where it was determined that the impacts of development were sufficiently covered in the LRDP FEIR. No further analysis was required in the LRDP SEIR and no further discussion is provided in this Initial Study and Addendum #4 in the areas of Noise, Geology & Soils, Hydrology & Water Quality, Vegetation & Wildlife, Visual Quality, Cultural Resources, and Population & Housing.

VI. DETERMINATION

All of the significant environmental effects of the proposed project: (1) have been mitigated or avoided as a result of the LRDP FEIR and Findings adopted in connection with the LRDP FEIR, (2) have been mitigated or avoided as a result of the LRDP SEIR and Findings adopted in connection with the LRDP SEIR, (3) have been examined at a sufficient level of detail in the LRDP FEIR and/or LRDP SEIR to enable those effects to be mitigated or avoided by site-specific revisions, the imposition of conditions, in connection with the approval of the proposed project, or by other means or (4) cannot be mitigated to avoid or substantially lessen the significant impacts despite The Regents' willingness to accept all feasible mitigation measures, and the only purpose of including analysis of such effects in another environmental impact report would be to put The Regents in a position to adopt a statement of overriding considerations with respect to the effects.

Furthermore the analysis contained in this Initial Study and Addendum #4 indicates that the proposed project may incrementally contribute to significant environmental impacts previously identified in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, but will not result in those impacts being more severe than as described in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. Further, the proposed project will result in no new significant impacts other than those previously identified in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. No new mitigation measures, other than those previously identified in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, are imposed on the proposed project. No further environmental documentation is required; therefore, FINDINGS consistent with this determination will be prepared.

Signature: Michelle Schaefer, UCSF Environmental Coordinator

Date: December 3, 2002

VII. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

Overview

The checklist form is used to assist in evaluating the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project with respect to the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. The form identifies potential project effects as follows: (1) **Potentially-Significant Impact** is an effect which is substantial based on the significance criteria. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant Impact” entries in the checklist form, an EIR is required; (2) **Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated** applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant Impact” to a “Less Than Significant Impact.” If there are any entries under this column in the checklist form, the Initial Study will include mitigation measures and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level; (3) **Impact for which LRDP/Program EIR is Sufficient** applies where the impacts of the project were adequately addressed and mitigated to the extent feasible in the LRDP FEIR and/or LRDP SEIR (or other Program EIR); (4) **Less-Than-Significant Impact** applies where the effects of the project create only less-than-significant impacts and no significant impacts; (5) **No Impact** applies where a project will not create an impact in that category.

A discussion follows each environmental item identified in the checklist form. Environmental impacts of the project that are determined in this Initial Study to have been adequately analyzed and mitigated in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR generally fall into one of two categories: (1) impacts that were determined to be less than significant after the implementation of the mitigation measures in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR; and (2) impacts considered significant and unavoidable in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR. As to the first category, no further analysis is required since the LRDP FEIR, LRDP SEIR and associated mitigation measures would reduce all project-level impacts to less than significant for all projects within the LRDP or LRDP Amendment No. 1, including the proposed project. Impacts identified as significant and unavoidable in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR include (A) impacts identified as significant for some projects in the LRDP, but which would not be significant in relation to the proposed project; (B) impacts that are significant on a cumulative level but not at a project level, for which the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR fully addresses the cumulative impact; and/or (C) impacts for which the analysis and mitigation measures are sufficiently generic so that no further analysis is necessary or appropriate on a project level (that is, the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR contains all of the analysis that reasonably could be included on the topic with respect to all projects generally, including this proposed project, and there is little variation from project to project). The specific basis for concluding that the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR adequately analyzes the impact is

included in each section. In addition, topics found to have no impact (noise, geology & soils, hydrology & water quality, vegetation & wildlife, cultural resources, and population & housing) were focused out after analyses in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. With respect to the proposed project, this Initial Study concludes that all impacts are less than significant on a project level after implementation of LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR mitigation measures adopted as conditions of approval. (See Section VIII, Summary of LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures, following the checklist for a complete summary of mitigation measures.)

IMPACT QUESTIONS

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. LAND USE AND PLANNING					
Would the project:					
a) Physically divide an established community?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
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 LRDP, general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c) Conflict with any designated adjacent existing or future land uses on or off-campus?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d) Be in general conformance with the LRDP land use designations?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
e) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

Summary of LRDP FEIR Impacts and Standards of Significance:

The LRDP FEIR concluded that LRDP uses would be generally consistent with the *San Francisco Master Plan* and the specific area plan, the *Mission Bay Plan*, addressing development of the site. The LRDP FEIR also concluded that LRDP proposals for a major new site would further implement educational, administrative, support and research uses in areas where it would improve existing vacant land or under-utilized industrial development.

The LRDP FEIR determined that development at Mission Bay by UCSF could conflict with then-existing zoning and specific plan policies. Although the Mission Bay Development Agreement had expired and a new plan was expected to be developed, the potential conflict with then-existing plans and policies prior to adoption of a new plan by the City was considered to be an unavoidable significant effect. The mitigation measure outlining a City amendment of the City Planning Code was outside the jurisdiction of the University. In 1998 the City amended the Planning Code as called for in the mitigation measure and adopted the new Redevelopment Plan, the Mission Bay South Plan, which includes the UCSF subarea. With the City's implementation of the mitigation measure, the UCSF site is consistent with all Mission Bay plans and codes. The adoption of the Mission Bay South Plan has resulted in a beneficial change in circumstances regarding land use impacts of the LRDP.

The LRDP SEIR analyzed LRDP Amendment No. 1, which revised the on-site functional zones, amended the space program included housing, and concluded that development of UCSF Mission Bay would be consistent with local land use plans and the LRDP as amended. No adverse change would result to the land use character, function and purpose of the Mission Bay site and no mitigation measures were required.

Pursuant to the University of California's constitutional authority, development and uses on property owned or leased by the University in furtherance of the educational mission of the University are not subject to local land use regulation. However, UCSF relies upon local land use policies as planning guidelines and as the basis for determining land use and planning impacts under CEQA. Further, UCSF cooperates with local planning agencies in matters of mutual concern. Based on these policies, the LRDP FEIR provided that the LRDP would have a significant adverse land use or planning impact if the proposed LRDP development and uses would:

- substantially conflict with the adopted environmental goals, plans and policies of the local planning jurisdiction;
- substantially conflict with the use designations, height and bulk, and density restrictions of local zoning; or
- be substantially incompatible with existing land uses.

Discussion of Checklist Questions:

After adoption by the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission, the Mission Bay North and Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plans were approved by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors in November 1998. The Plans' land use designations are intended to encourage the development in the Mission Bay area of market-rate and affordable housing, open space, commercial industrial, hotel, retail and public facilities in Mission Bay, as well as the UCSF Mission Bay site.

Mission Bay was historically zoned as an M-2 Heavy Industrial Use District. However, portions of the Mission Bay area have begun to develop since certification of the LRDP FEIR. Parking lots to serve the San Francisco Giants ballpark, Pacific Bell Park, have been constructed near Third and Fourth Streets south of China Basin Channel. Three new residential projects north of the Channel are completed or nearing completion. A new commercial office structure is complete east of the campus across Third Street, and site preparation is also underway for a new research facility on the parcel immediately west of the UCSF Mission Bay site across Owens Street.

Existing land use in the Mission Bay area is discussed in more detail in the LRDP SEIR and in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR.

The proposed Block 20 Housing project would contain up to 421,370 gsf (not including parking), or about 16% of the total 2,650,000 gsf of UCSF research, instructional and support uses that would be developed at UCSF Mission Bay at buildout under the LRDP. Together with approved Phase 1 Buildings 24A/B, 19B, 21B, and 24C, total new construction would provide approximately 1,306,370 gsf, or about 49% of the projected UCSF development at Mission Bay. This represents a portion of the total UCSF uses of these types to be developed at Mission Bay; therefore, the proposed 421,370 gsf of the proposed project falls within the total program analyzed in the LRDP FEIR and the LRDP SEIR.

The proposed project would contain up to approximately 910 residents in four buildings on Block 20. This population represents about 10% of the total UCSF population of 9,100 at the UCSF Mission Bay site that was analyzed in the LRDP FEIR. Together with an estimated population of 1,900 people for approved Phase 1 Buildings 24A/B, 19B, 21B, and 24C, the total UCSF population in Phase 1 would be approximately 2,810 people, which represents about 31% of the total UCSF population at UCSF Mission Bay at full buildout. The projected population of Phase 1 to 2005 therefore falls within the scope of the program described in the LRDP FEIR. Therefore no conflict with the adopted LRDP would result.

Since certification of the LRDP FEIR in 1997, the SFRA and the City approved the Mission Bay South Plan, which designates a UCSF Subarea for the UCSF major new site. The designation eliminates the possibility of a conflict with zoning and specific plan policies, and therefore eliminates the potentially significant impact found in the LRDP FEIR. In addition, the Mission Bay South Plan provides that, except for: (1) the portion of the Mission Bay Project Area within the UCSF Subarea to be developed either as a site for the San Francisco Unified School District or as public open space; and (2) dedicated public streets (which would be subject to the jurisdiction of the SFRA), the portion of the Mission Bay Project Area to be used by UCSF for educational purposes would not be subject to the actions of the SFRA, but would be developed by UCSF in accordance with the LRDP, as amended from time to time. The adoption of the Mission Bay South Plan is a beneficial impact on the UCSF development at Mission Bay.

The LRDP includes an illustrative site plan of UCSF development within the entire Mission Bay area and identifies functional zones that call for the UCSF site to be developed with Instruction and Research uses in the core of the site and associated Support uses around the site perimeter. These functional zones were later revised under LRDP Amendment No. 1, Mission Bay Housing Program, to facilitate the development of *Instruction, Research* and *Support* (including *housing*) generally along the northern and southern portions of the UCSF Mission Bay site, open space in the center of the site, and parking on the eastern and western edges. The proposed Block 20 Housing Project is at the location envisioned by the LRDP zones, as amended. The zone also allows for parking on Block 20, and although tenant parking is currently planned to be developed on an adjacent block, the parking designation would allow for development of some auxiliary parking as needed in the future. The project conforms to the adopted functional zones; therefore, no impact would result.

There are no habitat conservation plans or natural community conservation plant that are applicable to the UCSF Mission Bay site. Similarly, development of the UCSF site at Mission Bay would not conflict with open space or other adopted land use goals applicable to the area. The UCSF site would contain more than eight acres of open space. Therefore no impact would result.

Based on the above discussion, development of the proposed project would not cause any land use effects that were not examined in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP FSEIR, and therefore no further analysis of these impacts is required. Project-level land use impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/ Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
2. TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION/ PARKING					
Would the project:					
a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
c) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d) Result in inadequate emergency access?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
e) Result in inadequate parking capacity on Campus?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
f) Conflict with applicable policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/ Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Results in increased pedestrian and bicycle traffic in areas which may not have adequate facilities for these modes of travel, or cause conflict between bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles?	_____	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____
h) Increased demand for transit services?	_____	_____	<u>X</u>	_____	_____

Summary of LRDP FEIR Impacts and Standards of Significance:

The LRDP FEIR contained an extensive discussion of the potential traffic impacts of developing the UCSF site at Mission Bay.⁸ It analyzed the potential effects that could result from development of 2,650,000 gsf of UCSF uses, excluding parking, anywhere within the Mission Bay planning area and contained a corridor level of service (LOS) transportation analysis of existing conditions and year 2010 conditions, with and without UCSF. The LRDP FEIR analysis showed that traffic generated by the UCSF uses would be added to facilities that already face above-capacity demand during peak hours, including U.S. 101, I-280 and the Bay Bridge. Impacts on I-280 at buildout would be significant and unavoidable, even after mitigation. Traffic generated by the major new site would result in deterioration of conditions on Cesar Chavez Street and would be a significant and unavoidable impact even after mitigation. On the other hand, the analysis indicated that UCSF uses would not cause significant deterioration in levels of service on Third or Fourth Streets. This would not be considered a significant impact.

The cumulative traffic assumptions and analysis of future traffic conditions in the Mission Bay area presented in the LRDP FEIR were based on the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) year 2010 growth projections. However, because the MTC 2010 model did not account for employment levels similar to the major new site at Mission Bay, traffic associated with UCSF was treated as an increment of additional development to MTC model year 2010 projections. As a result, the transportation analysis in the LRDP FEIR presents a conservative analysis of year 2010 conditions at Mission Bay.

⁸ LRDP FEIR, Volume II, pages 344-352.

The LRDP FEIR estimated that a new site at Mission Bay, at full buildout, would generate about 10,816 daily vehicle trips, of which about 1,730 vehicle trips would occur in the AM peak hour and about 1,622 vehicle trips would occur during the PM peak hour. Under year 2010 conditions, traffic from UCSF uses would be expected to contribute to deterioration in the v/c ratios on several major facilities, including U.S. 101, I-280 and Cesar Chavez Street. These deteriorations in v/c ratios range from 0.01 on U.S. 101 to 0.04 on I-280. Under the LRDP FEIR mitigation measures adopted for Mission Bay, UCSF would extend its existing transportation demand management programs to Mission Bay to reduce the number of vehicle trips generated, but cumulative traffic impacts would nonetheless be expected to remain significant and unavoidable in the year 2010.

Since the certification of the LRDP FEIR, the only substantial change in the LRDP project is the adoption of LRDP Amendment No. 1, Mission Bay Housing Program, which was thoroughly analyzed in the LRDP SEIR. Traffic impacts associated with LRDP Amendment No. 1, Mission Bay Housing Program, were analyzed in the LRDP SEIR and found to be within the range of impacts analyzed in the LRDP FEIR. Since certification of the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, there have been no substantial changes in circumstances surrounding the proposed implementation of LRDP proposals at Mission Bay with respect to transportation, and no significant new information has become available.

The LRDP FEIR provided that the LRDP would have a significant adverse impact on traffic, circulation and parking conditions if the proposed LRDP development and uses would:

- cause the corridor level of service to drop during the peak hour below acceptable levels of service based on local traffic standards, or would cause a corridor already operating at an unacceptable level of service to further deteriorate during the peak hour to an extent determined to be significant by local traffic standards (if no local traffic standard exists, a drop in service level below Levels of Service (LOS) D, or if service levels are already below D, a deterioration of 0.01 or more in volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio, will be considered significant);
- generate projected transit demand that transit systems would not be able to accommodate; or
- cause substantial bicycle/pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.

The LRDP FEIR also contains a significance standard if LRDP development would “generate projected parking demand that would exceed the proposed parking supply.” The LRDP SEIR acknowledges that *San Francisco General Plan* policies emphasize the importance of public transit use and discourages the provision of facilities that encourage automobile uses. Therefore, the creation of parking demand that cannot be met by existing or proposed parking facilities

would not be considered a significant environmental effect in San Francisco. However, the City would generally consider whether the unmet parking demand would result in other significant physical effects or hazardous conditions.

The LRDP FEIR found that, under year 2010 conditions with the development of the Major New Site, the volume to capacity (v/c) ratios would deteriorate on US 101 south of Mariposa Street, US 101 south of Cesar Chavez Street, and I-280 south of Mariposa Street. These corridors would already be expected to operate at LOS F without traffic generated by the Major New Site. Nonetheless, the deterioration would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 12C4-1 called for transportation demand management (TDM) programs that would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated. However, the mitigation measure would not reduce the effects below the threshold of significance.

The LRDP FEIR also found that v/c ratios would deteriorate on Cesar Chavez Street west of Folsom Street and on Cesar Chavez Street west of Evans Avenue. Both of these segments of Cesar Chavez Street would already operate at LOS E under year 2010 conditions without the Major New Site, and the deterioration would be considered a significant impact. Mitigation Measure 12C4-3 indicates that capacity on Cesar Chavez Street could be increased only by further restricting peak-period on-street parking and introducing another through lane of traffic in each direction. Since however, even with these changes, the corridor would continue to operate at LOS E in the future, the measure would not be warranted. This mitigation measure would be within the jurisdiction or responsibility of agencies other than UCSF. TDM programs would reduce the number of vehicle trips generated, but not below a level of significance.

The LRDP FEIR did not find significant impacts related to parking, transit, pedestrian or bicycle activity.

Discussion of Checklist Questions:

Current Transportation Studies

More recent traffic studies have been completed by the City for the Giants Ballpark EIR and the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR, bringing cumulative projections forward to year 2015 at an intersection level of service scale. UCSF also has prepared refined traffic projections for buildout of the 43-acre UCSF site as part of the LRDP SEIR, and the phasing of traffic infrastructure has been outlined in formal agreements between The Regents, Catellus, and the City.

The transportation effects of the Mission Bay development upon area intersections in year 2015 were determined by the City by calculating the daily person trips generated by different types of land uses. The UCSF site was considered to be one of five “subareas” and was assumed to generate 1,622, or 8.5%, of the Mission Bay area PM peak hour vehicle trips.⁹ This is consistent with the LRDP FEIR projections. As with the LRDP FEIR, the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR concludes that cumulative traffic contributions to area freeways are significant. In addition, a total of 41 intersections were analyzed, with buildout of the UCSF subarea assumed to occur by 2010 and buildout of other subareas by 2015. Three existing intersections would decline to LOS E or F under future cumulative conditions, but all three intersections could be mitigated to LOS D or better conditions through construction of street improvements. All study intersections would operate at LOS D or better after implementation of the mitigation.¹⁰ The City adopted these measures as part of the Redevelopment Plan approvals and it is the obligation of Catellus to implement the mitigation; thus, with mitigation, no significant impacts on existing intersections would result from the Mission Bay development.

The LRDP SEIR further evaluated whether UCSF’s revised space program with housing would result in significant traffic impacts not identified in the LRDP FEIR. The LRDP SEIR found that the total number of p.m. peak-hour vehicle trips would increase slightly with the revised space program, but noted that additional p.m. peak-hour trips from residential uses would be in the non-peak direction, as compared to trips associated with the former non-residential uses, which favored the peak direction. It was determined that the revised space program would not cause levels of service at study intersections to deteriorate from those levels identified in the LRDP FEIR. Therefore, the LRDP SEIR found that the revised space program would have effectively the same impacts on traffic conditions as those identified in the LRDP FEIR.

As shown by this updated transportation information, local transportation impacts of UCSF uses at Mission Bay are adequately analyzed in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. Furthermore the proposed project is consistent with the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. The regional, area-wide cumulative impacts of the project are already adequately addressed in the certified LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR.

⁹ Mission Bay Subsequent EIR (State Clearinghouse Number 1997092068), p. D.35.

¹⁰ The three intersections are Brannan Street at Seventh Street (LOS B to E), Townsend at Seventh (LOS B to F), and Townsend at Eighth (LOS B to E). Mitigation measures call for restriping to add travel lanes and for the elimination of the Eighth Street traffic circle.

Trip Generation – Proposed Project with Phase 1 to 2005

The number of trips expected to be generated by the proposed project has been estimated based on current information regarding the expected population of the facilities. In addition, assumptions are consistent with the LRDP FEIR conclusion that residential use does not include a weekday absentee ratio such as is applied to employees. The number of visitors and vendors traveling to each building is calculated and included in the total expected trip generation. Trip generation is presented for the afternoon peak commute period (the PM peak hour), when the surrounding streets and freeways are expected to experience heaviest demand.

Block 20 Housing as currently proposed is to be occupied by up to 756 students and 90 adult family members on an average weekday. Table 1 presents the trip generation calculations for these uses, and converts the daily person trips to PM peak hour trips by applying a peaking factor of 15%. This peaking factor is consistent with that used in the LRDP FEIR, which was derived from information found in *Trip Generation, 6th Edition*, by the Institute of Transportation Engineers for Research & Development Uses. The reasonableness of this peaking factor has been confirmed by examining usage data from UCSF's Mission Center parking lot. The LRDP SEIR projected that PM peak hour trips would total 485, which is 5 more person trips than the current project estimate of 480 trips. Therefore, the LRDP SEIR analysis continues to be valid.

1. Block 20 Housing Trip Generation								
Categories	Population	Proportion of Absentees	Average Weekday Population	Trip Ends per Person	Total Daily Trips	Proportion of Internal Trips	Net External Person Trips	PM Peak Hour Person Trips
Students	756	0%	756	4.43	3,349	30%	2,344	398
Spouses	90	0%	90	4.43	399	5%	379	64
Visitors	30	0%	30	2	60	0%	60	11
Vendors	20	0%	20	2	40	0%	40	7
Total	896		896		3848		2823	480

Mode Split

In order to determine the number of new PM peak hour vehicle trips associated with the proposed project, mode split proportions must be applied to the person trips calculated above. The LRDP SEIR projected that the mode split for the residential uses at the UCSF site would include average drive alone rates of 25% for students and 44% for spouses. Transit mode shares

would be 43% for students and 22% for spouses. Comparable mode split percentages were determined for carpools, vanpools, bicycling and walking. Campus visitors were assigned the same mode split as faculty members, and as a conservative assumption it was presumed that all vendors would drive alone to the site (See Table 2).

It is likely that the initial vehicle usage rates for residents through Phase 1 to 2005 would be somewhat higher than those projected for the Mission Bay site as a whole in the LRDP FEIR. This is because Phase 1 Buildings would be among the first buildings occupied at Mission Bay, and early staffing levels may not be large enough to coordinate a significant number of carpools and vanpools. In addition, some of the transit improvements assumed in the full buildout analysis of the LRDP FEIR, most particularly the Third Street Light Rail project, will not be in full operation when these buildings are first occupied. Using full buildout mode split assumptions, the carpool, vanpool and MUNI modes combined are estimated to carry roughly 30% of the person trips generated in Phase 1. To account for the likelihood of increased vehicle trip-making during the initial stages of development, this study assumes that half of the person trips originally estimated to use the above modes would instead travel in single-occupant automobiles. This would result in an increase of 15% in total Phase 1 vehicle trips above that calculated per the LRDP FEIR methodology. The resulting total combined PM peak hour vehicle trips projected for the proposed project is presented in the last column of Table 2.

The PM peak hour vehicle trips from the proposed project would be about 189, as opposed to 192 trips projected in the LRDP SIER. Together with the remainder of approved Phase 1 development, the total PM peak hour vehicle trips to date would be roughly 860. This represents about 53% of the total PM peak hour vehicle trips (1,622) projected for the Mission Bay site in the LRDP FEIR. Again, future phases of development are expected to generate a much lower trip generation when transit and other alternative forms of travel are widely available to serve the project area.

Detailed transportation impact mitigation measures for this site were developed in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR. In that document, the UCSF site was included in a larger area known as Mission Bay South, the remainder of which is being developed by Catellus. Mission Bay South was projected to generate 10,738 PM peak hour vehicle trips at buildout, with UCSF contributing 15% of those trips. Thus, the trip generation from the proposed project would represent roughly 0.4% of overall Mission Bay South trips. The trip generation from Phase 1, including the proposed project, would represent roughly 8.2% of overall Mission Bay South trips.

2. Mode Split Proportions																				
	PM Peak Hour Person Trips	Drive Alone		Drop-Off		Carpool		Vanpool		MUNI		Other Transit		Bicycle		Walk		PM Peak Hour Vehicle Trips /1/		
		%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#			
Block 20																				
Students	398	25	100	4	16	2	8	5	20	17	68	26	103	3	12	18	72	138		
Spouses	64	44	28	4	6	2	1	5	3	16	10	6	4	3	2	20	3	35		
Visitors	11	59	6	5	1	11	1	4	0	6	1	7	1	2	0	6	1	9		
Vendors	7	100	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7		
Total	480		141		23		10		23		79		108		14		76	189		
<p><i>Note:</i> /1/ PM Peak Hour Vehicle Trips is calculated as: (Drive Alone) + (Drop-Off * 2) + (Carpool / 2) + (Vanpool / 10). In addition, peak hour vehicle trips by students have been increased 15% above trip generation rates to account for the likelihood of increased vehicle trips during the initial stages of development at Mission Bay.</p> <p><i>Sources:</i> LRDP FEIR Mode Split Calculations for Major New Site at Mission Bay, and Wilbur Smith Associates' Journey to Campus Data Analysis: Patients, Visitors, Students and Vendors, 1992.</p>																				

UCSF Mission Bay uses would generally be expected to generate the majority of its inbound trips in the morning and the majority of its outbound trips in the evening. However, residential use would operate in the opposite manner by generating most inbound trips in the evening and outbound trips in the morning. Therefore, although residential uses of Block 20 would add overall trips to some intersections and links, it would effectively be removing trips from the critical peak direction and replacing them with trips in the off-peak direction, creating a better directional balance of traffic volumes.

The transportation mitigation measures in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR are triggered by the total PM peak hour vehicle trips generated by the Mission Bay South development as a whole. The first mitigation measure that applies to Mission Bay South, a new traffic signal at the intersection of 16th and Vermont Streets, would be required once a threshold of 2,600 PM peak hour vehicle trips associated with Mission Bay uses is met. UCSF development through Phase 1 along with the proposed project is expected to generate about 880 PM peak hour trips. Therefore, when the development of the Catellus portion of the Mission Bay South area is sufficient to generate 1,720 PM peak hour trips, this mitigation measure will be triggered. The provision of required mitigation measures is controlled by the Owner Participation Agreement between Catellus and the City and County of San Francisco.¹¹ This agreement contains the Mission Bay South Infrastructure Plan, which outlines the required public infrastructure improvements in the Mission Bay South redevelopment area, the phasing of the improvements, and PM peak hour trip thresholds for intersection improvements.

Circulation within UCSF Mission Bay would not change substantially from the conditions analyzed in the LRDP FEIR and the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR. The LRDP FEIR assumed a number of parking facilities along the perimeter of the site, with a combined total of about 4,200 parking spaces to meet estimated demand by UCSF. To access these facilities, drivers would be destined to the western and eastern sides of the site, using Owens, Third, Fourth, or Sixteenth Streets, which were assumed to be the major transportation corridors. Drivers would choose among available parking facilities, depending on a variety of factors including proximity to destination, convenience, cost, garage vs. parking lot, and other considerations involved in personal choice.

Consistent with the vision in the LRDP and the analysis in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, the project includes development of parking; however, it is no longer proposed that a parking structure of 385 spaces be constructed on Block 20 as part of the housing project. Instead,

¹¹ Mission Bay South Owner Participation Agreement, by and between the Redevelopment Agency of the City and

planning has been initiated to develop a parking structure on Block 23 across the Plaza from the housing project. Approval for this second parking structure at UCSF Mission Bay will be sought in early 2003. The garage would be designed to accommodate the tenant parking demand and is planned for completion in 2005 when occupancy of the housing project would begin. The ultimate size of the 23B Parking project has not yet been determined, but will be adequate to meet the estimated parking demand of 385 spaces for the residents.

Transit

Transit access and egress to the UCSF site prior to year 2005 would be provided primarily by MUNI with the #15-Third route on Third Street just east of the site. The #15-Third would provide a connection to the CalTrain Station at Fourth and King Streets, and to the MUNI Metro N-Judah light rail line extensions on King Street. No re-routing of the #15-Third is anticipated as part of the Third Street Light Rail construction. The #15-Third continues north across Market Street, providing access to BART and MUNI lines on Mission and Market Streets. The N-Judah line extension now connects between Fourth/King and Parnassus Heights. A future connection between Mission Bay and the 16th Street BART station is also planned through modifications to the #22-Fillmore route, which is planned for the 2005-2009 time period.¹²

One of MUNI's major new projects, assumed in the LRDP FEIR to be in place at campus buildout, is the light rail extension on Third Street from the China Basin channel to the CalTrain Bayshore Station. This new light rail line would operate as an extension of the J-Church line, providing a base service of a one-car train every ten minutes each way, to be increased to six-minute headways during the PM peak hour. Construction of the light rail line has begun and is to be completed in all segments by the end of 2005. Therefore, light rail transit may not be fully operational at the time the proposed project buildings are opened for initial occupancy. MUNI anticipates that additional light rail capacity will be needed on the Third Street line by the year 2008, and plans call for the extension of the N-Judah line to Mariposa Street at that point.

In order to present a conservative analysis of transit demand resulting from Phase 1 to 2005, the transit trips calculated using the mode split proportions in Table 2 are used directly, and are not reduced to account for the expected increase in vehicle trips during the initial stages of development. At buildout, the LRDP FEIR forecast that the UCSF site could add approximately 3,390 daily transit trips to MUNI services. The daily MUNI trips expected from the proposed project would be about 460; combined with the expected MUNI trips generated by approved

County of San Francisco and Catellus Development Corporation, November 16, 1998.

¹² San Francisco Municipal Railway, Strategic Plan 2000: Short Range Transit Plan, December 1999.

3. MUNI Capacity Utilization with Additional Peak Hour UCSF Trips						
Screenline	Distribution of UCSF Trips		Capacity	Existing Ridership	Existing Utilization	Utilization with UCSF Trips
	%	#				
Northeast	27	21	4,931	3,047	62%	62%
Northwest	5	4	9,960	7,865	79%	79%
Southeast	42	33	4,211	3,871	92%	92%
Southwest	26	21	7,226	6,723	93%	93%
Total	79					

Source: 1997/98 MUNI screenline data from *Interim Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review*, City of San Francisco, January 2000.

Phase 1 buildings, the total new demand on MUNI would be about 1,300 daily trips, or roughly 38% of the LRDP FEIR forecast. This corresponds to about 79 MUNI trips in the PM peak hour as a result of the housing project. Based on the geographic distribution of MUNI trips developed in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR, these trips would cross MUNI screenlines as presented in Table 3.

As shown in the table, the additional trips generated by this portion of the UCSF development are not expected to significantly increase the capacity utilization along any MUNI screenline. Thus, these trips can be accommodated within the capacity of the existing MUNI services available in the area during peak periods.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Usage

According to the mode split calculations presented in Table 2, it is expected that the proposed project will produce roughly 90 PM peak hour pedestrian and bicycle trips from off-site. Similar to the LRDP SEIR projections, daily pedestrian and bicycle activity generated by the proposed project would be approximately 575 trips. This represents about 36% of the total pedestrian/bicycle trip generation (1,575 daily trips) estimated for the UCSF site in the LRDP FEIR. Approved Phase 1 projects and the proposed project together would comprise about 44% of the total pedestrian/bicycle trip generation estimated in the LRDP FEIR. The LRDP and the Mission Bay South Plan call for developing an extensive network of pedestrian pathways and designated bicycle routes at Mission Bay. There are also provisions to provide secure bicycle parking facilities throughout the UCSF site. Bicycle racks and storage rooms will be installed at Phase 1 buildings, including the proposed project. Given the provisions already committed, it is

not anticipated that the pedestrian and bicycle trips generated by the proposed project and Phase 1 will cause significant impacts.

Transportation Demand Management

UCSF has a transportation demand management (TDM) program in place at its existing sites including UCSF Mission Bay. In addition, in order to discourage single-occupant vehicles traveling between UCSF satellite sites during the workday, UCSF operates a shuttle service between Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay via Mission Center. It is anticipated that students would use the shuttle service in the early phases of Mission Bay development to reach Parnassus where a majority of their activities are conducted.

Parking

The LRDP SEIR estimated a residential parking ratio based on the current parking demand of students living in campus housing and student car ownership surveys that have been conducted by UCSF. The anticipated parking demand is 385 spaces representing a ratio of 0.8 parking space per student family unit, and about 0.5 parking spaces per single student occupant. An additional five spaces would be required to serve the retail and community uses on Block 20. Parking demand for the proposed project is presented in Table 4.

5. Peak Parking Demand Block 20 Housing				
Categories	Average Weekday Population	Daily Parking Demand	Peak Parking Demand Rate	Peak Parking Demand
Students	756	390	0.84	327
Spouses	90	45	0.84	38
Visitors	30	20	0.37	8
Vendors	20	20	0.6	12
Total	896	475		385
<i>Note: Daily Parking Demand is based on mode split assumptions by category, and the Peak Parking Demand Rate represents the proportion of total daily parked vehicles present during the period of peak demand.</i>				

The total combined peak parking demand for approved Phase 1 buildings and the proposed project would be roughly 1,680 spaces. Parking supply under construction for existing Phase 1 development totals 1,360 spaces. The campus has initiated planning for a second parking

structure to accommodate the residential tenant demand, and other estimated UCSF demand. The garage is expected to be completed at the time that the housing project is occupied.

If the second parking structure is not complete by the time the residential parking demand exists, there would be a parking shortfall of about 320 spaces. If necessary, additional parking could be made available on other blocks on the northwest side of the UCSF Mission Bay site. It can also be noted that as the Third Street Light Rail line, carpools and vanpools become fully operational, and as other transit improvements are implemented, parking demand from the UCSF research and office functions may be reduced by 15% under normal conditions. UCSF would monitor parking demand at each stage of development and use that information in planning future parking facilities.

Construction Traffic

The effects of construction-related traffic for the proposed project would be typical of other commercial projects in the area. The typical work shift for most construction workers would be from 7:00 AM to 4:00 PM on weekdays. This work schedule would minimize the traffic impact on neighborhood streets during the typical afternoon commute hours. UCSF-related construction workers are directed to park near the construction sites in the Pacific Bell Park parking lot, Section B, during most phases, including Phase 1, and would not occupy parking spaces on neighborhood streets.

While the exact routes for construction trucks depend on the location of individual construction sites, it is expected that for Phase 1, including the proposed project, Third and Cesar Chavez Streets would be the primary haul and access routes to or from San Francisco via U.S. 101. Trucks would also use Third Street and the ramps at Mariposa Street to enter and exit I-280. From the East Bay, trucks would use the Fifth Street and Fourth Street ramps to arrive at the Mission Bay site.

The construction activities associated with the proposed project may overlap with other construction activities in Phase 1 and in nearby areas. The construction of the Third Street Light Rail segment adjacent to the UCSF site is under construction and will continue through 2003. The overhead electrification system will be constructed later, perhaps near the end of 2004 or early 2005. Some overlap of construction activities between the Third Street Light Rail project and the construction of Phase 1 is expected. Additional overlap of construction activities is anticipated between UCSF and ongoing development of Catellus properties throughout the Mission Bay area. A Ballpark/Mission Bay Transportation Committee has been appointed by the City so that officials from each major development project can collaborate on the planning of

appropriate traffic control and signage measures for each stage of development. These efforts should help to reduce temporary construction-related impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Consistency with Regional Plans

The development of Mission Bay anticipates the use of local and regional transit carriers including CalTrain, BART, AC Transit, Sam Trans, Golden Gate Transit, commuter charter buses, and MUNI. These carriers have existing capacity, or planned future expansion capacity, to serve Mission Bay. In addition to the use of transit carriers, UCSF would extend its alternative transportation services to the Mission Bay site to minimize employees driving alone. These policies are in accordance with congestion management and air quality management policies. Responsible Agencies in the Bay Area have been aware of and have participated in Mission Bay development planning since 1990, and they have accounted for Mission Bay development in their regional projections and plans. Therefore, the buildings of the proposed project would not conflict with any established congestion management plan or air quality plan.

Based on the above discussion, development of the Block 20 Housing Project would not cause any traffic, circulation, parking or transit demand impacts that were not examined in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
3. AIR QUALITY:					
Would the project:					
a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?					
During Construction:	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
During Operation:	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
	Potentially Significant	Less Than Significant	Impact for which	Less Than Significant	No Impact

	Significant Impact	Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	which LRDP/ Program EIR is Sufficient	Significant Impact	Impact
c) 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)?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
d) Concentrate vehicle trips or vehicle-related emissions in a localized area (e.g. intersections, parking areas) which would cause a violation of the CO ambient air quality standard?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
f) Using the approved or established risk assessment methodologies of the air quality control agencies, cause a significant short- or long-term health risk from toxic air contaminants or increase cancer risk of greater than 10 per million?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____

Summary of LRDP FEIR Impacts and Standards of Significance:

The LRDP FEIR noted that demolition and construction activities at the UCSF Mission Bay site resulting from implementation of the LRDP could generate particulate matter (PM₁₀) that would exceed accepted standards, creating a temporary, significant impact that could be reduced to less-than-significant levels by implementing air pollution control strategies through construction contracts. The LRDP FEIR also concluded that net new vehicle trips associated with a major new site at Mission Bay would have a significant, unavoidable effect by generating criteria air pollutants exceeding the BAAQMD threshold of 80 lb/day, but would not exceed thresholds of roadside carbon monoxide (CO) levels. Finally, the LRDP FEIR noted that health risks from

development at the major new site would be below thresholds of significance for toxic air contaminants from stationary sources. However, development of the major new site could contribute to cumulative increases in emissions of toxic air contaminants in the Bay Area and the significance of that impact is unknown.

The LRDP SEIR found that revising the space program to include the housing use would increase emissions by less than one percent over the totals estimated in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR for all of Mission Bay, and therefore would not cause a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR. Mitigation measures to reduce air quality emissions are summarized in this document in Section VIII, Summary of LRDP FEIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

Since the certification of the LRDP FEIR, the only substantial change in the LRDP project is the adoption of LRDP Amendment No. 1, which was thoroughly analyzed in the LRDP SEIR. Since certification of the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, there have been no substantial changes in circumstances surrounding the proposed implementation of LRDP proposals at Mission Bay with respect to air quality, other than as discussed above, and no new information has become available.

According to the LRDP FEIR, a project would be considered to have a significant adverse impact on the environment if it would violate any ambient air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollution concentrations. Therefore, the LRDP FEIR noted that the LRDP would have a significant adverse impact on the environment if the proposed LRDP development and uses would:

- cause total criteria pollutant emissions at or from any UCSF site (i.e., from both stationary and mobile sources) to equal or exceed the following thresholds:

Reactive Organics	80 lb/day
Nitrogen Oxides	80 lb/day
Particulate Matter (PM ₁₀)	80 lb/day

- induce mobile source carbon monoxide (CO) emissions at or from any UCSF site which would cause or substantially contribute to violations of the federal or state ambient CO standards; or
- expose receptors to toxic air contaminant emissions at or from stationary sources at any UCSF site that (1) result in a cancer risk greater than ten cancer cases per one million people

exposed in a lifetime; or (2) for acute or chronic effects, result in concentrations of toxic air contaminant emissions with a Hazard Index of 1.0 or greater.

Finally, the LRDP FEIR noted that no standards of significance have been adopted by any regulatory agency with regard to, and no permitting procedure exists for, toxic air emissions from mobile sources or with regard to cumulative toxic air contaminant emissions from mobile and stationary sources, and therefore none was used in the LRDP FEIR.

Discussion of Checklist Questions:

Construction and operation of the Block 20 Housing Project would be expected to cause air quality impacts in several ways: construction-related emissions, criteria air emissions from stationary and mobile sources, toxic air contaminant emissions from mobile and stationary sources (such as diesel generators), and carbon monoxide emissions from mobile sources. Each of the potential air quality impacts was analyzed in the LRDP FEIR for the entire UCSF development.¹³

With respect to construction-related air quality impacts, construction of the proposed buildings would generate a portion of the air quality impacts analyzed in the LRDP FEIR for the entire UCSF development. Accordingly, UCSF would require project contractors to comply with Mitigation Measure 12D1-1 from the LRDP FEIR, which requires compliance with any air pollution control strategies developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). Additionally, Mitigation Measure 12D1-1 requires contractors to implement a variety of other measures to reduce air pollutant emissions, including the application of dust suppression methods, the use of covering for on-site storage piles, sweeping construction sites and surrounding areas, limiting construction site vehicle speeds on unpaved areas, and the replanting of vegetation.

Similarly, the proposed project would contain a portion of the stationary sources of criteria air pollutants located at the Mission Bay site, including emergency generators, but operation of any such sources would be subject to Mitigation Measure 12D1-2 from the LRDP FEIR, and this would ensure that such impacts would be less than significant. Mitigation Measure 12D1-2 requires that UCSF operate any proposed boilers, emergency generators or cogeneration equipment in accordance with BAAQMD permit conditions and/or applicable rules and regulations.

As described in the LRDP SEIR, the housing use would generate approximately 13% of the new daily vehicle trips associated with the UCSF site at Mission Bay, it would generate about 46 lb/day of NO_x and 22 lb/day of PM₁₀. At buildout of the UCSF Mission Bay site, the project would result in slightly greater levels of No_x and PM₁₀ than projected in the LRDP FEIR; however, as discussed

¹³ LRDP FEIR, Volume II, Major New Site, Air Quality, pages 366-370.

in the LRDP SEIR, the addition of new residences in San Francisco where there is an imbalance between housing and employment could be beneficial to air quality. The LRDP FEIR also determined that traffic generated by all UCSF uses at Mission Bay at buildout would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts related to criteria air pollutant emissions from vehicles. Specifically, the approximately 12,100 new daily vehicular trips generated by full UCSF development at Mission Bay would be expected to generate 120 lb/day of NO_x and 217 lb/day of PM₁₀.¹⁴ Even with the mitigation measures imposed in the LRDP FEIR, these emissions would exceed the 80 lb/day significance criteria in the future and were therefore found to be significant and unavoidable impacts in the LRDP FEIR.

The LRDP FEIR contains an extensive discussion of environmental impacts associated with toxic air contaminant emissions from stationary UCSF uses. The analysis concludes that UCSF operations at the major new site would not result in sensitive receptors being exposed to toxic air contaminant emissions from stationary sources at or from the UCSF site that would result in an incremental cancer risk greater than 10 cancer cases per 1,000,000 people exposed in a lifetime; or result in concentrations of toxic air contaminant emissions with a Hazard Index of 1.0 or greater. Specifically, the LRDP FEIR estimated the incremental cancer risk from all future UCSF research uses at Mission Bay at less than 1.0 in one million based on extrapolation from existing studies of the risk associated with research activities at UCSF's Parnassus Heights site. These conclusions remained the same with the LRDP SEIR.

A health risk assessment screening level analysis of the Block 20 Housing Project is in process. Although the health risk is expected to be less than significant, the test results could provide recommendations to solve nuisance exposures such as chemical odors.

Emissions of toxic air contaminants from vehicular emissions from project occupants would not be cumulatively considerable in the context of the cumulative significant impacts from mobile and stationary sources found in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. The percentage of development related to the proposed project represents a small percentage of overall UCSF development at buildout and would not be significant.

¹⁴ Emissions of ROG would be 67 lb./day, or less than significant.

Proposed project construction activities would also include dust monitoring for potential asbestos, primarily associated with serpentinite rock which was imported to fill Mission Bay. Asbestos containment activities would be directed under LRDP FEIR Mitigation 12F4-1, which involves preparation of a Risk Management Plan (RMP) for the UCSF site approved by the San Francisco Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB). The RMP for all of Mission Bay, including the UCSF Subarea, was adopted by the RWQCB in 1998. Its implementation complies with LRDP FEIR Mitigation Measure 12F4-1 as generally being equivalent to the form contemplated in the LRDP FEIR.

Development and operation of the proposed project would not violate any approved federal or state air quality management plans or local or regional growth or congestion management plans. Although the Bay Area is currently a non-attainment area for ozone, PM₁₀ and occasionally CO, extension of UCSF's existing TDM program to the Mission Bay site would promote alternatives to single-occupant vehicle travel, consistent with federal and state plans and policies. With respect to growth and congestion management plans, the Mission Bay area has long been slated for large-scale development, and local and regional plans have built-in development assumptions for the area that easily encompasses the proposed project and Phase 1 development.

As discussed in the LRDP FEIR and the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR, there would be no unregulated removal or movement of soils contaminated by hazardous materials that could become airborne. The proposed project development site would be subject to the adopted RMP, which would ensure proper investigation and management of any hazardous soils at the site, and therefore avoid contamination by airborne hazardous materials.

Wind Studies

The Block 20 Housing design was studied for potential wind hazards to pedestrians. Preliminary test results showed that variations of the design with shifted or reduced bulk, as compared to the project, performed the same as the project design. The averages of the wind speeds, (expressed as speeds exceeded 10% of the time) for all alternatives (including the project) ranged from 11.3 mph to 12.1 mph. The pedestrian comfort level is generally accepted to be 11 mph or less. The study concludes that the building design would be generally within acceptable wind speeds for pedestrians. The exceptions, within 1-2 mph exceedences, would be considered manageable and can be mitigated by further local refinement of the project design and by placement of street trees.¹⁵

¹⁵ Environmental Science Associates, Initial Findings on Wind Study for Block 20 Housing, January 4, 2002.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/ Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
4. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:					
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport of hazardous materials?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use of hazardous chemicals/ waste?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
c) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use of radioactive materials and waste?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
d) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use of biohazardous materials and waste?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
e) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine use of laboratory animals?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
f) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving release of hazardous, radioactive or biohazardous materials, or laboratory animals into the environment?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/ Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
g) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
h) Be located on a site which 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?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____
i) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	_____	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>
j) Create a potentially significant fire hazard?	_____	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____

Summary of LRDP FEIR Impacts and Standards of Significance:

The LRDP FEIR concluded that development of the major new site would involve the use and storage of hazardous chemical, radioactive, and biohazardous materials and research animals which could present health or safety risks for major new site occupants or the community; however the extension of health and safety laws and regulations would reduce this potential impact to less than significant levels. Since the certification of the LRDP FEIR, the only substantial change in the LRDP project is the adoption of LRDP Amendment No. 1, which was thoroughly analyzed in the LRDP SEIR.

Since certification of the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, there have been no substantial changes in circumstances surrounding the proposed implementation of LRDP proposals at Mission Bay with respect to hazards and hazardous materials, and no new information has become available.

No unanticipated hazards have been discovered during the construction of any of the UCSF projects currently being developed. Mitigation measures to reduce exposure to hazardous materials and to minimize the amount of hazardous waste generated are summarized in Section VIII, Summary of LRDP FEIR Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

For the purposes of impact evaluation, the LRDP FEIR noted that the LRDP would have a significant adverse impact on the environment if proposed LRDP development and uses would:

- create a substantial public health and safety hazard through release of emissions or undue risk of upset of hazardous materials related to human and environmental health and safety;
- involve the use, production or disposal of materials in a manner that poses a hazard to people or animal or plant populations in the area affected;
- interfere with emergency response plans or emergency evacuation plans; or
- fail to comply with applicable laws and regulations.

Discussion of Checklist Questions:

The LRDP FEIR analyzed the existing conditions at Mission Bay with respect to hazardous materials in the soil and groundwater. It also analyzed the use, storage and disposal of hazardous materials associated with UCSF's research activities.¹⁶

With respect to existing soil and groundwater conditions at Mission Bay, at the time the LRDP FEIR was published, no detailed site investigations had been conducted to confirm the presence or absence of soil and groundwater contamination. However, based on the historic occupancy by a large variety of industries over an extended period of time, the LRDP FEIR concluded that the soil and groundwater in Mission Bay was likely to contain hazardous waste materials, and the LRDP FEIR identified a potentially significant impact to construction workers at Mission Bay if pre-construction remediation had not been completed at the time of development.

The LRDP FEIR included Mitigation Measure 12F4-1 to reduce this impact to a less than significant level by requiring Catellus or, in the alternative, UCSF to: a) prepare a risk assessment for potential contaminants to identify the major pathways of exposure and discuss measures to limit transmission from each pathway; b) conduct an in-depth site investigation to characterize fully existing soil and groundwater conditions, including a comprehensive sampling plan; and c) prepare and implement a Remediation Action Plan to remediate on-site contamination under the oversight of the Department of Toxic Substance Control or the Regional Water Quality Control Board

¹⁶ LRDP FEIR, Volume II, Major New Site, Hazardous Materials, pages 385-390, 396-399.

(RWQCB). Implementation of this measure and others identified in the LRDP FEIR would ensure that construction workers would not be exposed to hazardous materials in soils and groundwater.

After publication of the LRDP FEIR, subsequent investigations of soil and groundwater conditions at Mission Bay were conducted in connection with preparation of the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR. Those studies indicate that soil and groundwater contamination at Mission Bay is less extensive than previously assumed in the LRDP FEIR. Furthermore, the UCSF Subarea is one of the least contaminated areas within the Mission Bay project area. The Mission Bay Subsequent EIR sets forth mitigation measures that required the preparation of a Risk Management Plan or Plans (RMP) to achieve compliance with the regulations of the RWQCB including Appendix F. The adopted 1999 RMP, which has been approved by the RWQCB, provides compliance with Mitigation Measure 12F4-1, albeit in a somewhat different (although equivalent) form than originally contemplated in the LRDP FEIR.

The increased use, transportation and disposal of hazardous materials and waste that would result from development of UCSF Mission Bay was analyzed in the LRDP FEIR. In addition, the residential use would be adjacent to campus research, instructional and support uses that would involve the use of hazardous materials. As indicated in the LRDP FEIR, UCSF would extend its existing Office of Environmental Health and Safety staff and policies to Mission Bay. Existing UCSF policies and procedures are intended to protect the health and safety of UCSF employees and visitors (and now residents) who would be at the major new site. Implementation of these procedures would ensure that no public health hazard is created that would expose people, animal or plant populations in the Mission Bay area to hazardous materials.

The potential impact of transporting hazardous materials was analyzed in the LRDP FEIR. All inbound transport and transport among UCSF sites of hazardous materials would be carried out in accordance with UCSF policies and procedures as indicated in the LRDP FEIR. Although transportation of hazardous materials has associated risks of spills and leaks, these risks could be reduced to less-than-significant levels through appropriate management of transported wastes in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Use and transport of hazardous materials to and from the proposed buildings would be minimal and related to common household or office products. Mitigation Measure 12F1-3 requires that UCSF would implement hazardous waste handling, minimization and disposal measures at Mission Bay consistent with safety requirements and applicable laws and regulations. These include extending UCSF's existing hazardous waste minimization plan to Mission Bay, implementing the operational controls required to comply with laws and regulations, including regular safety and compliance audits and staff training. Implementation of this mitigation measure for the proposed project would ensure

that impacts related to the minimal increased generation and disposal of hazardous waste would be less than significant.

The housing program would bring sensitive receptors, including young children, into an area that may contain subsurface contamination. Residential use of Block 20 was not contemplated in the 1996 LRDP and was not analyzed in the LRDP FEIR. However, by following the Risk Management Plan for Mission Bay approved by the Regional Water Quality Control Board, and other regulatory guidelines, most hazardous contamination impacts would be mitigated to less-than-significant levels. The Risk Management Plan addresses contaminated soil and groundwater conditions in the entire Mission Bay North and Mission Bay South Planning areas. As part of the LRDP SEIR, the Mitigation Measures J.1a and J.1b., pages VI.41-42 of the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR were adopted as SEIR Mitigation Measure 3.5.1 and 3.5.2.

Residents, including children, would be exposed to chemicals in the soils and groundwater through the same exposure pathways as employees at UCSF Mission Bay. The primary differences in assessing potential risks for residents as compared to workers or visitors are that residents are assumed to be present in their homes 24-hours per day, whereas workers or other site visitors are presumed to be onsite only during part of the day, and that children would be present on the site. Thus residents are more likely to be exposed to hazardous on-site soil or groundwater conditions, if any remain on site, for a greater period of time than workers or visitors at the site, increasing their risk of exposure and their risk of effects compared to risks of others. In addition, residents are more likely to include people more sensitive to hazardous materials (*i.e.*, young children) than the typical office worker would be.

On Block 20 where the housing program would be located, no exposed "native" soil would be accessible to residents as the housing program. Landscaping in the plaza and in the middle of Block 20 around the four buildings would be planted in clean soil imported to the site. Other potential hazardous soils conditions in the area would be avoided by implementation by Catellus Development Corporation of Mitigation Measure J.1c from the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR. UCSF also adopted this measure in the LRDP SEIR to protect UCSF residents from other contaminated UCSF Mission Bay sites.

Based upon the above discussion, hazardous materials effects that would result from development and operation of the proposed project would not cause any significant environmental effects that were not examined in the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR. Therefore, no further analysis of these impacts is required. Project-level impacts would be less than significant.

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/ Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
5. PUBLIC SERVICES, UTILITIES, AND INFRASTRUCTURE					
a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with substantially increased use or 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?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
Police protection?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
Schools?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
Parks?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
Other public facilities?	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
b) Would the project:					
1) Require or result in the construction of new water facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?					
	_____	_____	_____X_____	_____	_____
2) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage or					

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/ Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects or exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
3) Require or result in the construction of new electrical or natural gas facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____
4) Require or result in the construction of new telecommunication facilities, the construction of which would cause significant environmental effects?	_____	_____	<u> X </u>	_____	_____

Summary of LRDP FEIR Impacts and Standards of Significance:

The LRDP FEIR noted that implementation of the LRDP at the major new site would result in increases in UCSF-related employees and visitors. The LRDP FEIR concluded that police and fire services and other public services would not be adversely affected. Solid waste generated by the population increase would not be substantial; however, substantial solid waste would result from demolition and construction activities, and could generate a significant effect on solid waste disposal capacity. Preparation and implementation of a construction and demolition solid waste recycling plan would reduce this effect to less-than-significant levels.

The LRDP FEIR concluded that development under the LRDP of the major new site would not substantially affect demand for water or wastewater services, or for electric and natural gas services. No significant effects on utilities were anticipated.

Since the certification of the LRDP FEIR, the only substantial change in the LRDP project is the adoption of LRDP Amendment No. 1, which was thoroughly analyzed in the LRDP SEIR. Since certification of the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR, there have been no substantial changes in circumstances surrounding the proposed implementation of LRDP proposals at Mission Bay with respect to public services, utilities, and infrastructure, and no new information has become available.

According to the LRDP FEIR, the LRDP would have a significant adverse impact on public services if the proposed LRDP development and uses would:

- require additional service resources to avoid reductions in service elsewhere, thus significantly affecting the physical environment, including human health and safety;
- require a substantial increase in the demand for police or fire service such that meeting the demand would require additional staff, vehicles, equipment or stations in excess of what is planned by local jurisdictions;
- create a substantial increase in local solid waste generation that would require the expansion of solid waste disposal facilities beyond foreseeable capacity; or,
- generate a substantial increase in student enrollments that causes secondary environmental impacts resulting from the construction of new classrooms or new schools or from increased busing.

The LRDP would have a significant adverse impact on utilities and infrastructure if the proposed LRDP development and uses would:

- use potable water in a wasteful manner or increase consumption of potable water to the extent that substantial expansion of water supply, treatment or distribution facilities is required;
- require substantial expansion of wastewater treatment and distribution capacity beyond that planned by local jurisdictions;
- result in the use of large amounts of energy, oil or natural gas in a wasteful manner, or create energy demand that exceeds the energy supplier's existing and planned energy capacity; or
- require the development of new sources of energy.

Discussion of Checklist Questions:Public Services

The LRDP FEIR analyzes the potential environmental effects on public services that could result from development of approximately 2,650,000 gsf of research, academic, support and related uses, and a proposed user population of 9,100 total employees (an average daily population of 8,250 employees).¹⁷

With respect to police services, the LRDP FEIR indicates that the University of California Police Department (UCPD) serves UCSF's average daily population with 1.1 police officers per 1,000 persons. Based on this ratio, the proposed project would require the addition of one police officer to the UCPD staff to serve the population of 910 people. Other approved Phase 1 buildings would bring the total population to about 1,900, and therefore would require the addition of 2.2 police officers. As indicated in the LRDP FEIR, the UCPD has developed a plan for providing additional services and required resources as the major new site at Mission Bay is developed. Phase 1 would not be expected to create substantial service demands on the San Francisco Police Department because most police matters would be handled by the UCPD. Therefore, effects on public police services would not be a significant impact.

With respect to the demand on parks and open space, the LRDP FEIR indicates that UCSF employees would increase the demand for open space for parks and recreational uses. UCSF would develop over 8 acres of open space in connection with the UCSF site at Mission Bay, including about 6 acres as part of Phase 1.

With respect to schools, the LRDP FEIR indicates that the potential demand on the San Francisco Unified School District associated with new UCSF employees at Mission Bay would be less than significant. Additionally, the LRDP SEIR found that even with UCSF Mission Bay residents, the incremental increase in enrollment demand for schools would not be considered a significant environmental effect. Occupants of approved Phase 1 development plus the proposed project would represent about 21 percent of the total UCSF population at Mission Bay and would be expected to generate a minimal impact on school resources. Further, UCSF Mission Bay includes a 2.2-acre site reserved for a school that will be donated by The Regents to the SFUSD for its development, which the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR estimates can accommodate 500 elementary students.

¹⁷ LRDP FEIR, Volume II, Major New Site, Public Services, pages 453-455, 459-460.

The LRDP FEIR indicates that UCSF's average daily population at Mission Bay would generate approximately 1,350 tons of solid waste annually. Users of the proposed project combined with approved Phase 1 development would be expected to generate approximately 30 percent of this amount, or approximately 405 tons of solid waste annually. As indicated in the LRDP FEIR, this would not be considered a significant impact and no mitigation measures were imposed. With respect to solid waste disposal related to construction activities, Mitigation Measure 12J1-5 would require that all construction contractors, including the project contractors, provide information in their bids on the amount of recycling they plan to achieve. The Block 20 site is vacant and no recycling of existing solid waste volumes would be required.

Finally, development and operation of Phase 1, including the proposed project, would not be expected to increase or cause a significant impact by increasing the potential for fire emergency and medical aid response, as indicated in the LRDP FEIR.

Based upon the above discussion, construction and operation of Phase 1 to 2005, including the proposed project, would not cause public services impacts that were not examined in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR. Therefore, no further analysis of these impacts is required. Project-level impacts would be less than significant.

Utilities and Infrastructure

The LRDP FEIR analyzes the potential environmental effects on utilities and infrastructure for the UCSF site at Mission Bay, including impacts on water supply and distribution, wastewater collection and treatment, electricity and natural gas supply, and infrastructure based on the estimated user population of 9,100 employees and 2,650,000 gsf of building area. For each category, the LRDP FEIR concludes that the potential environmental impacts would be less than significant and that no mitigation would be required.¹⁸ The LRDP SEIR evaluates effects on utilities and infrastructure in light of the revised space program at UCSF Mission Bay, and again finds that effects would be less than significant.¹⁹

The proposed project would contain approximately 16% of the total gsf of all UCSF uses at the Mission Bay site and would house approximately 10% of the total UCSF employee population for the site at Mission Bay. To date, this would bring Phase 1 development to 30% of the total UCSF population at Mission Bay and 49% of total gsf at UCSF Mission Bay. Therefore, depending on whether the potential utility and infrastructure impacts are based on users or gsf, Phase 1 would be responsible for between 30% and 49% of the utility demand set forth in the LRDP FEIR for the

¹⁸ LRDP FEIR, Volume II, Major New Site, Utilities and Infrastructure, pages 463-466, 472-473.

entire UCSF site at Mission Bay. The quantities of utility demand by the proposed project estimated below assume the higher percentages based on gsf.

The LRDP FEIR projects that UCSF Mission Bay would require 0.51 million gallons per day of water; the proposed project would use about 0.07 million gallons per day, and the Phase 1 total, including the proposed project, would use about 0.25 million gallons per day. Wastewater for the entire UCSF site projected to be 0.46 million gallons per day average dry weather flow (ADWF); the proposed project would be expected to generate approximately 0.06 million gallons per day ADWF, and the Phase 1 total, including the proposed project would generate approximately 0.21 million gallons per day ADWF.

Electricity demand is projected to be 61.5 megawatt hours (MWh) per year for UCSF Mission Bay; the proposed project would be anticipated to generate about 9.8 MWh demand per year, and total Phase 1 demand would be about 30.1 MWh per year.

Natural gas consumption is projected to be 543 million cubic feet (cf) per year for UCSF Mission Bay; the proposed project would be expected to create a demand for about 86.8 million cf per year, and total Phase 1 demand would be about 266 million cf per year.

In connection with adoption of the Mission Bay North and South Plans, Catellus committed to extending the infrastructure throughout the Mission Bay to accommodate the development contemplated in the Plans. Therefore, utility lines would be in place for the proposed project. Based on the above discussion, construction and operation of Phase 1, including the proposed project, would not cause utilities and infrastructure impacts that were not examined in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR. Therefore, no further analysis of these impacts is required. Project-level impacts would be less than significant.

¹⁹ LRDP SEIR, Utilities and Public Services, pages 3-34 to 3-38

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Incorporated	Impact for which LRDP/Program EIR is Sufficient	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
8. 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?	_____	_____	_____	_____	___X___
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)?	_____	_____	___X___	_____	_____
c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?	_____	_____	___X___	_____	_____

Discussion:

- a) The proposed project is not located within any habitat of fish, wildlife or plant species.
- b) The LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR identified cumulative impacts in the areas of traffic, air quality, noise and hazardous materials. The proposed project would not make a considerable contribution to any cumulative effects identified in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR.
- c) There are no project specific environmental impacts that were not adequately analyzed previously in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP FSEIR.

15. FISH AND GAME DETERMINATION

Based on the information above, there is no evidence that the project has a potential for a change that would adversely affect wildlife resources or the habitat upon which wildlife depends. The presumption of adverse effect set forth in 14 CCR 753.5 (d) has been rebutted by substantial evidence.

Yes (Certificate of Fee Exemption)

No (Pay fee)

VIII. SUMMARY OF LRDP FEIR IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The following impact statements and mitigation measures were adopted by The Regents as part of their CEQA Findings in connection with approval of the LRDP and LRDP Amendment No. 1. Each will be implemented, as applicable, in the proposed project development and is included as part of the project analyzed in this document. Mitigation measures from the LRDP SEIR are indicated with an asterisk (*).

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
B. LAND USE	
<p><i>12B4-1. Consistency with Local Plans and Codes (Project).</i> Development of the Major New Site at Mission Bay would be consistent with local land use plans, and environmental goals, plans and policies. The possibility of a conflict with existing zoning and specific plan policies remains, if UCSF were to move forward with development of a Major New Site at Mission Bay prior to rezoning and adoption of a new plan by the City. This would be a significant impact of the project.</p>	<p>The University of California is exempt from local zoning; however, the LRDP Goals and Objectives express UCSF's intention to work with local jurisdictional land use planning and zoning guidelines. UCSF could request that the city amend the applicable Mission Bay Specific Plan and City Planning Code provisions to establish appropriate designations for the Major New Site at Mission Bay. Unless the Specific Plan and City Planning Code were amended, the conflict with the plans would be substantial and would constitute an avoidable adverse impact. <i>This mitigation measure is within the jurisdiction of an agency other than the University and has been implemented.</i>²⁰</p>
C. TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION/PARKING	
<p><i>12C4-1. US 101 and I-280 V/C Ratio Deterioration (Project).</i> Under year 2010 conditions with the Major New Site, the v/c ratios on the following corridors would deteriorate: US 101 south of Mariposa Street, US 101 south of Cesar Chavez Street, I-280 south of Mariposa Street. Those corridors would already be expected to operate at LOS F, without traffic generated by the Major New Site. This deterioration of the v/c ratios are considered significant impacts of the project.</p>	<p>TDM programs could reduce the impact of the Major New Site by reducing the number of vehicle trips generated, but would not be expected to reduce the effects below the threshold of significance.</p>

²⁰ The City and SFRA have adopted the Mission Bay South Plan, which includes a UCSF Subarea, and eliminated the prior zoning. As a result, Mitigation Measure 12B4-1 has been implemented and the potentially significant impact found in the LRDP FEIR has been eliminated.

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
<p><i>12C4-3. Cesar Chavez Street V/C Ratio Deterioration (Project).</i> Traffic generated by the Major New Site would result in the deterioration of LOS E conditions on Cesar Chavez Street west of Folsom Street by a v/c ratio of 0.01 during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Traffic from the Major New Site would also result in the deterioration of LOS E conditions on Cesar Chavez Street west of Evans Avenue by a v/c ratio of 0.02 during the a.m. peak hour and 0.03 during the p.m. peak hour. Both of these segments of Cesar Chavez Street would already operate at LOS E under year 2010 conditions without the Major New Site. This deterioration of the v/c ratios would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>The existing right-of-way and configuration on Cesar Chavez Street (a solid median and peak-period turn restrictions at many intersections) limits the improvements available to increase capacity of this corridor. Capacity could be increased only by further restricting peak-period on-street parking and introducing another through lane in each direction. Since the corridor would continue to operate at LOS E in the future, even with these changes this measure would not be warranted. <i>Implementation of these measures would be within the jurisdiction or responsibility of agencies other than UCSF.</i></p>
D. AIR QUALITY	
<p><i>12D1-1. Air Pollutant Emissions (Construction).</i> During construction of the Major New Site facilities, the air pollutants generated could cause violations of federal and/or state ambient air quality standards.</p>	<p>UCSF would require its contractors to reduce major criteria air pollutant emissions by complying with the air pollution control strategies developed by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD). UCSF would include appropriate dust control requirements in all construction contracts.</p>
<p><i>12D1-2. Operational Stationary Source Criteria Air Pollutant Emissions (Project).</i> Pollutants emitted by stationary equipment and facilities at the Major New Site such as boilers, emergency generators and a cogeneration facility could interfere with the attainment of regional or local air quality standards.</p>	<p>UCSF would operate any proposed boilers, emergency generators or cogeneration equipment in accordance with BAAQMD permit conditions and/or applicable rules and regulations.</p>
<p><i>12D4-2. Vehicle Operation Air Pollutant Emissions (Project).</i> Net new vehicle trips associated with the Major New Site at Mission Bay would generate criteria air pollutants in excess of the BAAQMD 80 lb./day Best Available Control Technology threshold. This would be a significant impact of the project.</p>	<p>Implement Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures to reduce vehicular pollutant emissions. TDM are not likely to reduce total trips so as to reduce criteria air pollutant emissions below the 80 lb./day threshold.</p>
<p><i>*3.3.3. Vehicle Operation Air Quality Emissions (Cumulative).</i> Additional vehicle trips associated with the housing program would not cause a substantial increase in the severity of impacts identified in the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR.</p>	<p>UCSF would implement the following TDM measures:</p>

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
<p>The additional impact would not be cumulatively considerable. In the LRDP FEIR, Mitigation Measure 12D4-2 to implement a TDM program would reduce total trips, but effects on air quality would be a significant unavoidable effect.</p>	<p>Expand the UCSF shuttle system to include UCSF Mission Bay.</p> <p>Provide preferential and/or low cost parking for carpools and vanpools. Cooperate with public and private transit agencies on routes and scheduling of service.</p> <p>Cooperate with local public works agencies to improve street lighting, security, and pedestrian links between UCSF and BART and other public transit connections.</p> <p>Sell transit passes on site.</p>
<p><i>WIND</i></p> <p><i>*3.4.1. Hazardous Wind Conditions (Project).</i> The proposed campus buildings may cause pedestrian-level wind speeds to exceed the hazard criterion on or near UCSF Mission Bay. As the proposed residential project is taller than the administrative building modeled in the wind tunnel, the effect of the residential project could be greater or different than shown in the wind tunnel results.</p>	<p>UCSF shall retain a qualified wind consultant to review specific designs for buildings 100 feet or more in height for potential wind effects. Wind tunnel testing of such buildings would also be required unless, upon review by a qualified wind consultant, and with concurrence by UCSF, it is determined that the exposure, massing, and orientation of buildings are such that impacts, based on a 26-mile-per-hour hazard for a single hour of the year criterion, will not occur. The purpose of the wind consultant's review and wind tunnel studies, if conducted, is to specify impacts based on the 26-mile-per-hour hazard criterion, and to provide a basis for design modifications to mitigate these impacts. UCSF shall ensure that buildings within UCSF Mission Bay are designed so that wind hazard criteria would not be exceeded.</p>
<p>E. NOISE</p>	
<p><i>12E1-1. Construction Noise (Construction).</i> During construction of UCSF facilities at a Major New Site, the noise generated from the construction activities would exceed the maximum limits specified by local noise ordinances. This would be a temporary but significant impact during the development of the Major New Site.</p>	<p>UCSF would require construction contractors to minimize unavoidable construction noise impacts resulting from development of the Major New Site by use of proper equipment and work scheduling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ As feasible, limit construction hours to between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. ■ Require use of construction equipment with noise reduction devices (i.e., mufflers in good working order). ■ Erect temporary noise walls to protect adjacent

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
	<p>noise-sensitive areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Use of impact tools would be minimized to the extent possible. ■ Locate stationary construction noise sources away from residential or other sensitive receptor areas, and require use of acoustic shielding with such equipment when feasible and appropriate.
<p><i>12E1-2. Operational Noise from Stationary Equipment (Project).</i> Noise generated by ventilation and air conditioning equipment, a cogeneration plant, and other stationary equipment at the Major New Site could have an adverse impact on noise-sensitive uses on-site and in adjacent neighborhoods.</p>	<p>UCSF would incorporate standard industrial noise control measures for stationary equipment at the Major New Site and would adopt noise performance standards insuring that operational noise from UCSF sources at the Major New Site would not exceed noise levels set forth in local general plans or ordinances for adjacent areas based on their use. If ambient noise levels in areas adjacent to the Major New Site already exceed such local noise standards, UCSF would not increase average daily noise levels (L_{dn}) from operational noise sources by three or more dBA at property lines.</p>
<p>F. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</p>	
<p><i>12F1-3. Increase in Generation of Hazardous Wastes and Additional Load on Hazardous Waste Management Facilities (Project).</i> Biomedical research uses at the Major New Site would increase hazardous waste generation and disposal of chemical, radioactive and biohazardous waste which could burden local and regional waste management capabilities.</p>	<p>UCSF would implement hazardous waste handling, minimization and disposal measures at the Major New Site consistent with safety requirements and applicable laws and regulations.</p> <p>A. UCSF would extend its hazardous waste minimization plan to include the Major New Site.</p> <p>B. UCSF would implement the operational controls required to comply with laws and regulations, including, but not limited to, monthly safety and compliance audits and training of staff at the Major New Site. This would 1) allow efficient processing of wastes for shipment to treatment facilities or disposal, reducing the time hazardous wastes are at a Major New Site, and 2) ensure that safety controls such as OSHA training, correct practices and safety equipment are in place.</p> <p>C. UCSF would implement procedures to minimize increases in the long-lived radioactive waste generation. According to the CA Department of Health Services Radiologic Health Branch, California radioactive materials licensees should:</p>

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Minimize the amount of low-level radioactive waste in possession and avoid accumulating waste that cannot be disposed of at this time; ■ segregate for disposing radioactive waste that are not subject to Southwestern Low-level Radioactive Waste Disposal Compact regulations; ■ segregate waste that can be disposed of or reduced in volume by approved treatment methods; ■ segregate short-lived radioactive waste for decay; ■ consider recycling radioactive materials; ■ consider extended on-site storage of any remaining low-level radioactive waste; and ■ consider non-radioactive substitutes.
<p><i>12F1-4. Contribution to Load on Hazardous Waste Management Facilities (Cumulative).</i> Development of a Major New Site in conjunction with other cumulative development that generates hazardous waste could place an additional load on hazardous waste management facilities. This would be a significant unavoidable impact.</p>	<p>Implementation of the measures in Mitigation Measure 12F1-3 would reduce the magnitude of this impact. However, the actions of UCSF alone cannot mitigate this impact, and other government entities would need to take steps to mitigate this impact. For example, local governments could implement and facilitate hazardous waste minimization programs, states could set mandatory waste reduction targets, and state or federal governments could operate treatment or disposal facilities. The feasibility and implementation of such measures cannot be guaranteed by UCSF because they fall within the jurisdiction of others to monitor.</p>
<p><i>12F4-1. Worker Exposure to Contaminated Soil or Water (Construction).</i> If pre-construction remediation of contaminated soil or water has not been completed, construction activities at the Major New Site at Mission Bay could expose construction workers to contaminated soil or groundwater.</p>	<p>Development of a Major New Site at Mission Bay would include implementation of the following mitigation measures by the current land owner to reduce soil and water contamination hazards to a less than significant level. In the alternative, UCSF may agree to accept the responsibility for characterization and containment or remediation in development of its site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A risk assessment for potential contaminants would be completed. The risk assessment

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
	<p>would identify the major pathways of exposure and discuss measures to limit transmission via each pathway. It would also describe the reductions in concentration, total amount or lateral spread of the wastes necessary to reduce the public health risk to a level of insignificance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An in-depth site investigation at the Major New Site would characterize fully the soil and groundwater conditions. The site investigations would include collecting data on surface soils, subsurface soils, groundwater and monitoring wells, and soil gas. The investigations would be guided by a comprehensive sampling plan describing the sampling pattern and locations, media to be sampled, methods, equipment, personnel, documentation and schedule. ■ Identification of hazardous wastes on the site would require notification to the County Department of Public Health, the California Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. ■ A Remedial Action Plan would be prepared and implemented. Remediation of on-site contamination would be carried out under the oversight of California Department of Toxic Substances Control or the Regional Water Quality Control Board. The Department of Toxic Substances Control or the Regional Water Quality Control Board would certify satisfactory completion of remediation prior to issuance of building permits on the affected properties.

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
<p><i>*3.5.1. Resident Exposure to Hazardous Soils (Construction).</i> UCSF's housing proposal would bring sensitive receptors, including children, into an area that may contain subsurface contamination.</p>	<p>UCSF would adopt Mitigation Measure J.1.c from the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR for UCSF's residential development on Block 20. The measure has been modified to be applicable to UCSF as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Limit direct access to uncovered native soil on undeveloped portions of the UCSF site at Mission Bay. To effectively limit access, install fencing or other physical barriers around the identified areas, and post "no trespassing" signs warning of potential hazardous soils conditions. ■ Hyrdoseed, or apply other vegetative or other cover to uncovered areas to reduce the potential for windblown dusts to be generated, and to reduce the potential for individuals to have direct contact with native soils in the area. ■ Include safety notices in leases. Notify tenants of occupied portions of Block 20 of potential risks involved with disturbing existing cover (i.e. asphalt, concrete, vegetation) or exposed native soil. ■ UCSF would conduct periodic inspection of open spaces of the UCSF Mission Bay campus site to reduce the illegal occupancy of open areas by transient populations, and to reduce illegal dumping by unauthorized occupants or off-site populations. Implement additional security measures such as fencing and/or uses of security guards, if inspections show a need. ■ UCSF would perform inspections verifying that risk management measures remain effective by identifying disturbances to cover materials that could result in exposure of underlying native soil and by identifying areas where temporary fencing or other physical barriers might need to be installed. If the inspections identify areas where measures have been rendered ineffective, implement corrective actions.

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
<p><i>*3.5.2. Resident Exposure to Hazardous Soils and Groundwater (Construction).</i> UCSF's housing proposal would bring sensitive receptors, including children, into an area that may contain subsurface contamination.</p>	<p>UCSF shall conduct additional assessments of the chemical concentrations detected in soil and groundwater at Block 20 and compare the results to the risk-based residential site-specific target levels ("SSTLs") established in the Mission Bay RMP. If testing indicates that the residential SSTLs for Block 20 is exceeded, UCSF will conduct appropriate additional remediation at the site until the Regional Water Quality Control Board staff concurs that the chemical levels are reduced below the residential SSTLs prior to commencement of any construction at the site.</p>
H. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	
<p><i>12H1-1. Erosion and Sedimentation of the San Francisco Bay (Construction).</i> Construction areas at a Major New Site may be subject to erosion, which could increase sedimentation in the San Francisco Bay during wet weather.</p>	<p>UCSF would prepare a construction Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan that includes at least the following Best Management Practices described in the detailed discussion of this mitigation to control stormwater quality on-site: minimize area and duration of grading; prevent the release of construction materials and pollutants; minimize erosion of dirt storage piles; install/maintain sediment and grease traps in local stormwater intakes; wash construction vehicle and wheels before leaving the site; implement a hazardous spill prevention, control and clean-up program. UCSF's construction contracts would require contractors to implement the Plan.</p>
<p><i>12H4-1. Contaminated Sediments Due to Erosion (Construction).</i> In addition to the standard erosion hazards identified in Development Scenario Impact 12HI-1, some of the soil in the Mission Bay area has been exposed to past industrial activity and contains elevated concentrations of contaminants. Erosion of the soil could result in contaminated sediments in the sewer system.</p>	<p>Implement Development Scenario Mitigation Measure 12H1-1. UCSF would implement the above mitigation to avoid erosion and sedimentation impacts. This mitigation revises and updates Mitigation Measures L.1 and L.6 found in the <i>Mission Bay Mitigation Monitoring Program</i> to include stormwater management requirements passed into legislation after the development of the <i>Mission Bay Mitigation Monitoring Program</i>.</p>
<p><i>12H4-4. Tidal Flooding (Project).</i> Major New Site facilities at Mission Bay could be subject to tidal flooding due to low elevations at Mission Bay and due to rising sea levels.</p>	<p>For all development within the UCSF Major New Site area, UCSF would protect low-lying areas from a potential rise in sea level through setbacks from the water's edge, increased elevation, and other methods as addressed in the Mission Bay Design Guidelines.</p>

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
I. VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE	
<p><i>12I1-1. Aquatic Habitat and Organisms (Construction).</i> Construction of the Major New Site would increase storm water run-off, which in turn would increase erosion which leads to increased sediments and contaminants in receiving water bodies. This would degrade and contaminate aquatic habitat and adversely affect marine species, and would, therefore, be a significant construction impact at the three Major New Sites.</p>	<p>UCSF would implement Mitigation Measure 12H1-1 (see Section H, Hydrology and Water Quality), that requires development of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in connection with development of the Major New Site.</p>
J. PUBLIC SERVICES	
<p><i>12J1-5. Solid Waste Disposal (Construction).</i> Construction activities at the Major New Site could increase solid waste flows to landfills that might require substantial expansion of planned landfill capacity, and this would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>UCSF would require construction contractors to provide information in their bids on the amount of recycling they plan to achieve, and to document the amount of recycling achieved at the end of each construction project.</p>
L. VISUAL QUALITY	
<p><i>12L1-1. Alteration of Views (Project).</i> Development of the Major New Site could alter existing views. Potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>See site-specific Mitigation Measures 12L1-3 and 12L1-4, following below.</p>
<p><i>12L1-3. Increased Light and Glare (Project).</i> Development of the Major New Site could increase the amount of light and glare in the Major New Site area.</p>	<p>UCSF would minimize light and glare from new buildings at the Major New Site through orientation of buildings, use of landscape materials, and choice of primary facade materials. Design standards and guidelines for minimizing light and glare would be followed, including avoiding the use of glass walls as a primary building material for facades, and configuring exterior light fixtures to emphasize close spacing of low intensity light sources directed downward.</p>
<p><i>12L1-4. Construction Night Lighting (Construction).</i> Illumination of construction activities at night could disturb adjacent residential uses.</p>	<p>UCSF would require as a condition to construction contracts that flood or area lighting needed for construction activities be placed and directed so as to avoid disturbance of adjacent residential uses.</p>

LRDP FEIR IMPACTS	LRDP FEIR MITIGATION MEASURES
M. CULTURAL RESOURCES	
<p><i>12M1-1. Disturbance of Prehistoric and Historic Archaeological Resources (Construction).</i> Construction activities associated with development of the Major New Site could disturb archaeological resources.</p>	<p>See site-specific Mitigation Measures 12M2-1 and 12M4-2, following below.</p>
<p><i>12M4-2. Disturbance of Historic Archaeological Resources (Construction).</i> Construction activities associated with the Major New Site at Mission Bay could disturb historic archaeological resources.</p>	<p>If construction activities associated with the Major New Site at Mission Bay occurred within areas shown on Figure 12-28, UCSF would implement mitigation measures, as adapted from Mitigation Measures J.1, J.2, J.3 and J.6 of the <i>Mission Bay Mitigation Monitoring Program</i> to protect historic archeological resources:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ UCSF would retain the services of an archaeologist to instruct construction crews regarding potential historic archaeological resources and appropriate procedures to follow if such resources are uncovered. ■ As required, the consulting archaeologist would develop archaeological exploration programs for the areas shown on Figure 12-28 having potential historic cultural resources. ■ As required, the archaeologist would provide archaeological monitoring during construction in these areas. Particular attention would be given if development were proposed in the area occupied by the late 19th-century city dump.

IX. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

CEQA requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project under review, or to the location of the project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a)). The LRDP FEIR analyzed two alternative locations for development of the major UCSF site, including buildings needed for the proposed project, other than Mission Bay. The alternative locations were Harbor Bay in Alameda County and Brisbane Baylands/Executive Park in San Mateo and San Francisco Counties. As demonstrated by the environmental analysis in the LRDP FEIR, the proposed UCSF site at Mission Bay had the fewest significant environmental impacts of any of the three major new UCSF sites evaluated in the LRDP FEIR. The LRDP SEIR analyzed further alternatives to the proposed housing program.

Initial Study and Addendum #2 and Addendum #3 provided a brief analysis of alternatives to the projects analyzed (Buildings 19B, 21B, 24C, 21A Garage and Landscaping, Parking and Campus Infrastructure Improvements), although such an analysis is not required for an addendum. A reasonable range of alternatives to projects was discussed, including: (1) a “no project” alternative; (2) building a smaller amount of square footage in the proposed project at the Mission Bay; (3) locating the proposed project buildings at an alternative location at the Mission Bay site; and (4) developing the proposed project blocks with other uses such as administration or logistical support. The results of the Addendum #2 and #3 alternatives analysis determined that the alternatives would not avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects identified in the LRDP FEIR, and would not meet objectives of the project. Therefore, the alternatives were rejected by The Regents.

With regard to the proposed project, three alternatives were analyzed in the LRDP SEIR, the “No Project,” the “LRDP-Complying Housing,” and the “UC Hall Site Housing.” This analysis is summarized directly from the LRDP SEIR. Although the exact details of the Block 20 Housing Project have changed since publication of the LRDP SEIR, all conclusions of the alternatives analysis in the LRDP SEIR remains valid to the proposed project. The summary is as follows:

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would not implement the revised UCSF Mission Bay functional zoning and space program to include housing within the 2,650,000 gsf program. The site buildout would proceed under the original LRDP program without the project. The project site, Block 20, would provide for 110,000 gsf of administrative uses and a parking garage and an additional approximate 290,000 gsf of administrative and logistics uses would be provided elsewhere at the campus site. No housing would be provided on Block 20 or elsewhere on UCSF Mission Bay. The families at

Aldea would still have to move by August 2005 at the latest, when those 65 units are scheduled to be demolished; however, UCSF would not supply replacement housing. Turk Street housing units would continue to operate as residences for 65 single students. If the No Project Alternative were implemented, all impacts would remain the same as would occur under the approved LRDP and as analyzed in the LRDP FEIR.

Land use impacts would be the similar for this alternative as for the project except that no residential development would be located at UCSF Mission Bay. Impacts of providing less housing for UCSF faculty, staff, and students would contribute more to the jobs/housing imbalance in Mission Bay and potentially throughout the City than would the project.

This alternative would generate about 1,908 daily person trips compared to about 3,848 for the project. A total of about 260 p.m. peak hour trips would occur with this alternative compared to 480 for the project. This alternative would result in fewer trips than the project. However, the alternative would increase administrative and other support functions at the campus, resulting in more trips in the peak direction compared to the project. This is because residents would generally travel in the reverse commute direction. Thus, although this alternative would result in fewer trips, traffic impacts would be expected to be similar for this alternative, compared to the project. This alternative would not cause a near-term reduction in staff and visitor parking at UCSF Mission Bay, as would the project; however development of additional new staff and visitor parking is not foreclosed by the project, resulting in similar less-than-significant parking effects as with the project.

The chance for wind hazard effects, would be similar with this alternative as with the project. However, this alternative building would be less likely to cause wind effects than the project as the entire footprint would be five-stories high, compared to ten stories on the eastern portion of the footprint with the project. Like the project, this alternative could provide physical baffling and/or landscaping to help reduce impacts.

Less-than significant air quality, hazardous materials, and public utilities / services impacts would result from this alternative, the same as with the project. No residents would be exposed to toxic air contaminants, and to hazardous soils and groundwater conditions as residents would with the project. This alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts would be essentially the same as with the project.

LRDP-COMPLYING HOUSING ALTERNATIVE

This alternative would provide housing for 340 students as called for in the LRDP. All of the families from Aldea would be relocated to the UCSF Mission Bay campus, along with the 65 single students from the Turk Street apartments. The total residential population at UCSF Mission Bay would be 466 (340 students and 126 family members), or about one half of the 910 residents with the project.

This alternative would provide about 4,750 gsf of retail space, about half as much as the project. This alternative would be one half the height as the proposed project, with a maximum of five stories instead of ten stories in the eastern portion of the site as with the project. Assuming the same percentage of parking per family unit and single-student beds, this alternative would require about 203 parking spaces, compared to about 385 spaces proposed for the project. Similar to the project, this parking would be developed elsewhere on the site a structure or on surface lots.

Land use impacts would be the similar for this alternative as for the project except that less residential development would be located at UCSF Mission Bay. Because this alternative would provide about 200,000 gsf less of housing than provided for with the project, about 200,000 gsf of administrative uses would be added elsewhere to the Mission Bay campus to retain the 2,650,000 gsf space program approved by the LRDP.

This alternative would generate about 2,566 daily trips compared to about 3,848 for the project. A total of about 323 p.m. peak hour trips would occur with this alternative compared to 480 for the project. However, with an increase in administrative and other support functions at the campus over the project, more trips would be expected in the peak direction compared to the project. This is because residents would generally travel in the reverse commute direction. Thus impacts would be expected to be similar for this alternative, compared to the project. This alternative would have the same proportional parking shortfall as would the project, resulting in similar less-than-significant parking effects.

The chance for temporary wind hazard effects on the project site would be similar with this alternative as with the project. However, this alternative building would be less likely to cause wind effects than the project as it would be five-stories high, compared to ten with the project. As with the project, this alternative could provide physical baffling and/or landscaping to help reduce impacts.

UC HALL HOUSING ALTERNATIVE

This housing alternative would be located on the site of existing UC Hall at the UCSF Parnassus Heights site, instead of at UCSF Mission Bay. This alternative would consist of an approximate 421,500 square foot alternative, the same size as the proposed housing project, and would provide the same unit mix and population as the project. The UC Hall housing alternative would provide about 14,500 gsf of retail space and about 385 parking spaces, the same as proposed for the project.

Land use impacts would be the similar for this alternative as for the project as both would be campus infill housing projects, although this alternative would be located at Parnassus Heights, and the project would be located at UCSF Mission Bay. This project would provide the same gsf of UCSF housing except at a different UCSF campus site. UCSF Mission Bay would still be developed with its 2,650,000 gsf space program approved by the LRDP. Other land uses at the UC Hall site, such as laboratories, research uses, classrooms, and administrative uses, would be precluded by this alternative.

This alternative would generate the same approximate 3,848 daily trips as would the project, except that the trips would be located at Parnassus Heights. Because these trips would be mostly related to residential uses, they could potentially help reduce vehicle trips coming onto the campus depending on the space and the number of workers/students removed from Parnassus Heights. However, several existing intersections at and near Parnassus Heights currently operate at unacceptable levels of service (LOS E or F) and are expected to continue operating at unacceptable levels in the future. Thus any traffic impacts at Parnassus Heights with this alternative, would result in worse impacts than estimated for the proposed housing project.

With implementation of this housing alternative at UC Hall, an additional approximate 1,908 daily trips would occur at UCSF Mission Bay with its development under the approved LRDP. Thus impacts would be expected to be greater for this alternative, compared to the project. Transit impacts would be similar for this alternative or the project. This alternative would have the same proportional parking shortfall as would the project. However, given that parking at Parnassus Heights is already saturated, a parking shortfall at that location could result in other physical effects such as increased blocking of the access to nearby residents and business, as well as fire hydrants. Thus parking impacts would be worse at this location compared to a similar parking shortfall for the proposed housing project at UCSF Mission Bay.

Less-than significant air quality and toxic air contaminants, hazardous materials, and public utilities and services impacts would result from this alternative, the same as with the project, although located at Parnassus Heights, instead of at the UCSF Mission Bay campus site. This alternative would not be subject to hazardous soils and groundwater effects as would the project. This alternative's contribution to cumulative impacts would be essentially the same as with the project except that it would contribute to worse cumulative traffic impacts than the project would.

Less-than-significant temporary construction noise, construction traffic and air quality impacts would occur on and around Parnassus Heights compared to those temporary effects occurring at the UCSF Mission Bay campus site with the project.

Comparison of Alternatives to Proposed Housing Project			
	No Project	LRDP-Complying Housing	UC Hall Site Housing
Land Use	Similar except no residential	Similar except less residential	Similar, except located at Parnassus Heights
Traffic	Similar	Similar	Worse
Parking	Similar	Similar	Worse
Toxic Air Contaminants	Similar, but no residents exposed	Similar, but fewer residents exposed	Similar, same number of residents exposed
Hazardous Materials	Similar, but no residents exposed	Similar, but fewer residents exposed	Not subject to hazardous soils and groundwater
Hazardous Winds	Less likely to cause	Less likely to cause	Fewer wind effects
Provide Housing at Mission Bay?	No	Yes	No
Ensure Adequate Student Housing?	No	Not as much as project	Yes
Decent University-Controlled Housing?	Not applicable	Yes	Yes
Provide Affordable Student Housing?	No	Yes	Yes

Source: UC Campus Planning; Maxwell & Associates, 2001.

ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The LRDP SEIR identifies the LRDP-Complying Housing Alternative as potentially the environmentally superior alternative. Although this Alternative would have similar effects regarding land use and hazardous materials as the project, this alternative would contribute less to significant cumulative traffic and air quality impacts. In addition, this alternative would be less likely than the project to result in significant wind effects. The UC Hall Alternative would result in worse significant traffic impacts than the project and thus would not be the environmentally superior alternative, although it would result in fewer other less-than-significant impacts than would the project.

In contrast, the proposed project would satisfy all the project objectives, including meeting the most immediate program needs of UCSF. As indicated in the alternatives discussion in the LRDP FEIR, the LRDP SEIR, and in this Initial Study and Addendum #4, no alternative locations exist that would avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts of the proposed project. Additionally the LRDP FEIR and LRDP SEIR sufficiently analyzed a range of reasonable alternative locations to the project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)(2), and the circumstances remain substantially the same as they relate to those alternatives.

X. CRITERIA FOR AN ADDENDUM

As described in Public Resources Code Section 21166 and CEQA Guidelines Sections 15162 and 15164, preparation of an Addendum is appropriate where: 1) none of the conditions calling for preparation of a subsequent EIR or supplement to an EIR have occurred, such as a) substantial changes in the project or in the circumstances under which the project is undertaken that would involve major revisions to the EIR due to the involvement of new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of previously identified significant effects, or b) new information of substantial importance that was not known at the time the EIR was certified becomes available and that new information indicates that (i) the project will have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous EIR, (ii) significant effects previously examined will be substantially more severe than shown in the previous EIR, (iii) mitigation measures or alternatives previously found infeasible, which would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, are feasible, but not adopted by the project proponent as part of the project, or (iv) mitigation measures or alternatives which are considerably different from those analyzed in the previous EIR and would substantially reduce one or more significant effects of the project, are available but are not adopted by the project proponent as part of the project; and 2) the changes to the EIR made by the Addendum do not raise important new issues about the significant effects on the environment.

None of the conditions or circumstances that would require preparation of a subsequent or supplemental EIR pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21166 exists in connection with the proposed project. No substantial changes have been proposed to the project described in the LRDP FEIR as amended by LRDP Amendment No. 1, and analyzed in the LRDP SEIR, that require major revisions of the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR. The project proposed in the LRDP includes development of up to 2,650,000 gsf of UCSF instructional, research and support uses, plus associated parking. The LRDP FEIR analyzes the environmental impacts that could result from such development anywhere within the Mission Bay area and specifically shows, as an illustrative site plan, a 45-acre site on and immediately adjacent to the selected UCSF site. UCSF's proposed construction of up to 421,370 gsf of residential housing uses would be consistent with the project described in the LRDP FEIR as supplemented by the LRDP SEIR. The LRDP SEIR analyzed a revised space program to include housing, with corresponding adjustments in future development of other uses such that the total gross square footage remains the same at 2,650,000 gsf.

There have not been any substantial changes with respect to the circumstances under which the UCSF projects would be undertaken that would require major revisions in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR. When the LRDP FEIR was prepared, Catellus had already terminated the Development Agreement for Mission Bay, but the Mission Bay Plan and Article 9 of the San Francisco Planning Code remained in effect. The approval of the Mission Bay North and Mission Bay South Plans does not represent changes in circumstances that could cause new or increased significant impacts from those analyzed in the LRDP FEIR because the level of development authorized under the Plans is generally consistent with the level of development analyzed in the LRDP FEIR for the Mission Bay area. In order to provide a conservative cumulative impacts analysis with respect to transportation, air quality and other impacts, the LRDP FEIR used the MTC year 2010 traffic projections and added the 2,650,000 gsf of the UCSF site to the regional cumulative projections. This approach intentionally overstates environmental impacts that could result. Therefore, it is not anticipated that any environmental impacts resulting from future changes in plans and circumstances described in this section would be significant new impacts that were not analyzed in the LRDP FEIR or increase the severity of impacts found to be significant in the LRDP FEIR.

Finally, no new information of substantial importance, which was not known and could not have been known at the time that the LRDP FEIR or the LRDP SEIR was certified as complete, shows that the proposed project would cause new significant environmental impacts or substantially worsen environmental impacts discussed in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR, that mitigation measures or alternatives found infeasible in the LRDP FEIR or LRDP SEIR would in fact be feasible, or that different mitigation measures or alternatives from those analyzed in the LRDP

FEIR or LRDP SEIR would substantially reduce one or more significant environmental impacts.

XII. REFERENCES

The following reference documents are available at the UCSF Campus Planning 3333 California Street, Suite 11, San Francisco, California 94143-0286.

Association of Bay Area Governments, *Projections '96*, December 1995, and *Projections '98*, December 1997.

Catellus Development Corporation, *Response to Preliminary Campus Development Plan*, Exhibit C, Infrastructure and Exhibit J, Minimum Infrastructure, August 18, 1998.

City and County of San Francisco, *Mission Bay Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified August 23, 1990 (State Clearinghouse Number 1986070113).

City and County of San Francisco, *Mission Bay Subsequent Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified October 14, 1998, Notice of Determination filed November 3, 1998 (State Clearinghouse Number 1997092068).

City and County of San Francisco, *San Francisco Giants Ballpark at China Basin Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified June 26, 1997 (State Clearinghouse Number 1996102056).

City and County of San Francisco, San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, *Mission Bay North Plan and Mission Bay South Plan*, August 1998, adopted November 2, 1998.

Environmental Science Associates, Technical Memorandum, *Health Risk Assessment Screening and Wind Tunnel Testing of Exhaust Stack Performance, UCSF Building 24*, November 19, 1999.

Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc., *Traffic Projections and Analysis Report for the UCSF Mission Bay Campus*, May 4, 1998.

Fehr & Peers Associates, Inc. *Traffic Projections and Parking Demand for UCSF Mission Bay Phase I*, April 13, 2000.

Metropolitan Transportation Commission, *1994 Regional Transportation Plan for the San Francisco Bay*.

University of California, *UCSF 1996 Long Range Development Plan Final Environmental Impact Report*, certified by The Regents on January 17, 1997 (State Clearinghouse Number 1995123032).

University of California, *UCSF Long Range Development Plan Amendment No. 1 Mission Bay Housing Program Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report*, certified by The Regents on January 17, 2002 (State Clearinghouse Number 1995123032).