

RESOLUTION NO. 8-2012
Adopted June 11, 2012

ADOPTING ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW FINDINGS PURSUANT TO THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND CONDITIONALLY APPROVING A COMBINED BASIC CONCEPT AND SCHEMATIC DESIGN FOR A NEW PUBLIC PLAZA AND PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE FACILITIES ON BLOCKS 36-37 AND THE 4TH STREET RIGHT-OF-AWAY IN MISSION BAY TO SERVE THE FUTURE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN FRANCISCO MEDICAL CENTER PURSUANT TO THE OWNER PARTICIPATION AGREEMENT WITH FOCIL-MB, LLC

WHEREAS, On September 17, 1998, the Commission of the Redevelopment Agency of the City and County of San Francisco (“Redevelopment Commission”) approved the Redevelopment Plan for the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Project Area (“Plan”) by Resolution No. 190-98, following certification of the Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (“FSEIR”) for the Mission Bay North and South Redevelopment Plans and adoption of CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) and State CEQA Guidelines by Resolution No. 182-98 and adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations by Resolutions Nos. 182-98 and 183-98, respectively. On the same date, the Redevelopment Commission adopted related documents, including Resolution No. 193-98 authorizing execution of an Owner Participation Agreement (“South OPA”) and related documents between Catellus Development Corporation, a Delaware corporation (“Catellus”), and the Redevelopment Agency. On November 2, 1998, the San Francisco Board of Supervisors (“Board of Supervisors”), affirmed the certification of the FSEIR by Motion 98-132, adopted CEQA Findings and a Statement of Overriding Considerations by Resolution No.854-98 and by Ordinance No. 335-98, adopted the Plan. The Plan and its implementing documents, as defined in the Plan, constitute the “Plan Documents;” and,

WHEREAS, The Redevelopment Commission has issued various addenda to the FSEIR, including Addendum #6, dated September 8, 2008, which concluded that revisions proposed by The Regents of the University of California (“The Regents”) to the University of California San Francisco (“UCSF”) Medical Center at Mission Bay (“MCMB”) did not result in any new significant impacts or increase the severity of previously identified impacts in the FSEIR; and,

WHEREAS, The Plan and the Plan Documents, including the Design Review and Document Approval Procedure, Attachment G to the South OPA (“DRDAP”), obligate a review process for the approval of schematic designs for public open spaces in Mission Bay; and,

- WHEREAS, On March 17, 2005, The Regents certified a Final Environmental Impact Report for Long Range Development Plan Amendment #2 – Hospital Replacement Program (“LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR”). The LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR considered the environmental impacts of a number of potential hospital replacement scenarios, including two sites in Mission Bay. On the same date, The Regents approved an amendment to its Long Range Development Plan (“LRDP”) which stated that the initial phase of hospital replacement will be the development of an approximately 210-bed specialty hospital in the Mission Bay South Project Area; and,
- WHEREAS, On November 1, 2005 the Redevelopment Commission approved a Memorandum of Understanding with The Regents (“MOU”) to address the fiscal and design implications of UCSF’s development of a hospital on Blocks 36 to 39. Also on November 1, 2005, the Commission approved a Second Amendment to the South OPA with Catellus Operating Limited Partnership and FOCIL-MB, LLC, to allow for the transfer of Blocks 36 to 39 to the Regents. In approving the MOU and amended OPA, the Commission acted as a “responsible” agency relied on the LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR and its accompanying mitigations to adopt environmental findings; and,
- WHEREAS, On September 18, 2008, The Regents certified a Final Environmental Impact Report for a revised hospital plan for Mission Bay South on Blocks 36-39 and X3 (“MCMB FEIR”), which included the development of a hospital in Mission Bay of up to a 289 beds in Phase I, with additional 261 beds in Phase II. At the same time, The Regents adopted CEQA Findings, including a Statement of Overriding Considerations, and approved the Phase I hospital; and,
- WHEREAS, Subsequently, on April 22, 2009, The Regents certified a Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report to analyze a Residential Sound Reduction related to the operations of a helipad at the Medical Center Program (“Final UCSF Helipad SEIR”), adopted CEQA Findings and approved operation of a helipad at the MCMB; and,
- WHEREAS, On March 2, 2010, the Redevelopment Commission approved an amendment to the MOU with The Regents to incorporate X3 in the hospital plan. In approving the Amended MOU, the Commission acted as a “responsible” agency and used the MCMB FEIR, the Final UCSF Helipad SEIR, and accompanying mitigations to adopt environmental findings; and,
- WHEREAS, Under Assembly Bill No. X1 26 (Chapter 5, Statutes of 2011-12, First Extraordinary Session) (“AB 26”) and the California Supreme Court’s decision in California Redevelopment Association v. Matosantos, No. S194861, the Redevelopment Agency, together with all other redevelopment agencies in the State of California, dissolved by operation of law on February 1, 2012; and,

- WHEREAS, Consistent with AB 26, on January 24, 2012 the City's Board of Supervisors approved and on January 26, 2012 the Mayor signed Resolution No. 11-12 (the "Board of Supervisors Resolution"), providing for the City to become the successor agency of the Redevelopment Agency ("Successor Agency"), and to acquire its housing and non-housing assets, funds and enforceable obligations, and to fulfill its rights and duties as successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency under AB 26; and,
- WHEREAS, AB 26 places successor agencies' performance of their duties under the supervision of newly established oversight boards, which are different from the local legislative bodies and which will oversee the fiscal management of future successor agency activities regarding the enforceable obligations; and,
- WHEREAS, The Mayor (with confirmation by the Board of Supervisors) and the taxing entities have appointed members to the oversight board of the City and County of San Francisco (the "Oversight Board"); and,
- WHEREAS, In addition to the duties that AB 26 places on this Oversight Board, the City delegated to this Oversight Board, through the Board of Supervisors Resolution, certain authority and responsibility regarding the implementation of the Mission Bay Project; and,
- WHEREAS, The City delegation to this Oversight Board included the authority to grant approvals under specified land use controls for the Mission Bay Project consistent with the approved Plan and enforceable obligations, in place of the commission of the former Redevelopment Agency, with delegation to City staff ("Successor Agency staff") consistent with the former Redevelopment Agency's policies and procedures; and,
- WHEREAS, UCSF has proposed the development of a public plaza on the UCSF Medical Center site and on the adjacent City 4th Street right-of-way property between 16th and Mariposa Streets ("4th Street Public Plaza"). 4th Street currently terminates at 16th Street. 4th Street adjacent to the UCSF Medical Center site has been planned as a City street but has not yet been constructed. The 4th Street Public Plaza is designed to provide a safe east/west connection between UCSF's facilities on either side of 4th Street, and accommodation through access on Fourth Street from 16th to Mariposa Streets for pedestrians and bicycles and for emergency vehicles. The plaza will contain plantings, benches, pathways for pedestrians and bicycles, and an amphitheater. If UCSF approves Phase II of the UCSF Medical Center, two enclosed pedestrian bridges are proposed between the UCSF medical center buildings on either side of 4th Street; and,
- WHEREAS, On May 18, 2012, The Regents certified the Final Environmental Impact Report for the University of California, San Francisco Campus Medical Center at Mission Bay – 4th Street Public Plaza Project ("Project FEIR") and adopted environmental findings pursuant to CEQA. The Project FEIR analyzes the environmental effects of having the University construct and

maintain a public plaza on Fourth Street between 16th Street and Mariposa Street; it also analyzes the effects of implementing eight traffic improvement measures identified by the University, some of which are necessary to avoid significant traffic effects if the University approves and implements the second phase of the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay. As evaluated in the FEIR, development of the 4th Street Public Plaza will not result in any significant and unavoidable impacts. Further the Project FEIR did not identify any project specific mitigation measures; however, the Project incorporates mitigation into its description and The Regents established a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that includes all of the mitigation measures identified in the LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR and MCMB FEIR incorporated as part of the project, as described in the Project Description of the Project FEIR; and,

WHEREAS, UCSF, as a State agency, is exempt from local land use controls. However, for the portions of the 4th Street Public Plaza within the 4th Street public right-of-way, UCSF has committed itself to be subject to the Mission Bay design process outlined in the Plan and Plan Documents. This will be memorialized as part of a Master Agreement that will be approved by the Board of Supervisors; and,

WHEREAS, Pursuant to the DRDAP, UCSF submitted a final Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design packet for the 4th Street Public Plaza dated May 29, 2012 (Schematic Design"); and,

WHEREAS, Agency staff has reviewed the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design packet for purposes of compliance with CEQA; and,

WHEREAS, Successor Agency staff has reviewed the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design for the 4th Street Public Plaza and finds that the Oversight Board can consider approval pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15096, relying on the Project FEIR as a responsible agency as defined by CEQA Guidelines Section 15381. Successor Agency staff has prepared findings in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and San Francisco Administrative Code Chapter 31 ("Chapter 31"), for consideration by the Oversight Board with respect to its approval of the Project (the "CEQA Findings"), which findings are found in Attachment A to this Resolution, and Exhibit 1, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project. As explained in the findings, Oversight Board approval will not change the scope of the project analyzed in the Project FEIR and no major revisions are required due to new significant environmental effects or a substantial increase in the severity of significant effects previously identified in the FEIR, that no substantial changes have occurred with respect to the circumstances under which the project would be undertaken, and that no new information of substantial importance to the project analyzed in the FEIR has become available; and,

WHEREAS, Successor Agency staff, in making the necessary findings for the approval action contemplated herein, considered and reviewed the Project FEIR,

and has made documents related to the Schematic Design and the FEIR files available for review by the Oversight Board and the public, and these files are part of the record before the Oversight Board; and,

WHEREAS, Successor Agency staff has reviewed the and Schematic Design and finds it acceptable and recommends approval thereof, subject to the resolution of certain conditions; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That the Oversight Board finds and determines that the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design submission is an Implementing Action within the scope of the project analyzed in the Project FEIR and requires no additional environmental review pursuant to State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15096, 15162 and 15163 for the following reasons:

1. The Project FEIR, prepared and certified as adequate by The Regents and the University, has been made available for review by the Oversight Board and the public and this document is part of the record before the Oversight Board.
2. The Oversight Board has reviewed and considered the Project FEIR and the record as a whole, finds that the Project FEIR is adequate for its use as the decision-making body for the approval of the project under California Public Resources Code Section 21161.5 and hereby adopts and incorporates into this resolution by this reference the CEQA Findings in Attachment A, including Exhibit 1.
3. The Oversight Board finds that the approval of the Schematic Design for the project is within the scope of the project analyzed in the Project FEIR.
4. The Oversight Board finds that since The Regents certified the Project FEIR, there have been no substantial project changes and no substantial changes in project circumstances that would require major revisions to the Project FEIR due to the involvement of the new significant environmental effects or an increase in the severity of previously identified significant impacts, and there is no new information of substantial importance that would change the conclusions set forth in the Project FEIR.
5. The Oversight Board has not identified any feasible alternative or additional feasible mitigation measures within its powers that would substantially lessen or avoid any significant effect the project would have on the environmental;

and, now, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Oversight Board has reviewed and considered the Project FEIR findings and hereby adopts the CEQA findings set forth in Attachment A, including Exhibit 1, which are incorporated herein; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That Oversight Board approves the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design for the 4th Street Public Plaza, subject to the following conditions:

1. The approval of the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design is contingent on approval of the Minor Mission Bay South Infrastructure Plan amendment by the Mayor and Director of the Department of Public Works, as well as the approval by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors of all the related legislation required to implement the 4th Street Public Plaza by UCSF.
2. Staff shall review and approve the final furnishings for the 4th Street Public Plaza, including bike racks, benches, signage, and light poles during design development. UCSF shall consider the long-term durability, maintenance requirements, and the sustainability of the materials when selecting furnishings.
3. Final hardscape materials for the 4th Street Public Plaza, including all paving materials and patterns, shall be reviewed and approved by staff during the design development. Attention will be given to the shared pedestrian/bicycle promenade, as well as to the pedestrian and vehicle interface at the drop-off, to ensure safe and compatible use by all modes of transportation.
4. A final planting plan for the 4th Street Public Plaza, including all new trees, planting palette, stormwater treatment basins, amphitheater, and tree grove area, shall be reviewed by staff for approval during design development.
5. The lighting plan, including lighting fixtures and locations, shall be reviewed and approved by staff during design development to ensure that the lighting plan promotes the public character of the plaza, as well as defines the promenade as a major north-south public thoroughfare for pedestrians and bicyclists. Attention shall be given to the proposed building parapet flood lights to ensure that they do not overly light the plaza and affect the adjacent neighborhood.
6. Once UCSF completes final designs for Phase 2 of the UCSF Mission Bay Medical Center, UCSF shall work with Successor Agency and City staff to revisit the 4th Street Public Plaza design to determine what modifications, if any, to the plaza may be necessary to accommodate the final design of Phase 2 of the Medical Center. Specific attention will be given to minimizing the size of the drop-offs and retaining a safe movement of pedestrian,

bicycle, and emergency vehicles. The approval process for the Phase 2 plaza improvements shall be subject to the Mission Bay South Design Review and Document Approval Procedures, or an alternative City design review process if the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan has already expired.

7. The project boundaries shown on Pages 4 and 5 of the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design are identified for purposes of developing the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design only. The actual project boundaries for purposes of construction and permitting will be determined by Department of Public Works staff.
8. Approval of the Combined Basic Concept and Schematic Design does not constitute approval of the various technical studies completed by UCSF for the preparation of the overall plaza design.

I hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was adopted by the Oversight Board at its meeting of June 11, 2012.

Natalie Jones

Board Secretary

ATTACHMENT A

CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS RELATED TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA REGENTS SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS, MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA PROJECT CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

I. INTRODUCTION

These Findings are made by the City by and through the Oversight Board, Successor Agency to the former San Francisco Redevelopment Agency (the “City”) in its capacity as a responsible agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, California Public Resources Code section 21000 et seq., (“CEQA”) with respect to the Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) (SCH # 2011122065) for The Board of Regents (“The Regents”) of the University of California, San Francisco Campus (“UCSF”) Medical Center at Mission Bay (“MCMB”) – Fourth Street Public Plaza Project (“Project”). These findings are made in light of substantial evidence in the record of Project proceedings, including but not limited to, the Project FEIR prepared by The Regents pursuant to CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, 14 California Code of Regulations Sections 15000 et seq., (the “CEQA Guidelines”).

This document is organized as follows:

Article 1 explains the purpose of the findings and organization of the document.

Article 2 describes the Project and the environmental review process undertaken by The Regents.

Article 3 describes the actions to be taken by the City in its capacity as a responsible agency.

Article 4 provides the basis for the City's approval of the Project and a description of the alternatives included in the FEIR. In approving the Project, The Regents concluded that all of the alternatives are infeasible or undesirable. This Article summarizes The Regents findings concerning the alternatives.

Article 5 sets forth findings as to significant impacts related to the City's approval action as identified in Article 3 and the disposition of each of the mitigation measures proposed in the Project FEIR that will mitigate significant environmental effects related to the City's approval action. Exhibit 1, attached to these findings, contains the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project.

The City has reviewed the Project FEIR prepared by The Regents as lead agency and certified by The Regents in May 2012 and has reached its own conclusion on whether and how to approve those portions of the Project that are within the City's jurisdiction. These findings are based on the record of proceedings, including, but not limited to, the Project FEIR and MCMB FEIR and the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by the Agency in March 2010, upon its approval of

modifications to an MOU with UCSF, based on the MCMB FEIR. These records and other information in the administrative record provide the basis for the City's approval of the Project and support the CEQA Findings set forth below.

As a responsible agency, the City's role is limited. The CEQA Guidelines provide that a responsible agency has responsibility for mitigating or avoiding only the direct or indirect environmental effects of those parts of a project which it decides to carry out, finance or approve. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(g)(1). Where an EIR has been prepared for a project, a responsible agency can refuse to approve the project as proposed if the responsible agency finds feasible alternative or feasible mitigation measures within its powers that would substantially lessen or avoid the significant impacts the project would have on the environment. (CEQA Guidelines Section 15096(g)(2)).

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND CEQA PROCESS

A. Project Description

The Project is in furtherance of the implementation of The Regents Long Range Development Plan ("LRDP") for the UCSF campus. In March 2005, The Regents approved the LRDP Amendment #2, a comprehensive future hospital facilities plan for UCSF designed to satisfy new California-mandated seismic and life safety standards, as set out in the Alfred E. Alquist Hospital Facilities Seismic Safety Act (Senate Bill 1953).

The LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR (SCH# 2004072067) analyzed several proposed hospital scenarios including facilities of various sizes and locations in Mission Bay. As approved by The Regents, the LRDP Amendment #2 provided that in the initial LRDP Phase (through 2012), the Regents would develop three integrated specialty hospitals including a hospital with about 210 beds at Mission Bay. In September 2008, the Regents certified the MCMB FEIR (SCH# 2008012075), which analyzed the development of the MCMB hospital complex. The MCMB identified two major phases for development of a hospital complex at Mission Bay. The two phases were the LRDP Phase (Phase I), which was analyzed at a project level, and a Future Phase (Phase II), which was analyzed at a program level. Together, the two phases would provide for a medical center with a total of 550 beds at Mission Bay. The Regents approved Phase I in September 2008, along with an Energy Center, Outpatient building, surface parking and construction of a medical helipad. The Regents approved operation of the helipad in April 2009.

The Fourth Street Plaza Project will construct a public plaza at the MCMB site on Regents' property and on adjacent City Fourth Street right-of-way property between 16th and Mariposa Streets. Fourth Street currently terminates at 16th Street. Fourth Street adjacent to the MCMB site has been planned as a City street but has not yet been constructed. The Project is designed to provide a safe east/west connection between UCSF's Phase I medical center facilities on the east side of Fourth Street and the parking facilities on the west side of Fourth Street. If UCSF approves and constructs Phase II, the Project would provide a safe connection between the Phase I medical center facilities and the parking and Phase II medical center facilities on the other side of Fourth Street. The Project would provide through access on Fourth Street from 16th to Mariposa Streets for pedestrians and bicycles and for emergency vehicles, including fire, police, and ambulance vehicles. The plaza will contain plantings, benches, pathways for pedestrians and bicycles, and an amphitheater. If UCSF approves Phase II, two enclosed pedestrian bridges are proposed at the third and fourth floors between the UCSF medical center buildings on either side of Fourth Street.

As described in the Project FEIR, certain mitigation measures identified in previous EIRs have been incorporated into the Project as proposed. These include mitigation measures from the LRDP FEIR, certified by The Regents in January 1997, LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR, MCMB FEIR and Mission Bay Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report (Mission Bay FSEIR), certified by the San Francisco Planning Commission in September 1998, which certification was affirmed by the Board of Supervisors on October 19, 1998 by Motion No. 98-132.

The Regents require various approvals from the City to construct the Project. Under the proposed Project, the Fourth Street right-of-way between Sixteenth Street and Mariposa Street would remain City land and the University would seek a major encroachment permit from the City. The University would also seek from the City a lease for an underground utility tunnel beneath Fourth Street in Phase I, and for air rights to construct the bridges across Fourth Street in Phase II and easements.

The Project also includes eight traffic improvement measures, some of which are anticipated to be necessary to avoid potential significant traffic impacts of the Project that would occur if Phase II of the MCMB is ultimately approved and constructed. City approvals are required for The Regents to implement the traffic improvement measures, which The Regents would implement either as part of Phase I or at the point in time that the traffic monitoring plan proposed as part of the Project indicates the measures are needed. Various approvals from the City would allow The Regents to implement the traffic improvement measures.

B. CEQA Process

1. Project FEIR

The Regents originally evaluated the Project as a project alternative in the MCMB FEIR. The purpose of the MCMB EIR was to analyze the environmental consequences of the initial phase of the Medical Center at Mission Bay project ("Phase I" or the "LRDP Phase") at a project level while analyzing the impacts of the full development ("Phase II" or "Future Phase," and together with Phase I, the "MCMB") at a program level. While certain features of the proposed Project analyzed in the Project FEIR have evolved since certification of the MCMB EIR, the main components remain the same. The Project FEIR is tiered from the MCMB FEIR.

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15090, in May 2012, The Regents, acting through the President of the University pursuant to The Regents' delegation procedures, certified the Project FEIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The Regents found that the MCMB EIR and the Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations adopted by The Regents in September 2008, as well as the Project FEIR and the other information in the administrative record, provided the basis for approval of the revised Project. These findings hereby incorporate by this reference the Findings adopted by The Regents in May 2012 in support of The Regents' approval of the Project.

2. Preparation of the EIR

Consistent with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines and University Procedures for Implementation of CEQA, The Regents prepared an Initial Study and a Draft EIR for the Project. The Draft EIR was published on February 15, 2012. The Draft EIR circulation period extended from February 15, 2012, to April 2, 2012, a 45-day period of review and

comment. During that time, the document was available for review by various state and local agencies, as well as by interested individuals and organizations. A public hearing was held on March 22, 2012, but no public speakers were present and no comments were submitted. Three written comments were submitted during the 45-day review period. The Project FEIR was completed on April 27, 2012, and contains no material revisions to the Draft EIR. The Regents found that no new significant information was added to the Draft EIR following public review and thus, recirculation of the Draft EIR was not required by CEQA.

C. Record of Proceedings

The documents and other materials which constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City approval actions are based are located at the Oversight Board, Successor Agency to the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency; 1 South Van Ness Avenue, Suite 500; San Francisco, CA 94103; Attention: Stanley Muraoka.

The record of proceedings includes, but is not limited to, the following documents:

1. The Project FEIR, certified by The Regents in May 2012.
2. The MCMB FEIR certified by The Regents in September 2008.
3. The LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR, certified by The Regents in March 2005.
4. UCSF staff report, including but not limited to CEQA Findings, and the President's approval of the Project on May 18, 2012.
5. San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Resolution No. 19-2010, adopted March 2, 2010, approving amendments to a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") with UCSF and adopting CEQA Findings as a responsible agency under CEQA, related to the MCMB FEIR, including Exhibit 1, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay Project.
6. San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Resolution No. 175-2005, adopted November 1, 2005, adopting CEQA Findings as a responsible agency under CEQA, related to the LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR, in support of approval of a MOU with UCSF, including Attachment A., CEQA Findings, and Exhibit 1, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the UCSF LRDP Amendment #2 Project.
7. Board of Supervisors Motion No. 98-132, adopted October 19, 1998, affirming the certification of the Mission Bay Final Subsequent Environmental Impact Report by the Planning Commission and the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency Commission, and Resolution No. 854-98, adopted the same day, approving environmental findings and a statement of overriding considerations for the Mission Bay Project

The City has relied upon all of the documents above in reaching its decisions, even if not every document was formally presented to the City decision-makers.

III. CITY ACTIONS

The actions of the City in connection with the Project involve approvals that The Regents require from the City so that The Regents may implement the Project. These actions will further the implementation of the Project by enabling The Regents to construct the Fourth Street Plaza, a portion of which is on City property, and implementing the traffic improvement measures. The following City approvals are required.

**Oversight Board, Successor Agency to the former San Francisco
Redevelopment Agency**

- Approve Fourth Street Plaza Schematic Design.

Mayor

- Approve a Mission Bay Minor Infrastructure Plan Amendment.

Department of Public Works

- Approve a permit to install, use and maintain UCSF Street and Utility Improvements, including the Fourth Street Public Plaza and those necessary to implement traffic improvement measures.

- Approve Mission Bay Minor Infrastructure Plan Amendment.

Board of Supervisors

- Approve a Master Agreement between the City and The Regents that includes:
 - a major encroachment permit granting revocable permission to UCSF to occupy portions of Fourth, Owens, Third and Sixteenth Streets for UCSF improvements and activities, including the Fourth Street Public Plaza;
 - a maintenance agreement for these improvements;
 - easement agreements for public pedestrian passage over sidewalk curb ramps and for public pedestrian passage and City utilities over certain UCSF property; and
 - a lease of subsurface and air space for UCSF improvements above and below certain segments of Fourth Street between Sixteenth and Mariposa Streets on State Trust property.
- Accept offers of real property and public improvements along such streets and portions of Mariposa Street for street widening, turning radii and right turn lane purposes.
- Make findings of consistency with the City's General Plan.

San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency

- Approve street lane configurations and traffic signalization changes necessary to implement traffic improvement measures.

IV. ALTERNATIVES

CEQA requires an evaluation of the comparative effects of a range of reasonable alternatives that would attain most of the basic objectives of the proposed project and avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant adverse effects of the proposed project, including alternatives that are more costly or could otherwise impede the attainment of the project's objectives.

The University independently reviewed and considered the information regarding alternatives provided in the Project FEIR and the administrative record. The University determined that the alternatives identified in the Project FEIR either would not meet any of the Project objectives, would only partially meet some of the Project objectives, or

would not result in fewer significant and unavoidable impacts than the Project itself. The City does not have the authority to choose which alternative is approved by The Regents. Both The Regents' project objectives and brief summaries of the evaluated alternatives are set forth below:

1. Project Objectives

Section 15124(b) of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the project description in an EIR include "a statement of the objectives sought by the applicant," which should include "the underlying purpose of the project." The Regents' objectives of the proposed Project are:

- to provide a safe and clear east/west connection between the Phase I Medical Center facilities on the east side of Fourth Street and the parking facilities on the west side of Fourth Street in Phase I; and parking and medical center facilities on the west side of Fourth Street in Phase II, particularly for children, the elderly, and those with compromised health or disabilities
- to provide a safe and inviting north/south pathway for pedestrians and bicyclists traveling on the Fourth Street right-of-way
- to develop a well-designed public open space that welcomes patients, visitors, staff, and the general public
- to minimize conflicts among vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists
- to maintain adequate access to the Medical Center emergency room and urgent care facilities
- to develop an open space that provides flexibility of use for UCSF events
- to develop well-designed bridges in Phase II, facilitated by design criteria agreed upon by the City and the University

2. Alternatives to the Project

The Project FEIR analyzed two alternatives to the proposed Project: the No Project Alternative and the Fourth Street Open As a Shared Street Alternative.

i) No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, Fourth Street would be developed as a vehicular through-street as envisioned in the Mission Bay South Redevelopment Plan and as assumed in the MCMB FEIR. Under this alternative, no plaza would be constructed in the Fourth Street right-of-way, but the Fourth Street frontage on MCMB property could be designed with a small plaza and landscaping. The cul-de-sacs would be located on MCMB property as assumed in the MCMB FEIR. Under this alternative, no pedestrian bridges across Fourth Street would be constructed in Phase II.

The No Project Alternative would have less than significant impacts in the areas of aesthetics and land use, as with the proposed Project. The No Project Alternative would avoid some of the Phase II traffic impacts of the proposed Project, but would continue to have a significant traffic impact in Phase II at two intersections: Sixteenth Street/Owens Street and Owens Street/Center Garage Access. However, these significant traffic impacts could be mitigated to less than significant levels.

The Regents found that the No Project Alternative would not meet the Project objectives to (1) provide a safe and clear east/west connection between the Medical

Center facilities on both sides of Fourth Street, particularly for children, the elderly, and those with compromised health or disabilities; (2) minimize conflicts among vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists; and (3) develop an open space that provides flexibility of use for UCSF events. The Project objective to develop a well-designed public open space that welcomes patients, visitors, staff, and the general public would only partially be met, but not at the scope and scale that the University desires.

ii) Fourth Street Open as a Shared Street Alternative

Under the Fourth Street Open as a Shared Street Alternative, Fourth Street would be open to vehicular traffic but would also accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians within the same space as vehicles. The roadway would be designed utilizing traffic-calming measures to discourage vehicular through-traffic, and would include visual and non-visual cues to slow travel speeds and inform drivers and bicyclists of the presence of pedestrians. Under this alternative, it is anticipated that some vehicular through-traffic would still occur, but to a lesser degree than with Fourth Street fully open.

Under this alternative, a plaza could be partially constructed in the Fourth Street right-of-way, integrated with a roadway for vehicular traffic and one or two cul-de-sacs for patient drop-off. Although this Alternative would discourage through-traffic, Fourth Street would be open to the public and would continue to be owned by the City of San Francisco. Under this alternative, pedestrian bridges across Fourth Street would be constructed in Phase II.

The Fourth Street Open as a Shared Street Alternative would have less than significant impacts in the areas of aesthetics and land use, as with the proposed Project. The Fourth Street Open as a Shared Street Alternative would avoid some of the traffic impacts of the proposed Project, but would continue to have a significant traffic impact at three intersections: Sixteenth Street/Third Street, Sixteenth Street/Owens Street and Owens Street/Center Garage Access.

The Regents found that the Fourth Street Open as a Shared Street Alternative would only partially meet the Project objectives to (1) develop a well-designed public open space that welcomes patients, visitors, staff, and the general public; and (2) develop an open space that provides flexibility of use for UCSF events. These objectives would partially be met, but not at the scope and scale that the University desires.

iii) Environmentally Superior Alternative

The environmentally superior alternative among those evaluated in the FEIR is the No Project Alternative. Other than the No Project Alternative, the remaining alternative, the Fourth Street Open as a Shared Street Alternative, is the environmentally superior alternative.

V. SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

1. Project Impacts

The Project EIR concluded that the Project would not cause any potentially significant impacts. To avoid causing significant impacts in the areas of light and glare, liquefiable soils, and construction-related air quality, archeological resources, hydrology and water quality; noise and transportation impacts, the Project Description incorporated mitigation measures from The Regents' LRDP FEIR, LRDP Amendment #2 FEIR, the MCBM FEIR and the City's 1998 Mission Bay FSEIR that were applicable to the Project.

With the incorporation of these mitigation measures into the Project, the Project would result in no significant impacts.

2. Findings That Mitigation Measures Have Been Incorporated Into the Project

Mitigation measures that the University incorporated into the Project would avoid significant impacts related to the following resource areas.

1. Light and glare, Mitigation Measure 4.4-1 (LRDP amendment #2 EIR).
2. Construction-related air quality, Mitigation Measure 4.2-2 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR). The Project EIR updates the language of this mitigation measures to make it consistent with recent Bay Area Air Quality Management District dust control guidelines.
3. Construction-related archaeological resources, Mitigation Measures MCMB.2-1 (MCMB EIR), 4.3-1 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR), 12M4-2 (1996 LRDP EIR), D.3 (1998 Mission Bay FSEIR).
4. Liquefiable soils, Mitigation Measure 4.4-4 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR).
5. Hydrology and water quality, Mitigation Measure 4.6-3 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR).
6. Construction noise, Mitigation Measure MCMB.5-1 (MCMB EIR);.
7. Construction-related transportation, Mitigation Measure 4.11-1 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR).

In approving Agency Resolution 175-2005 and Agency Resolution 19-2010, the Agency previously adopted mitigation measures contained in the LRDP Amendment #2 EIR and the MCMB EIR. Further, the City previously adopted all mitigation measures from the Mission Bay FSEIR in Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 854-98, when it approved the Mission Bay project. The City hereby incorporates by reference these previous findings of the Agency and the Board of Supervisors.

By these CEQA Findings, the City finds that construction-related impacts could disturb historic archeological resources and to protect these resources, adopts Mitigation Measures 12M4-2 (1996 LRDP EIR). Further, the City adopts the updated Mitigation Measure 4.2-2, which will assure that construction-related dust is controlled in accordance with current BAAQMD-recommended dust control measures. The City finds that the mitigation measures identified above will mitigate, reduce or avoid significant effects and that The Regents have adopted and committed to implement all of these measures by its adoption of CEQA findings and its approval action on May 18, 2012. The City further finds that implementation of these mitigation measures by The Regents will mitigate the associated impacts identified in the Project EIR and earlier referenced EIRs identified in these CEQA Findings.

3. Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(d) require the lead agency approving a project to adopt a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the changes to the project that it has adopted or made a condition of project approval in order to ensure compliance during project implementation.

The Regents have prepared an MMRP that designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation for impacts and conditions within

the jurisdiction of the University. Implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Project FEIR MMRP will be accomplished through administrative controls over Project planning and implementation, and monitoring and enforcement of these measures will be accomplished through inspection and documentation by appropriate University personnel.

The Project MMRP is attached to these findings as Exhibit 1. The Regents have adopted and will implement all of the measures proposed for implementation in these findings. The City hereby adopts as required by CEQA Section 21081.6 and Guidelines Section 15091(d), the Project MMRP, which mitigation measures are applicable to the City approval actions as more fully set forth and explained above. The City hereby finds that The Regents can and should implement the mitigation measures contained in the MMRP as part of its implementation of the Project.

4. Additional Findings

The City has reviewed the environmental effects of the Project as reflected in the Project FEIR and other records of proceedings. The City finds that the Project FEIR is adequate for use by the City in its role as responsible agency. The City further finds that all Project impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level by the incorporation by The Regents of the mitigation measures identified in Exhibit 1 into the Project. The Regents have committed to implement the MMRP as part of its implementation of the Project. The City has adopted The Regents MMRP and found that The Regents can and should implement the mitigation measures in the MMRP as part of The Regents implementation of the Project.; The City therefore finds, based on these CEQA Findings and the information contained in the record, that all significant effects on the environment due to its approval of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened to a less than significant level.

CHAPTER 9

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

9.1 OVERVIEW

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that a Lead Agency establish a program to monitor and report on mitigation measures adopted as part of the environmental review process to avoid or reduce the severity and magnitude of potentially significant environmental impacts associated with project implementation. CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 (a)(1)) requires that a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) be adopted at the time that the agency determines to carry out a project for which an EIR has been prepared, to ensure that mitigation measures identified in the EIR are fully implemented.

The MMRP for the proposed Project is presented in the following table, which includes the full text of mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR. The MMRP includes the mitigation measures adopted as part of the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay project that are included as part of the Project, as well as the LRDP Amendment #2 mitigation measures that are applicable to the project. The MMRP describes implementation and monitoring procedures, responsibilities, and timing for each mitigation measure identified in the EIR, including:

Significant Impact: Identifies the Impact Number and statement from the Final EIR.

Mitigation or Improvement Measures: Provides full text of the mitigation measures as provided in the Final EIR.

Implementation: Summarizes the steps to be taken to implement the measure.

Responsible Unit: Designates responsibility for implementation of the measure.

Report Mechanism: Specifies procedures for documenting and reporting mitigation implementation.

Consistent with UC policy, UCSF may modify the means by which a mitigation measure will be implemented, as long as the alternative means ensure compliance during project implementation. The responsibilities of mitigation implementation, monitoring and reporting extend to several UCSF departments and offices. The manager or department lead of the identified unit or department will be directly responsible for ensuring the responsible party complies with the mitigation. The UCSF Campus Planning Department is responsible for the overall administration of the program and for assisting relevant departments and project managers in their oversight and reporting responsibilities. The Department is also responsible for ensuring the relevant

parties understand their charge and complete the required procedures accurately and on schedule.

**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA**

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
--------------------	--------------------	----------------	------------------	------------------

MITIGATION MEASURES NEWLY IDENTIFIED IN THE EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

No new mitigation measures are required.

MITIGATION MEASURES IDENTIFIED IN PRIOR EIRS THAT ARE APPLICABLE TO THE FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA PROJECT

AESTHETICS

<p>4.1-1 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR): New hospital development at any of the sites could increase light and glare which could affect nighttime views at the selected site in its vicinity.</p> <p>[note: as only certain portions of this mitigation measure are applicable to the proposed Project, the mitigation measure has been revised accordingly.]</p>	<p>Minimize light and glare from new hospital development through the orientation of buildings, the proposed project through use of landscaping materials, and choice of primary facade materials. Design standards and guidelines to minimize light and glare would be adopted for the new hospital development, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflective metal walls and mirrored glass walls shall not be used as primary building materials for facades. • Installation of illuminated building signage shall strive to be consistent with City Planning Code sign requirements and/or Mission Bay design guidelines. • Exterior light fixtures shall be configured to emphasize close spacing and lower intensity light. Light fixtures shall use luminaries that direct the cone 	<p>Issue instructions to the architect/landscape architect to incorporate the mitigations as design criteria.</p> <p>Working with the Project Manager, require architect/landscape architect and design professionals to document how siting and design measures are addressed and incorporated. Review design plans for the proposed project to ensure that such features have been incorporated in the design to address the impacts.</p>	<p>UCSF Medical Center Project Manager, Campus Planning</p>	<p>Provide written verification to Monitor during design phase regarding compliance with this mitigation measure.</p>
--	---	---	---	---

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	of light downward.			
4.1-2 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR): Construction of a new hospital could result in flood lighting at any of the sites during nighttime construction activities.	UCSF would <u>shall</u> require a condition in construction contracts that flood or area lighting for construction activities be placed and directed so as to avoid potential disturbances to adjacent residences or other uses.	Include the lighting restrictions in construction contracts. Working with the project and construction managers, require contractors to document compliance with construction lighting measures. Review construction documentation to ensure that mitigation is included to address lighting effects.	UCSF Medical Center and construction project manager	Provide written verification in report form to Monitor within 10 working days of each contract bid to certify that selected bid includes provisions for construction lighting. During construction phase, construction manager shall document compliance with this mitigation measure.
AIR QUALITY				
4.2-2 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR): Demolition and construction activities associated with the hospital construction would generate fugitive dust and criteria pollutant emissions that could adversely affect local air quality. [note: this mitigation measure has been updated to be consistent with more recent BAAQMD dust control guidelines]	During construction, UCSF shall require the construction contractor to implement the appropriate level of BAAQMD’s dust control procedures for all construction sites. UCSF shall include this requirement in all construction contracts. This mitigates this impact to less than significant. Elements of the basic dust control program include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following: • Water active construction areas at least twice daily. Watering should be sufficient to prevent airborne dust from leaving the site. Increased watering frequency may be necessary whenever wind speeds exceed 15 miles per hour. Reclaimed water should be used whenever possible;	Issue instructions in each bid package of each construction project for contractors to incorporate the mitigation. The successful contractor will prepare a construction air pollution control strategy to report on the implementation of the mitigation measure.	UCSF Medical Center and construction project manager	Provide written verification in report form to Monitor within 10 working days of each contract bid to certify that selected bid includes provisions for construction air pollution control. Provide a report on construction air pollution control strategies and report to Monitor upon request; but no less than quarterly after beginning of construction activities.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cover trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard (i.e., the minimum required space between the top of the load and the top of the trailer); • Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply nontoxic soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; • Sweep daily (with water sweepers, using reclaimed water if possible) if soil material visible all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites; • Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers, using reclaimed water if possible) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. • <u>All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day.</u> • <u>All haul trucks transporting soil, sand or other loose material off-site shall be covered.</u> • <u>All visible mud or dirt track-out</u> 			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p><u>onto adjacent public roads shall be removed using wet power vacuum street sweepers at least once per day. The use of dry power sweeping is prohibited.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph.</u> • <u>All roadways, driveways and sidewalks to be paved shall be completed as soon as possible. Building pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.</u> • <u>Idling times shall be minimized either by shutting equipment off when not in use or reducing the maximum idling time to 5 minutes (as required by the California airborne toxics control measure Title 13, Section 2485 of the California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</u> • <u>All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer’s specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified visible emissions evaluator.</u> • <u>Post a publicly visible sign with</u> 			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p><u>the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</u></p>			
	<p>If the working area of any construction site exceeds four acres at any one time, implement the enhanced PM10 control measures, in addition to the basic control measures listed above, in accordance with the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines:</p>			
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hydroseed or apply nontoxic soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas; • Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply non-toxic soil binders to exposed stockpiles; • Limit vehicle speed on construction site unpaved roads to 15 miles per hour; • Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways; • Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. 			
	<p>If the working area of any</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>construction site is located near sensitive receptors, the following measures are strongly encouraged in addition to those listed above:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Install wheel washers or wash off the tires of trucks and equipment leaving the site; • Install wind breaks at the windward side(s) of construction areas; • Suspend excavation and grading when winds exceed 25 miles per hour; • Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activity at any one time. 			
<p>MCMB.2-1 (MCMB EIR): Demolition and construction activities associated with the Medical Center at Mission Bay project would generate fugitive dust and criteria pollutant emissions that could adversely affect local air quality.</p>	<p>To further mitigate less than significant project level impacts, additional measures related to The 2007 CARB off-road diesel rule on equipment exhaust emissions from construction equipment shall be required in UCSF construction contracts to comply with the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prohibit the use of conventional cutback asphalt for paving to restrict the maximum VOC content of asphalt emulsion. Diesel portable generators less than 50 horsepower shall not be allowed at 	<p>Issue instructions in each bid package of each construction project for contractors to incorporate the mitigation. The successful contractor will prepare a construction air pollution control strategy to report on the implementation of the mitigation measure.</p>	<p>UCSF Medical Center and construction project manager</p>	<p>Provide written verification in report form to the Monitor within 10 working days of each contract bid to certify that selected bid includes provision for construction air pollution control. Provide a report on construction air pollution control strategies and report to Monitor upon request; but no less than quarterly after beginning of construction activities.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>the construction site, except for those used by welders.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All diesel-fueled engines used for on- and offsite construction activities shall be fueled only with ultralow sulfur diesel, which contains no more than 15 ppm sulfur. • All construction diesel engines used for on- and offsite activities that have a rating of 100 hp or more shall meet, at a minimum, the Tier 2 California Emission Standards for Off-Road Compression-Ignition Engines as specified in California Code of Regulations, Title 13, section 2423(b)(1) unless it is certified by the construction contractor that such engine is not available for a particular item of equipment. In the event a Tier 2 engine is not available for any off-road engine larger than 100 hp, that engine shall be a Tier 1 engine. In the event a Tier 1 or Tier 2 engine is not available for any offroad engine larger than 100 hp, that engine shall be equipped with a CARB Level 3-verified diesel emission control device (e.g., catalyzed diesel particulate filter), unless the engine manufacturer or the construction contractor certifies that the use of such 			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>devices is not practical for specific engine types. In the event that a CARB Level 3 verified diesel emission control device is not practical for the specific engine type, then the engine shall be equipped with a CARB Level 1- or 2-verified control device (e.g., diesel oxidation catalyst), unless the engine manufacturer or the construction contractor certifies that such devices are not available for the engine in question. For purposes of this condition, the use of such devices is “not practical” if, among other reasons:</p>			
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The construction equipment is intended to be onsite for ten (10) days or less. 2. The use of the diesel emission control device is excessively reducing normal availability of the construction equipment due to increased downtime for maintenance, and/or reduced power output due to an excessive increase in backpressure. 3. The diesel emission control device is causing or is reasonably expected to cause significant engine damage. 			
	<p>In the event that the use of a diesel emission control device is to be</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>terminated, the construction contractor shall be required to inform the UCSF project manager within 10 days prior to such termination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. • Best management construction practices shall be used to avoid (or limit) unnecessary emissions (e.g., trucks and vehicles in loading and unloading queues would turn their engines off when not in use, and to the extent practical, all diesel heavy construction equipment shall not remain running at idle for more than five minutes) • Use alternative fueled equipment when feasible (such as ULSD, CNG, biodiesel, water emulsion fuel, and electric). The construction contracts shall require each contractor and subcontractor to consider this measure and adopt it for their work unless they can demonstrate to UCSF the inapplicability or infeasibility of the measure to their specific work, or can provide mitigation measures with equivalent or better effectiveness. This information shall be reported as part of the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting 			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>and Compliance Program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use on-site power when feasible to reduce reliance on portable generators. The construction contracts shall require each contractor and subcontractor to consider this measure and adopt it for their work unless they can demonstrate to UCSF the inapplicability or infeasibility of the measure to their specific work, or can provide mitigation measures with equivalent or better effectiveness. This information shall be reported as part of the Mitigation Monitoring Reporting and Compliance Program. 			

CULTURAL (ARCHAEOLOGICAL) RESOURCES

<p>4.3-1 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR): Building construction, including excavation and grading associated with the proposed project, could cause substantial adverse change to archaeological resources at the project sites.</p>	<p>Should an archaeological artifact be discovered at the Mission Bay site during project construction and excavation, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (f), “provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction” should be instituted. In the event that any prehistoric or historic subsurface cultural resources are discovered during ground disturbing activities, all work within 100 feet of the resources shall be halted and UCSF shall consult with a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to assess the significance of the find</p>	<p>Issue instructions in each bid package for contractors to incorporate the mitigation. The successful contractor will demonstrate knowledge of procedures and requirements when cultural resources are discovered during construction activities.</p>	<p>UCSF Medical Center and construction project manager.</p>	<p>Provide written verification in report form to the Monitor within 10 working days of each contract bid to certify that selected bid includes provision for mitigation if cultural resources are discovered during construction activities. Provide construction status report to Monitor upon request.</p>
--	---	---	--	---

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>(per Public Resource Code Section 5024.1, Title 14 CCR, Section 4852 and/or Public Resource Code 21083.2 in the event of a unique archaeological find). If any find is determined to be significant and will be adversely affected by the project, representatives of UCSF and the qualified archaeologist and/or paleontologist would meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate mitigation (per CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (b) and Public Resource Code 21083.2). All significant cultural materials recovered shall be subject to scientific analysis, professional museum curation, and documented by the qualified archaeologist according to current professional standards (Per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation (48 FR 44716)).</p> <p>If the discovery includes human remains, CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (e)(1) shall be followed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the event of the accidental discovery or recognition of any human remains in any location other than a dedicated cemetery, the following steps should be taken: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the 			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until:</p>			
	<p>(A) The coroner of the county in which the remains are discovered must be contacted to determine that no investigation of the cause of death is required, and</p>			
	<p>(B) If the coroner determines the remains to be Native American: (1) The coroner shall contact the Native American Heritage Commission within 24 hours. (2) The Native American Heritage Commission shall identify the person or persons it believes to be the most likely descended from the deceased Native American. (3) The most likely descendent may make recommendations to the landowner or the person responsible for the excavation work, for means of treating or disposing of, with appropriate dignity, the human remains and any associated grave goods as provided in Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, or</p>			
	<p>(2) Where the following conditions occur, the landowner</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
12M4-2 (1996 LRDP EIR):	<p>or his authorized representative shall rebury the Native American human remains and associated grave goods with appropriate dignity on the property in a location not subject to further subsurface disturbance.</p> <p>(A) The Native American Heritage Commission is unable to identify a most likely descendent or the most likely descendent failed to make a recommendation within 24 hours after being notified by the commission.</p> <p>(B) The descendant identified fails to make a recommendation; or</p> <p>(C) The landowner or his authorized representative rejects the recommendation of the descendant, and the mediation by the Native American Heritage Commission fails to provide measures acceptable to the landowner.</p>			
	<p>If construction activities associated with the Major New Site and Mission Bay occurred within areas shown on Figure 12-28, UCSF would implement mitigation measures, as adapted from Mitigation Measures</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>J.1, J.2, J.3 and J.6 of the <i>Mission Bay Mitigation Monitoring Program</i> to protect historic archaeological 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 constructing archaeologist would develop archaeological exploration programs for the areas shown on Figure 12-28 having potential historic cultural resources. <p>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.</p>			
D.3 (1998 Mission Bay SEIR):	<p>Retain the services of an archaeologist, because of the strong possibility of encountering the remains of cultural or historic artifacts or features in the six historic resources areas. The Environmental Review Officer (ERO) in consultation with the President of the Landmarks Preservation Advisory Board (LPAB)</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>and the archaeologist would determine: 1) whether the archaeologist should instruct all excavation and foundation crews on the project site of the potential for discovery of historic archaeological deposits and artifacts, and the procedures to be followed if such materials are uncovered; and 2) prior to the commencement of foundation excavation, a program of archaeological testing.</p> <p>Regain a qualified historic archeologist to supervise a pre-foundation excavation testing program for each phase of Project Area development or each construction site, as appropriate, using a series of mechanical, exploratory borings or other testing methods determined by the archaeologist to be appropriate. A qualified historical archaeologist would supervise the testing in the six historic resource areas to determine the probability of finding cultural and historical remains. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archeologist would submit a written report first and directly to the ERO and the President of the LPAB, with a copy to the project sponsor, which described the findings, assesses their significance and proposes appropriate recommendations for</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>any additional procedures necessary for the mitigation of adverse impacts to cultural resources determined to be significant.</p> <p>Retain a certified archaeologist to supervise a program of on-site monitoring during site excavation in the six historic resource areas, following site clearance and pre-excavation testing. The certified archaeologist would record observations in a permanent log. Should cultural or historic artifacts be found following commencement of excavation activities, the archaeologist would assess the significance of the find, and immediately report to the ERO and the President of LPAB. Upon receiving the advice of the consultant and the LPAB, the ERO would recommend specific mitigation measures, if necessary. The monitoring program, whether or not there are finds of significance, would result in a written report to be submitted first and directly to the ERO and the President of the LPAB, with a copy to the project sponsor.</p> <p>Suspend excavation or construction activities which might damage discovered cultural resources for a total maximum of four weeks over the course of construction at each site to permit inspection,</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>recommendation and retrieval, if appropriate.</p> <p>Implement an appropriate security program to prevent looting or destruction, if cultural resources of potential significance are discovered. Any discovered cultural artifact assessed as significant by the archaeologist upon concurrence by the ERO and the President of the LPAB would be placed in a repository designated for such materials or possibly exhibited in a public display. Following approval of the archaeological testing and monitoring program reports by the ERO and the President of LPAB, a final report would be sent to the California Archaeological Site Survey Office at Sonoma State University, the Foundation for San Francisco’s Architectural Heritage and the State Office of Historic Preservation. The Office of Environmental Review would receive three final copies of the final archaeological findings report. Archaeological testing could be coordinated with other site investigations for geotechnical and toxic waste purposes.</p>			
GEOLOGY/SOILS				
<p>4.4-4 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR): In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic ground shaking could</p>	<p>A site-specific, design-level geotechnical investigation shall be completed based on the proposed project design and shall provide</p>	<p>A geotechnical assessment shall be prepared and the results of the investigation incorporated into the project design to address impacts.</p>	<p>UCSF Medical Center Project Manager</p>	<p>Provide the Monitor with final geotechnical investigation that reports feasible measures and incorporates</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
expose people and property to liquefaction and earthquake-induced settlement at Mission Bay.	engineering recommendations for mitigation of liquefiable soils, in accordance with the California Geological Survey’s Geology Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards (CGS Special Publication 117, 1997). These geotechnical recommendations shall be incorporated into the final design of the project.	Information from the geotechnical investigation for the MCMB may be used, as applicable.		them into project design.
HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
4.6-3 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR): Construction of new hospital buildings at the Mission Bay North or South sites by the LRDP Phase or Future Phases could result in hydrology and water quality impacts at Mission Bay.	<p>UCSF shall adopt Mitigation Measures K.2, K.3 and K.4 of the Mission Bay Subsequent EIR as follows:</p> <p>K.2 Participate in the City’s existing Water Pollution Prevention Program. Facilitate implementation of the City’s Water Pollution Prevention Program by providing and installing wastewater sampling ports in any building anticipated to have a potentially significant discharge of pollutants to the sanitary sewer, as determined by the Water Pollution Prevention Program of the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission’s Bureau of Environmental Regulation and Management, and in locations as determined by the Water Pollution Prevention Program.</p> <p>K.3 Design and construct sewer improvements such that potential</p>	Issue instructions in each bid package for contractor to incorporate the mitigation measures	UCSF Medical Center Project Manager	Provide written verification in report form to the Monitor within 10 working days of each contract bid to certify that selected bid includes provision for mitigation measures. Provide construction status report to Monitor upon request.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>flows to the City’s combined sewer system from the project do not contribute to an increase in the annual overflow volume as projected by the Bayside Planning Model by providing increased storage in oversized pipes, centralized storage facilities, smaller dispersed storage facilities, or detention basins, or through other means to reduce or delay stormwater discharges to the City system.</p> <p>This mitigation measure could be implemented by including the Water Pollution Prevention Program in the review process, as each individual construction is proposed. The Water Pollution Prevention Program would review each project, determine if one or more sampling ports should be installed in a particular building, and specify the location of the sampling port(s).</p> <p>K.4 Implement alternative technologies or use other means to reduce settleable solids and floatable materials in stormwater discharges to China Basin Channel to levels equivalent to, or better than, City-treated combined sewer overflows. Such alternatives technologies could include one or more of the following: biofilter system, vortex sediment system, catch basin filters, and/or additional source control measures to</p>			

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	remove particulates from streets and parking lots.			
NOISE				
MCMB.5-1 (MCMB EIR): Demolition and construction activities associated with the proposed project would elevate noise levels in and around the project site, and particularly at nearby sensitive receptors.	<p>UCSF shall require construction contractors to minimize unavoidable construction noise impacts by use of proper equipment and work scheduling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit construction hours to the following schedule. [Monday through Friday, 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. for “Not Noisy” work; and Monday through Friday 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. for Noisy work] Approve extended hours [Monday through Friday, 5 p.m. to 8 p.m.; Saturday 7 a.m. to 8 p.m.; and Sunday 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.] only with advanced notice from the UCSF project manager. Prohibit high impact noise on Saturdays and Sundays. Designate a UCSF Community Contact to receive and resolve construction complaints. 	<p>Issue instructions in each bid package for contractors to incorporate the mitigation. The successful contractor will prepare a construction noise impact abatement plan to report on the implementation of the mitigation measure.</p> <p>Designate a UCSF Community Contact to receive and resolve construction noise complaints.</p>	<p>UCSF Medical Center and construction project manager</p> <p>UCSF Community Relations</p>	<p>Provide written verification in report form to the Monitor within 10 working days of each contract bid to certify that selected bid includes provisions for construction noise abatement (including limitations on construction hours). Provide a report on construction noise abatement to Monitor upon request; but no less than quarterly after the beginning of construction activities.</p> <p>Provide written verification to the Monitor within 10 working days of the first contract bid identifying the UCSF Community Contact and contact information.</p>
4.6 TRANSPORTATION				
4.11-1 (LRDP Amendment #2 EIR): Building construction, including demolition, excavation, and grading associated with the proposed	To assure that construction and/or demolition activities minimize parking demand and circulation obstruction, UCSF shall require construction and/or demolition	Issue instructions in each bid package for contractors to incorporate the mitigation. Require the successful contractor to prepare a construction traffic and circulation	UCSF Medical Center and construction project manager.	Provide written verification to the Monitor within 10 working days of each contract bid to certify that selected bid includes provisions for a construction traffic and circulation

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
<p>project could cause substantial adverse impacts to traffic flow, circulation and access as well as to transit, pedestrian, and parking conditions.</p>	<p>contractors to develop and implement construction traffic and parking management plans during demolition and/or construction activities at all campus sites. The plans would be expected to include measures such as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop a traffic management plan in consultation with the San Francisco DPT and Muni to minimize disruption due to lane closures. The plan should be consistent with the Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets and Chapter 6 of the California Supplement to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices. • Prepare an offsite parking plan for construction employees and subcontractor employees. An alternative plan would provide shuttle service to/from designated remote parking lots and/or public transportation transfer nodes. This plan would be incorporated into the construction contract between UCSF and the contractor. • Schedule heavy-truck deliveries with the construction project manager at least one day in advance. • Whenever possible, make 	<p>plan for the proposed project and to report on the implementation of the mitigation measure.</p>		<p>plan. Provide a construction traffic and circulation plan implementation report to Monitor upon request, but no less than quarterly after the beginning of construction activities.</p>

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (Continued)
EIR FOR THE UCSF MEDICAL CENTER AT MISSION BAY – FOURTH STREET PUBLIC PLAZA

Significant Impact	Mitigation Measure	Implementation	Responsible Unit	Report Mechanism
	<p>deliveries using trucks of 40 feet maximum bumper-to-bumper length.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Whenever possible schedule heavy trucks deliveries to arrive at off-peak hours, outside of 7:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m. • Note any deliveries that cannot comply with the above requirements for heavy trucks on the schedule, and notify the UCSF construction project manager at least 48 hours in advance. The contractor may provide flagmen to direct traffic in those cases. 			