

**CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT FINDINGS IN CONNECTION
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE GROUND LEASE AND LEASE DISPOSITION AND
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE RESEARCH BUILDING AT THE
PRISCILLA CHAN AND MARK ZUCKERBERG SAN FRANCISCO GENERAL
HOSPITAL AND TRAUMA CENTER AT THE SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS**

I. CERTIFICATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The University of California (“University” or “UCSF”), as the lead agency pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”), has prepared a Final Environmental Impact Report (“Final EIR”) for the Research Building at the Priscilla Chan and Mark Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center Campus and the City Parking Garage Expansion (the “Project”). The Project will be developed at the Priscilla Chan and Mark Zuckerberg San Francisco General Hospital and Trauma Center Campus (“ZSFG”) on the B/C parking lot at Twenty-Third Street between Vermont and Utah streets, following the University’s lease of the B/C parking lot from the City and County of San Francisco (the “City”). The Board of Regents (the “Board”) hereby issues these Findings and concurrently approves the ground lease of the B/C parking lot and the Lease Disposition and Development Agreement by and between the University and the City (the “LDDA”) in support of the Research Building component of the Project. The initial decision in support of the approval of the Research Building component of the Project is the Board’s approval of the ground lease of the B/C parking lot and the LDDA. Budget, design and external finance approval of the Research Building component of the Project will be brought forth at a later date.

The Final EIR has been assigned State Clearinghouse Number 2015102010. The Final EIR assesses the potential environmental effects of implementation of the Project, identifies the means to eliminate or reduce potentially significant adverse impacts, and evaluates a reasonable range of alternatives to the Project, including four variants to the City Parking Garage Expansion component of the Project. The Final EIR also responds to comments on the Draft EIR, explains changes made to the text of the Draft EIR, and includes a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that outlines the substance and timing of mitigation measures required for the Project.

Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081 and CEQA Guidelines section 15090, the Board certifies that it completed the following activities prior to approving the ground lease of the B/C parking lot and the LDDA in support of the Research Building component of the Project: the Board has received the Final EIR; the Board has reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR and received through public comments; and the Board has considered all additional written and oral statements received prior to or at its public hearing on the Final EIR and on the Project. The Board additionally certifies that the Final EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA and that the Final EIR reflects the University’s independent judgment and analysis. The conclusions presented in these Findings are based on the Final EIR and other evidence in the administrative record.

II. FINDINGS

Having received, reviewed, and considered the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record, the Board hereby adopts the following Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the Research Building component of the Project in compliance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University's procedures for implementing CEQA. The Board adopts these Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations in conjunction with its approval of the ground lease of the B/C parking lot and the LDDA in support of the Research Building component of the Project, as set forth in Section III, below.

A. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW PROCESS

1. CEQA Process and Preparation of the EIR

On October 6, 2015, a Notice of Preparation ("NOP"), including an Initial Study, was published for the Project's EIR. The 30-day public comment period ended on November 5, 2015. A copy of the NOP/Initial Study is included in Appendix A of the Initial Study. A scoping meeting was held on October 21, 2015, in the Cafeteria on the ZSFG campus, to accept public input on environmental topics to be analyzed in the EIR and approaches to the impact analyses. Written and oral comments received on the NOP are included in Appendix B of the Draft EIR. The Draft EIR was published on March 23, 2016, commencing a 45-day public review period ending on May 9, 2016. Notices of availability of the document were distributed to the public and advertised in the San Francisco Examiner and two neighborhood newspapers – the Potrero View and El Tecolote. The University also mailed postcards to nearly 2,800 residences and businesses surrounding the Project site, and provided written notification to a comprehensive mailing list that included adjacent property owners, community groups, neighbors, and other individuals. The University emailed notice to about 115 individuals and organizations on the University's neighborhood listserv. Copies of the Draft EIR were placed at various branches of the San Francisco Public Library (Main Library, Mission branch, Potrero Hill branch, Bernal Heights branch, and Mission Bay branch) and at the UCSF Mission Bay campus library. The Draft EIR was posted online on the Campus Planning website. The Draft EIR was sent to the State Clearinghouse and to other local and regional agencies. A public hearing for the Draft EIR was held on April 21, 2016, and a transcript of the public hearing can be found in Section 9.2 of the Final EIR.

i. Public Comments

During the public review period, eleven (11) comment letters on the Draft EIR were received, and ten (10) people provided verbal comments at the Draft EIR public hearing. Written responses to the comments were prepared and included in the Final EIR. Among the comment letters received, four (4) were from City departments – the Department of Public Health (DPH), the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), the Planning Department (Planning), and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). The DPH letter

RESEARCH BUILDING AT THE ZSFG SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS

CEQA FINDINGS

November 16, 2016

Page 3

provided information concerning a “Parking Relief Plan” involving potential temporary off-site parking (on a site(s) not yet identified) during construction activities. The SFMTA and Planning letters provided detailed comments concerning the traffic analysis and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. The HPC letter expresses concurrence with the findings and analysis with the Cultural and Paleontological Resources section of the Draft EIR.

Comments from the general public, neighbors, or neighborhood groups included (1) opposition to the proposed displacement of parking due to the Research Building; (2) opposition to development on the few “open space” areas remaining on campus; (3) opposition to the proposed expansion of the City-owned parking structure, including retail space; (4) desires to see the proposed Research Building constructed on the UCSF Mission Bay campus site instead of the City’s ZSFG campus; (5) concerns about densification at the site; (6) concerns about construction-period impacts, such as air quality, noise, truck traffic, and glare; and (7) concerns about operational impacts such as increased traffic, parking demand, and litter.

One letter from a group of individuals and organizations included the following comments: (1) that UCSF should not be lead agency because the site is City property and is covered by a San Francisco Conditional Use Permit, Final EIR for the ZSFG hospital rebuild project and the ZSFG Institutional Master Plan; (2) that seismic retrofit of the existing historic brick buildings should be included in the EIR as an alternative; (3) that impacts on the historic brick buildings and the historic district should be analyzed; (4) that mitigation measures associated with the City’s proposed garage expansion are not realistic; (5) that the proposed City garage expansion is not consistent with the San Francisco General Plan; (6) that discretionary approvals include the City and UC and all current mitigations associated with the ZSFG hospital rebuild project must be enforced prior to EIR certification and approval of the proposed project; (7) that cumulative impacts need to be considered; and (8) that the traffic and parking analyses are deficient. All comments have been responded to in the Final EIR. None of the issues raised by the commenters alters the Draft EIR analysis in any significant way.

ii. Final EIR

The Final EIR contains all of the comment letters received during the public comment period, as well as a transcript of the public hearing held on April 21, 2016. The Final EIR also contains responses to those comments, which the University prepared in accordance with CEQA, the CEQA Guidelines, and the University’s procedures for implementing CEQA. The Board has reviewed the comments received and the responses thereto and finds that the Final EIR provides adequate, good faith, and reasoned responses to those comments.

2. Absence of Significant New Information

CEQA Guidelines section 15088.5 requires that a lead agency recirculate an EIR for additional review and comment when significant new information is added to the EIR after the public comment period but before certification. Such information can include changes in the project or environmental setting, but that information is not significant unless the EIR is changed

in a manner that deprives the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment upon a substantial adverse environmental effect of the project or a feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect that the project's proponent declines to implement.

The following text changes were made to the Draft EIR and are incorporated as Section 8.3 "Text Changes" in the Final EIR. Changes were made to the Summary to clarify the implementation of one traffic improvement measure; to the Project Description to add TDM planning coordination and strategies; to Cultural and Paleontological Resources to include impacts on public art; to Transportation and Traffic to revise Mitigation Measure TR-3 and include additional TDM strategies to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips while explaining additional TDM strategies that were considered as part of the internal planning process, but rejected as infeasible; and to Appendix C, Transportation Impact Study in order to include the results of employee surveys. These text changes are either minor or technical revisions, and do not trigger the criteria for recirculation.

The Board finds that no significant new information was added to the Draft EIR after the public review period. The Board specifically finds that: no new significant environmental impact would result from the Research Building component of the Project or from the implementation of a mitigation measure; no substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result, or if such an increase would result, the University has adopted mitigation measures to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance; the University has not declined to adopt any feasible project alternative or mitigation measures considerably different from others previously analyzed that would clearly lessen the environmental impacts of the Research Building component of the Project; and the Draft EIR is not so fundamentally and basically inadequate in nature that it precluded meaningful public review.

Having reviewed the information in the Draft EIR, Final EIR, and administrative record, as well as the requirements under CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 and interpretive judicial authority regarding recirculation of Draft EIRs, the Board finds that no new significant information was added to the EIR following public review, and recirculation of the EIR is therefore unnecessary and not required by CEQA.

3. Differences of Opinion Regarding the Project's Impacts

In making its determination to certify the Final EIR and to approve the Research Building component of the Project, the Board recognizes that the Research Building component of the Project involves several controversial environmental issues and that a range of opinion exists with respect to these issues. Through its review of the Final EIR, the comments received on the Draft EIR, and the responses to comments, the Board has acquired a comprehensive understanding of the scope of such issues. This has enabled the Board to make fully informed and thoroughly considered decisions after taking into account the various viewpoints on the important environmental issues involved in the Research Building component of the Project's implementation. Considering the evidence and analysis presented in the Final EIR as a whole, the Board finds that the Findings herein are based on a full appraisal of all viewpoints expressed

throughout the CEQA review process, as well as other relevant information contained in the administrative record.

B. IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

As required by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the following section summarizes the environmental impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR and includes the Board's Findings regarding those impacts and any mitigation measures set forth in the Final EIR, adopted by the Board, and incorporated as requirements of the Research Building component of the Project. These Findings summarize the determinations of the Final EIR with respect to the Project's impacts before and after mitigation and do not attempt to describe the full analysis of each environmental impact considered in the Final EIR. Instead, the Findings provide a summary description of each impact, describe the applicable mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and adopted by the Board for the Research Building component of the Project, and state the Board's Findings regarding the significance of each impact with the adopted mitigation measures. The Final EIR contains a full explanation of each impact, mitigation measure, and the analysis that led the University to its conclusions on those impacts. These Findings hereby incorporate by reference the discussion and analysis in the Final EIR, which supports the Final EIR's determinations regarding the Project's environmental impacts and mitigation measures. In making these Findings, the Board ratifies, adopts, and incorporates by reference the Final EIR's analysis, determinations, and conclusions relating to environmental impacts and mitigation measures, except to the extent that any such determinations and conclusions are specifically and expressly modified by these Findings.

As described in the Final EIR, UCSF would develop the Research Building on the B/C Lot site, and the Parking Authority of the City would develop the City Parking Garage Expansion. If the Research Building component of the Project is approved, the mitigation measures would be adopted by the Regents. Therefore, all mitigation measures applicable to the Research Building for significant impacts must be carried out in order to fulfill the requirements of approval. A number of the mitigation measures would be implemented during the course of the development review process. These measures would be checked on plans, in reports, and in the field prior to construction. Most of the remaining mitigation measures would be implemented during the construction or implementation of the Research Building component of the Project. If the proposed City Parking Garage Expansion at ZSFG is approved, implementation and enforcement of certain mitigation measures related to construction of the City Parking Garage Expansion would be adopted by the Parking Authority and the responsibility of the Parking Authority and/or the City and County of San Francisco approving bodies as applicable, which may include the Board of Supervisors, Planning Commission, Public Health Commission and Department of Public Health (DPH), San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA), Department of Public Works, and Building Department.

In adopting the mitigation measures described below, the Board intends to adopt each of the mitigation measures recommended in the Final EIR related to the Research Building component of the Project. Accordingly, in the event that a mitigation measure recommended in

RESEARCH BUILDING AT THE ZSFG SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS

CEQA FINDINGS

November 16, 2016

Page 6

the Final EIR has been inadvertently omitted from these Findings, that mitigation measure is hereby adopted and incorporated by reference in the Findings. Additionally, in the event that the description of mitigation measures set forth below fails accurately to capture the substance of a given mitigation measure due to a clerical error (as distinct from specific and express modification by the Board through these Findings), the language of the mitigation measure as set forth in the Final EIR shall govern.

With respect to mitigation measures that were suggested in comments by the public or other public agencies but not included in the Final EIR, the responses to comments explain that the suggested mitigation measures either are already part of the Project and associated CEQA documentation or are infeasible or ineffectual and thus not recommended for adoption for the reasons outlined in the responses to comments. The Board hereby adopts and incorporates by reference the reasons stated in the responses to comments as the basis for finding these suggested mitigation measures not necessary or appropriate for inclusion as Project requirements.

The Final EIR focuses only on areas for which the Initial Study determined additional environmental review would be required, namely Aesthetics, Air Quality, Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Land Use, Noise, and Transportation. With respect to Aesthetics, the Initial Study determined that the Project would have less than significant impact concerning scenic vistas and scenic resources, and a less than significant impact with mitigation incorporated concerning new sources of substantial light or glare. Therefore, the Final EIR only analyzes whether the Project would substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. With respect to Land Use, the Initial Study found that the Project would not physically divide an established community, conflict with any applicable habit conservation plan or natural community conservation plan, or have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity. Therefore, the Final EIR analyzes the Project's potential effect of conflicting with any applicable land use plan adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect or conflicting with local land use regulations such that a significant incompatibility is created with adjacent land uses. With respect to Noise, the Initial Study determined that the Project is not located within two miles of a public airport, an airport land use plan, along any of the primary or alternative flight paths of helicopters accessing the UCSF Medical Center at Mission Bay helipad, and would not expose people to excessive noise levels from aircraft operations. Therefore, the Final EIR analyzes exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in any applicable plan or noise ordinance, excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels, ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity, and construction noise levels in the Project vicinity. With respect to potential Transportation impacts, the Initial Study concluded that the project would have no impact on air traffic patterns or transit systems or service. The Initial Study also concluded that the Project would not substantially result in inadequate emergency access. Therefore, the Final EIR analyzes whether the Project would conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, conflict with an applicable congestion management program, substantially increase hazards due to a design feature, conflict with adopted policies, plans or programs regarding public transit, bicycle or pedestrian facilities,

or exceed the applicable LRDP EIR standards of significance by causing substantial conflict among autos, bicyclists, pedestrians, and transit vehicles.

1. Aesthetics

- i. *Impact AES-1: The proposed project would not substantially damage scenic resources or other features that contribute to a scenic public setting or substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.1-6 to 4.1-9), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not result in a significant impact on the scenic attributes of ZSFG; therefore, no mitigation is required.

2. Air Quality

- i. *Impact AQ-1: The proposed project and its variants would result in increased emissions of dust and criteria air pollutants during demolition and construction activities. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The University shall implement several measures from BAAQMD Best Management Practices for particulate control during construction activities of the Project. These measures will reduce particulate emissions primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites. (Final EIR at pages 4.2-22 to 4.2-23).

FINDING: The Board finds that construction activities for the Research Building component of the Project would result in emissions of criteria pollutants from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment, haul truck trips and vehicle trips generated from construction workers traveling to and from the demolition and construction sites (Final EIR at pages 4.2-21 to 4.2-23). Mitigation Measure AQ-1 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Research Building component of the Project. For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.2-23), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would ensure that dust control measures would be implemented during construction of the Research Building consistent with the guidance of the BAAQMD to reduce dust-related impacts to a level that would be less than significant.

- ii. *Impact AQ-2: The proposed project and its variants would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during operation. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.2-23 to 4.2-24), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not result in a significant impact on emissions of criteria air pollutants during operation; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- iii. *Impact AQ-3: Construction and operation of the proposed project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations. (Less than Significant)*

Mitigation Measure AQ-3: The University's construction contractor shall implement measures during construction of the research building to further reduce construction-related exhaust emissions prohibiting portable diesel engines when alternative sources of power are available, and ensuring certain standards for engines in off-road equipment. (Final EIR at pages 4.2-27 to 4.2-28).

FINDING: The Board finds that construction activities for the Research Building component of the Project would generate toxic air contaminants, including diesel particulate matter, and could expose sensitive receptors to substantial air pollutant concentrations (Final EIR at pages 4.2-24 to 4.2-27). Mitigation Measure AQ-3 is hereby adopted and incorporated into the Research Building component of the Project. For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.2-27 to 4.2-30), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-3 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, significantly affect the generation of toxic air contaminants.

- iv. *Impact AQ-4: The proposed project and its variants would not create objectionable odors that would affect a substantial number of people. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.2-30), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not result in a significant impact on objectionable odors; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- v. *Impact AQ-5: The proposed project could conflict with, or obstruct implementation of, the 2010 Clean Air Plan. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure AQ-1: The University shall implement several measures from BAAQMD Best Management Practices for particulate control during construction activities of the Project. These measures will reduce particulate emissions primarily during soil movement, grading and demolition activities but also during vehicle and equipment movement on unpaved project sites. (Final EIR at pages 4.2-22 to 4.2-23).

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.2-30 to 4.2-33), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, conflict with, or obstruct implementation of the 2010 Clean Air Plan.

3. Cultural and Paleontological Resources

- i. *Impact CP-1: Construction of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the SFGH Historic District, a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5, including those resources listed in Article 10 or Article 11 of the San Francisco Planning Code. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure CP-1: The University shall implement several design guidelines for the Research Building component of the Project through provisions that address building height, massing and footprint. The west elevation of the Research Building component of the Project should be generally parallel to the north-south entry road that bisects the ZSFG campus. The south elevation should be generally rectilinear and parallel to Twenty-Third Street. The Research Building component of the Project will be restricted in height, scale and massing. Building facades would be broken up by architectural and design features to minimize the appearance of mass and bulk. The use of masonry exclusively or in combination of compatible exterior cladding materials is encouraged to conform within the SFGH Historic District. Fenestration patterns and proportions should be consistent with the SFGH Historic District. Other site features shall be retained. (Final EIR at pages 4.3-27 to 4.3-29).

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.3-26 to 4.3-29), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure CP-1 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of the SFGH Historic District.

- ii. *Impact CP-2: Construction of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure CP-2: The University shall implement an Archeological Research Design, Testing and Evaluation Plan, Archeological Monitoring Program and/or Archeological Data Recovery Program. The University shall retain the services of an archeological consultant to prepare and implement an Archeological Research Design, Testing, and Evaluation Plan (ARDTEP) prior to project construction of the Research Building. The ARDTEP will guide fieldwork and help to determine if identified archeological remains qualify as significant. The ARDTEP shall be prepared by professionals who meet the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in historical archeology, prehistoric archeology, and history (36 CFR Part 61), and shall be reviewed and approved by the University for the Research Building component of the Project. An appropriate representative shall be contacted upon the discovery of an archeological site associated with descendant Native Americans, the Overseas Chinese, or other descendant group on the Research Building site. The University shall determine with the archaeological consultant whether an Archeological Monitoring Program

and/or Archeological Data Recovery Program is required. The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. The archeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archeological Resources Report (FARR) to the University that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archeological resource and describes the archeological and historical research methods employed in the archeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. (Final EIR at pages 4.3-30 to 4.3-35).

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.3-30 to 4.3-35), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure CP-2 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archeological resource pursuant to Section 15064.5.

- iii. *Impact CP-3: Construction of the proposed project could disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure CP-2: See Section II.B.3.ii above.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.3-36), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure CP-2 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, cause a substantial adverse impact on disturbing any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.

- iv. *Impact CP-4: Construction of the proposed project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Section 21074. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure CP-2: See Section II.B.3.ii above.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.3-36 to 4.3-37), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure CP-2 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, cause a substantial adverse impact in the significant of a tribal cultural resource as defined in PRC Section 21074.

- v. *Impact CP-5: Construction of the proposed project could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site, or a unique geologic feature. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure CP-5: The University shall arrange for a paleontological training by a qualified paleontologist regarding the potential for such resources to exist in the Research

Building component of the Project site and how to identify such resources. The training could consist of a recorded presentation of the initial training that could be reused for new personnel. The training shall also include a review of penalties for looting and disturbance of these resources. An alert sheet shall be prepared by the qualified paleontologist. If potential fossils are discovered by construction crews, all earthwork or other types of ground disturbance within 50 feet of the find shall stop immediately until the qualified professional paleontologist can assess the nature and importance of the find. Based on the scientific value or uniqueness of the find, the paleontologist may record the find and allow work to continue, or recommend salvage and recovery of the fossil. If treatment and salvage is required, recommendations shall be consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 2010 guidelines and currently accepted scientific practice, and shall be subject to review and approval by the University. (Final EIR at pages 4.3-37 to 4.3-38).

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.3-37 to 4.3-38), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure CP-5 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, cause a substantial adverse impact on destroying a unique paleontological resource or site, or a unique geologic feature.

4. Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- i. *Impact GHG-1: The proposed project and its variants would result in an increase in greenhouse gas emissions. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure GHG-1: The University shall implement several BAAQMD-suggested measures during demolition and construction activities, which include using alternative fueled construction vehicles and equipment where feasible, using locally sourced building materials for at least 10% of overall materials brought to site, and recycle or reuse at least 50% of construction waste or demolition materials. (Final EIR at pages 4.4-14 to 4.4-17).

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.4-14 to 4.4-17), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce this potentially significant impact to a less-than-significant impact and that the Research Building component of the Project will not, therefore, cause a substantial adverse impact on greenhouse gas emissions.

- ii. *Impact GHG-2: The proposed project and its variants would not conflict with the AB32 Scoping Plan, the UCSF Climate Action Plan, the UCSF GHG Reduction Strategy, or the City of San Francisco's GHG Reduction Strategy. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.4-17 to 4.4-19), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not result in a

significant impact on the AB32 Scoping Plan, the UCSF Climate Action Plan, or the UCSF GHG Reduction Strategy; therefore, no mitigation is required.

5. Land Use and Planning

- i. *Impact LU-1: The proposed project would be consistent with the applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect, and would not conflict with local land use regulations such that a significant incompatibility is created with adjacent land uses. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.5-8 to 4.5-9), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies, and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- ii. *Impact LU-2: The proposed project would not have a substantial impact upon the existing character of the vicinity. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.5-11 to 4.5-12), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would be consistent with existing uses on the ZSFG campus, which are generally compatible with the surrounding residential, commercial, and transportation land uses; therefore, no mitigation is required.

6. Noise

- i. *Impact NO-1: Construction of the proposed project could cause a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure NO-1: The University's contractors shall employ site-specific noise attenuation measures during construction to reduce the generation of construction noise to less than 10 dBA over existing noise levels. These measures shall be included in a Noise Control Plan that shall be submitted for review and approval by the University for construction of the Project to ensure that construction noise is reduced to the degree feasible. Measures specified in the Noise Control Plans and implemented during project construction shall include noise control strategies regarding equipment, trucks, sound-control devices, impact tools, stationary noise sources, enclosures and mufflers for stationary equipment, and a point of contact for noise complaints. (Final EIR at pages 4.6-16 to 4.6-17).

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.6-14 to 4.6-17), the Board finds that implementation of Mitigation Measure NO-1 would reduce the Research Building component of the Project's construction noise impacts to a less-than-significant level. Given that this measure would implement construction-related noise

control measures for a project that does not include impact pile-driving, the Research Building component of the Project's construction noise impact would be less than significant with mitigation.

- ii. *Impact NO-2: Construction of the proposed project would not expose people to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan, noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.6-17 to 4.6-18), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would be consistent with the San Francisco Noise Ordinance; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- iii. *Impact NO-3: Construction of the proposed project would not expose people and structures to or generate excessive groundborne vibration levels. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.6-18 to 4.6-19), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project's construction activities would not involve construction equipment that are typically associated with substantial groundborne vibration such as impact or vibratory pile driving or impact compaction technologies and the distance of receptors is approximately 70 feet away from the Research Building component of the Project; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- iv. *Impact NO-4: Operation of the proposed project would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.6-19 to 4.6-21), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would result in marginal increases in weekday traffic noise levels which would be less than significant for receptors along all seven roadway segments; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- v. *Impact C-NO-1: Operation of the proposed project when considered with other cumulative development would cause a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.6-21 to 4.6-22), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project's cumulative increase in roadway noise would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

7. **Transportation and Traffic**

- i. *Impact TRAF-1: Construction of the proposed project could cause substantial adverse impacts to traffic flow, circulation and access as well as to transit, pedestrian, and parking conditions during demolition and construction activities. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-19 to 4.7-20), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project's construction activities would be temporary and limited in duration and are required to be conducted in accordance with City requirements, construction-related transportation impacts of the proposed project would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

Improvement Measure IM-TR-1: Construction Coordination and Monitoring Measures would further reduce the Research Building component of the Project's less-than-significant impacts related to potential conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, transit, and autos. The University shall require construction contractor(s) for the Research Building to prepare a traffic control plan for major phases of Research Building construction (e.g. demolition, construction, or renovation of individual buildings). The University and their construction contractor(s) will meet with DPH and relevant City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including temporary transit stop relocations, and other measures to reduce potential traffic and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during major phases of construction of the Research Building. In order to minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers for the proposed Research Building, the University shall require the construction contractors to include in the Traffic Control Plan for Construction methods to encourage walking, bicycling, carpooling, and transit access to the campus sites by construction workers in the coordinated plan. In order to minimize construction impacts on access for nearby residences, institutions, and businesses, the University shall provide nearby residences and adjacent businesses with regularly-updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and lane closures via a newsletter and/or website. (Final EIR at pages 4.7-21).

- ii. *Impact TRAF-2: Development of the proposed project would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure TR-1: Restripe 24th Street at Potrero Avenue to Provide a Westbound Left-Turn Pocket, which will restripe the westbound approach on 24th Street at Potrero Avenue as two lanes: a 10-foot-wide left-turn pocket approximately 50 feet in length and a 10-foot-wide shared through / right-turn lane. This would require the removal of three or four parking spaces on the southern side of 24th Street at the intersection of Potrero Avenue and the restriping of the eastbound lane adjacent to the removed parking spaces to be 12 feet wide. This mitigation measure would not include the addition of new signal phases or other alterations due to the existing timing plan, although the SFMTA may choose to do so as part of the mitigation

measure. This mitigation measure would require that large trucks or buses making the northbound right-turn movement would sweep into the westbound left-turn lane. As such, the final design of this intersection should include placement of the stop bar on the westbound turn lane approximately one car length back from the current intersection to accommodate larger turning vehicles. (Final EIR at pages 4.7-24).

Mitigation Measure TR-2: Open 23rd Street exit of 23rd Street Garage during the PM Peak Period to coincide with a major hospital employee shift change would allow some vehicles to shift away from the 24th Street exit and thus improve the operating condition of the intersection of Potrero Avenue / 24th Street. In conjunction with the earlier opening of the 23rd Street exit, which would increase the amount of traffic on 23rd Street, the pedestrian crossing that connects the 23rd Street Garage to the east side of the West ZSFG Driveway should be improved. Although SFMTA staff would need to concur on a final design, this should include evaluation of signal phasing prior to implementation, and it could include shifting the eastern edge of the crosswalk to the east by ten feet in order to double the width of the crosswalk to 20 feet, repainting the crosswalk in the continental style to be more visible, and shifting the westbound 48 Quintara/24th Street in the same location 20 feet to the east to increase the visibility of pedestrians. (Final EIR at pages 4.7-25 to 4.7-26).

Mitigation Measure TR-3: Implement Additional TDM Strategies to Reduce Single Occupancy Vehicle Trips to and from ZSFG. The University and DPH shall coordinate and each implement the following policies to the extent feasible: expanding the University's and DPH's Shuttle Service, maintaining a dialogue with SFMTA regarding ZSFG's strong desire to see transit connections between the Mission District and ZSFG campus remains, creating a more robust carpool matching program, providing showers and locker facilities on campus and in the Research Building, and advertise existing pre-tax commuter accounts. (Final EIR at pages 4.7-26 to 4.7-27a).

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-23 to 4.7-30), the Board finds that the Project would cause the Potrero Avenue / 24th Street signalized intersection to degrade from an acceptable LOS D to an unacceptable LOS F during the PM peak hour. With the Research Building component of the Project alone, the LOS would degrade to LOS E. Therefore, the Research Building component of the Project would have a significant impact at the intersection of Potrero Avenue / 24th Street, and the University shall implement or fund its proportional share to SFMTA to implement Mitigation Measure TR-1. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, intersection operations would improve to acceptable levels (i.e. LOS D or better conditions) during the PM peak hour. However, the University does not have the authority to implement this improvement without SFMTA's approval and assistance, which is unknown at this time. The effectiveness of implementing Mitigation Measure TR-2 to reduce the impact to less than significant is not known given the uncertainty over the volume of vehicles choosing to exit this northern egress, and the University does not have the authority to implement it without SFMTA's approval and assistance, which is unknown at this time. While implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3 would reduce traffic impacts, the No Garage

Expansion Alternative (Variant 4) is the only scenario in which full implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3 with identified feasible elements would reduce the significant impact at this intersection to less than significant. The Research Building component of the Project's traffic impact at the intersection of Potrero Avenue / 24th Street would therefore be considered significant and unavoidable. The Board finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Research Building component of the Project outweigh this and other significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the Research Building component of the Project for the reasons set forth in the "Statement of Overriding Considerations" in Section III, below.

- iii. *Impact TRAF-3: Development of the proposed project would increase transit ridership demand. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-30 to 4.7-32), the Board finds that new Muni transit trips, regional transit trips, and UCSF shuttle trips generated by the Research Building component of the Project would result in a less-than-significant impact; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- iv. *Impact TRAF-4: Development of the proposed project would not cause a substantial conflict with pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-33 to 4.7-34), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not create substantial conflicts between pedestrians and autos, bicyclists, or transit vehicles, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas and the Research Building component of the Project's impact to pedestrian facilities would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- v. *Impact TRAF-5: Development of the proposed project would not cause a substantial conflict with bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-34 to 4.7-35), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not create substantial conflicts between bicyclists and autos, pedestrians, or transit vehicles, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the site and adjoining areas. Additionally, Mitigation Measure TR-1, with its physical design component, would not be expected to have a negative effect on bicycle travel. The Research Building component of the Project would not affect bicycle accessibility to ZSFG or adjoining areas. Thus, the Research Building component of the Project's impact to bicycle facilities and circulation would be less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- vi. *Impact TRAF-6: Development of the proposed project would increase loading demand. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-35 to 4.7-36), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project's estimated loading supply should be adequate for the estimated demand, and no conflicts between loading vehicles and Muni vehicles are expected. Thus, the Research Building component of the Project's impact to commercial loading is considered a less-than-significant impact. Future passenger loading supply would be sufficient to accommodate the estimated Research Building component of the Project demand, therefore the Research Building component of the Project's impact to passenger loading is considered less than significant. Therefore, no mitigation is required.

- vii. *Impact TRAF-7: Development of the proposed project would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-37), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not inhibit emergency access to ZSFG and would have a less-than-significant impact to emergency access; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- viii. *Impact TRAF-8: Development of the proposed project could increase parking demand. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-37 to 4.7-38), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project's parking demand would be considered less than significant; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- ix. *Impact TRAF-9: Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network. (Potentially Significant)*

Mitigation Measure TR-1: See Section II.B.7.ii above.

Mitigation Measure TR-2: See Section II.B.7.ii above.

Mitigation Measure TR-3: See Section II.B.7.ii above.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-40 to 4.7-42), the Board finds that the Project would add 120 vehicle trips to the critical westbound approach, which represents a 48 percent increase from Year 2040 conditions, and the Project's contribution would be considered significant. With the Research Building component of the Project alone, the LOS at the intersection of Potrero Avenue / 24th Street would degrade to LOS E. Therefore, the Research Building component of the Project would have a significant impact at the intersection of Potrero Avenue / 24th Street, and the University shall implement or fund its proportional share to SFMTA to implement Mitigation Measure TR-1. With implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-1, intersection operations would improve to acceptable levels (i.e. LOS D or better conditions) during the

PM peak hour. However, the University does not have the authority to implement this improvement without SFMTA's approval and assistance, which is unknown at this time. The effectiveness of implementing Mitigation Measure TR-2 to reduce the impact to less than significant is not known given the uncertainty over the volume of vehicles choosing to exist this northern egress, and the University does not have the authority to implement it without SFMTA's approval and assistance, which is unknown at this time. While the implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3 would reduce traffic impacts, the No Garage Expansion Alternative (Variant 4) is the only scenario in which full implementation of Mitigation Measure TR-3 with identified feasible elements would reduce the significant impact at this intersection to less than significant. The Research Building component of the Project's traffic impact at the intersection of Potrero Avenue / 24th Street would therefore be considered significant and unavoidable. The Board finds this remaining significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Research Building component of the Project outweigh this and other significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the Research Building component of the Project for the reasons set forth in the "Statement of Overriding Considerations" in Section III, below.

- x. *Impact TRAF-10: Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would increase transit ridership demand. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-42 to 4.7-44), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco would have less than significant Year 2040 SF Muni transit impacts, Year 2040 regional transit service impacts, and peak hour Year 2040 UCSF shuttle trips; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- xi. *Impact TRAF-11: Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would not cause a substantial conflict with pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-44), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not result in overcrowding of sidewalks or create new potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians under Near Term conditions and the Research Building component of the Project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco would have less than significant Year 2040 pedestrian impacts; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- xii. *Impact TRAF-12: Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would not cause a substantial conflict with bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-45), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not create substantial conflicts between bicyclists and autos, pedestrians, or transit vehicles, and the Research Building component of the Project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco would have less than significant Year 2040 bicycle impacts; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- xiii. *Impact TRAF-13: Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would increase loading demand. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-45 to 4.7-46), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not create potentially hazardous conditions or significant delays affecting traffic, transit, bicycles, or pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with loading access to the campus sites and adjoining areas, and the Research Building component of the Project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco would have less than significant Year 2040 loading impacts; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- xiv. *Impact TRAF-14: Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would increase parking demand. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-46 to 4.7-47), the Board finds that planned improvements to the transit network would likely reduce parking demand adjacent to ZSFG under Year 2040 Conditions, and the Research Building component of the Project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco would have less than significant parking impacts; therefore, no mitigation is required.

- xv. *Impact TRAF-15: Construction of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, could cause substantial adverse impacts to traffic flow, circulation and access as well as to transit, pedestrian, and parking conditions during demolition and construction activities. (Less than Significant)*

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-47), the Board finds that the Research Building component of the Project's construction impacts are localized and site-specific, and would not contribute to impacts from other development projects near ZSFG, and the Research Building component of the Project in combination with reasonably foreseeable development in San Francisco would have less than significant Year 2040 construction impacts; therefore, no mitigation is required.

C. OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

1. Significant and Unavoidable Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(b) requires consideration and discussion of impacts that are significant and unavoidable, even with the implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at page 5-1), the University finds that the Research Building component of the Project would cause two significant and unavoidable impacts:

- **Impact TRAF-2: Development of the proposed project would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.**
- **Impact TRAF-9: Development of the proposed project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.**

The Board finds these significant impacts to be acceptable because the benefits of the Research Building component of the Project outweigh this and other significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the Research Building component of the Project for the reasons set forth in the “Statement of Overriding Considerations” in Section III, below.

2. Cumulative Impacts

CEQA Guidelines Section 15130 requires consideration and discussion of cumulative impacts of a project when the project’s incremental effect is cumulatively considerable.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 4.7-40 to 4-7-42, and 5-1), the University hereby finds that the Research Building component of the Project would contribute to cumulative impacts in the areas of transportation and traffic, which would result in a significant impact. The Board finds this significant impact to be acceptable because the benefits of the Research Building component of the Project outweigh this and other significant and unavoidable environmental impacts of the Research Building component of the Project for the reasons set forth in the “Statement of Overriding Considerations” in Section III, below.

3. Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(c) requires consideration and discussion of significant irreversible environmental changes caused by a project.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 5-2 to 5-3) and the Initial Study (Initial Study, Section 5.8 on Hazards and Hazardous Materials), the University finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not cause irreversible land use impacts, would not result in the wasteful or inefficient use of energy or

other resources, and would not pose a risk of irreversible damage from environmental accidents.

4. Growth Inducement

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d) requires consideration of the potential growth inducing impact of proposed projects, including the ways in which “the proposed project could foster economic and population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment...and the characteristic of some projects which may encourage or facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively.” Information regarding growth-inducing impacts is the same as discussed in the Final EIR.

FINDING: For the reasons stated in the Final EIR (Final EIR at pages 5-3), the University finds that the Research Building component of the Project would not result in substantial employment growth that would indirectly affect demand for housing in the City or the Bay Area as the future occupants of the research building already work for UCSF. The Research Building construction is expected to meet its need for labor from the Bay Area. Further, the Research Building component of the Project would not extend utilities or transportation infrastructure to previously undeveloped areas.

D. MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Public Resources Code section 21081.6 requires the lead agency, when making the finding required by Public Resources Code section 21081(1)(a), to adopt a mitigation monitoring and reporting program that incorporates all of the changes made to the project or any conditions of project approval adopted to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The University has prepared a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program that requires the University to monitor all of the mitigation measures adopted and made fully enforceable through these Findings and the approval of Research Building component of the Project. The Board finds that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program has been designed to ensure compliance with the mitigation requirements during project implementation.

The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program designates the responsibility and anticipated timing for implementation of mitigation measures within the University’s jurisdiction. The University will ensure the accomplishment of mitigation measures through administrative controls over the Research Building component of the Project’s implementation, and the University will monitor and enforce the implementation of mitigation measures through verification in periodic mitigation monitoring reports and through periodic inspections by appropriate University personnel.

E. PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

Chapter 6 of the Draft EIR evaluated a range of alternatives to the Project. The EIR's analysis examined the feasibility of each alternative, the environmental impacts of each alternative, and each alternative's ability to meet the Project objectives described in Section 2.3 of the Draft EIR. In compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the alternatives analysis included an analysis of a no-project alternative and also identified the environmentally superior alternative. The Draft EIR also analyzes four variants to the City Parking Garage Expansion component of the Project, which are not discussed in these Findings.

FINDING: The Board certifies that it has independently reviewed and considered the information on alternatives provided in the Draft and Final EIR and in the administrative record. For the reasons set forth below, the Board finds that the alternatives either would not meet any of the Research Building component of the Project objectives, would only partially meet some of the Research Building component of the Project objectives, would not result in fewer significant and unavoidable impacts than the Project itself or are "infeasible" as that term is defined by CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

1. Project Objectives

The Board finds that the objectives for the Project are as described in Section 2.3 of the Draft EIR. The overall purpose of the Project is to develop a research building at ZSFG.

The specific objectives of the Research Building component of the Project are as follows:

- To develop a new research facility of at approximately 175,000 gross square feet in order to accommodate UCSF research programs and employees that must vacate seismically compromised buildings elsewhere on the ZSFG campus.
- To comply with UC's Seismic Safety Policy, to ensure a seismically safe environment for UCSF employees, patients and visitors.
- To ensure existing UCSF research activities remain on the ZSFG campus in close proximity to the communities being served, and in close proximity to the ZSFG Level 1 Trauma Center, enabling physicians to provide a rapid response to trauma and urgent clinical needs of patients.
- To ensure existing research activities remain on the ZSFG campus, which is a requirement for the ZSFG Trauma Center to retain its designation as a Level 1.
- To foster collaboration, accommodate interdependent programs, and reinforce academic, research and clinical relationships at ZSFG.
- To develop a new research building that is compatible with the overall landscape of the ZSFG campus as well as the surrounding neighborhood.
- To develop a new research building that, to the extent feasible, complies with the San Francisco Planning Code.

- To develop a new research building that is cost-effective in terms of design, construction cost, operational costs, and maintenance.

2. Alternatives to the Project

The Draft EIR evaluated three alternatives to the Project: No Project Alternative, On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative, and No Garage Expansion Alternative (which will be discussed in these Findings.)

i. No Project Alternative

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Research Building would not be constructed and no expansion of the existing parking garage would occur. The proposed Research Building site would remain as a surface parking lot (B/C Lot). UCSF would continue to occupy approximately 297,000 gsf of research labs, office, and clinic space on the ZSFG campus in ten buildings (Buildings 1, 3, 5, 9, 10, 20, 30, 40, 80/90, and 100). Additional UCSF employees in off-campus leased space would not relocate to the ZSFG campus under the No Project Alternative.

Under the No Project Alternative, the less than significant impacts in the areas of aesthetics, air quality, cultural and paleontological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning, and noise would not occur, as with the proposed Project. The No Project Alternative would avoid some of the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts of the proposed Project, and would not result in any impacts at local intersections.

The No Project Alternative would not meet any of the basic project objectives for the Research Building.

ii. On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative

The On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative would consist of the Research Building as proposed by the Project with the addition of an underground parking structure constructed below the building. The underground garage would likely consist of two-levels that would contain 202 parking spaces, which would represent a net gain of 37 spaces in comparison to the 130 existing spaces on the B/C Lot and adjacent 35 spaces for handicapped users, service vehicles, and ZSFG staff that would be displaced by construction of the Research Building. The expansion of the existing ZSFG parking garage would not occur. This alternative was selected to avoid the significant and unavoidable traffic impact at the Potrero Avenue/Twenty-Fourth Street intersection.

Under the On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative, the less than significant impacts in the areas of aesthetics, cultural and paleontological resources, greenhouse gas emissions, land use and planning would be similar or less than the mitigated impacts of the proposed Project. The noise impacts that occur during construction would likely be greater under this alternative

due to the additional excavation necessary to construct the underground garage, but the overall noise impact would likely be less because the ZSFG parking garage would not be expanded. The significant and unavoidable project and cumulative impacts would not occur under this alternative.

The On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative would meet most of the project objectives for the Research Building, but would not meet the objective to develop a new research building that is cost-effective in terms of design, construction cost, operational costs, and maintenance. While this alternative would accommodate the potential new parking demand for the Research Building, it would not meet parking demand for recently completed projects such as the new hospital or potential future projects such as new clinics and backfill of vacated space on the ZSFG campus.

iii. Environmentally Superior Alternative

While the Board finds that the No-Project Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative because it would avoid many of the significant environmental impacts of the development that would occur under the Project, the Board also finds that the No-Project Alternative is infeasible pursuant to Public Resources Code §21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines §15091(a)(3) because it would not meet any of the basic project objectives of the Research Building component of the Project. CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Therefore, the Draft EIR identified the On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative as the environmentally superior alternative. The On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative would avoid many of the significant environmental impacts of the development that would occur under the Project. The On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative would also reduce the magnitude of the impacts associated with traffic conditions at the Potrero Avenue/Twenty-Fourth Street intersection. The On-Site/Underground Parking Alternative, however, is infeasible because it would not meet the objective to develop a new research building that is cost-effective in terms of design, construction cost, operational costs, and maintenance. For these reasons, the Board rejects the environmentally superior alternative as infeasible. When compared to those alternatives, the Research Building component of the Project provides the best available and feasible balance between maximizing attainment of the Research Building objectives and minimizing significant environmental impacts, and the Research Building component of the Project is the environmentally superior alternative among those options.

III. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

A. IMPACTS THAT REMAIN SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE

As discussed above, the Board has found that the following impacts of the Research Building component of the Project will remain significant, either in whole or in part, following adoption and implementation of the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR.

- Impact TRAF-2: Development of the Research Building component of the Project would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.
- Impact TRAF-9: Development of the Research Building component of the Project, in combination with reasonably foreseeable future developments, would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.

B. OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines section 15093, the Board has, in determining whether or not to approve the Research Building component of the Project, balanced the economic, legal, social, technological and other benefits of the Research Building component of the Project against its significant and unavoidable environmental impacts. The Board has found that, for the reasons set forth below, the benefits of the Research Building component of the Project outweigh the Research Building component of the Project's significant adverse environmental effects that the University cannot mitigate to less-than-significant levels. This statement of overriding considerations is based on the Board's review of the Final EIR and other information in the administrative record. The benefits of the Research Building component of the Project include the following:

- For over 140 years, the Regents and UCSF have been affiliated with ZSFG. It is critical to UCSF that the faculty from all four of its professional schools (Medicine, Dentistry, Nursing and Pharmacy) be able to continue to work at ZSFG, providing patient care, conducting research and teaching because ZSFG is a major teaching hospital for UCSF residents and fellows.
- The ZSFG campus accommodates over 20 UCSF research centers, affiliated institutes, and major laboratories. About 100 UCSF principal investigators, many also providing patient care, direct significant research programs from ZSFG which generate millions of dollars in research revenue.
- Research activities on the ZSFG campus enable the ZSFG Trauma Center, the only Level 1 trauma center available for the over 1.5 million people living and working in San Francisco and northern San Mateo County, to retain its designation as Level 1.
- The business case supporting the 2015 Regents amendment of the UCSF 2015-2016 Budget for Capital Improvements and preliminary planning funds approval determined there were no other suitable existing buildings or development sites in the area, and a ground lease and development of the Project is the most viable method to sustain and further strengthen the affiliation between UCSF and ZSFG.
- Construction of the Research Building component of the Project will provide approximately 650 days of temporary job opportunities for construction workers in the area.
- The Research Building component of the Project would enable UCSF employees in existing seismically compromised buildings on the ZSFG campus to relocate to new space that meets UC seismic standards.

Considering all factors and the evidence in the EIR and other relevant documents, the Board finds that specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other benefits of the

Research Building component of the Project outweigh the significant and unavoidable adverse environmental impacts of the Research Building component of the Project. The Board therefore finds that those significant adverse impacts are acceptable in the context of the overall Research Building component of the Project benefits.

IV. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The record of proceedings upon which the Board bases these findings consists of all the documents and evidence relied upon by the University in preparing the Research Building component of the Project and the associated EIR. The custodian of the record of proceedings is: Diane Wong, Principal Planner/Environmental Coordinator, UCSF Campus Planning, 654 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, California 94143-0286, (415) 502-5952.

V. SUMMARY

Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, the Board has made one or more of the following Findings with respect to the significant environmental effects of the proposed Research Building component of the Project as described in the Final EIR:

- Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Research Building component of the Project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effects on the environment.
- Changes or alterations that are wholly or partially within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other public agency.
- Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations make infeasible certain mitigation measures and alternatives.

Based on the foregoing Findings and the information contained in the record, it is hereby determined that:

- All significant effects on the environment due to approval of the Research Building component of the Project have been eliminated or substantially lessened to the extent feasible for the reasons set forth in Section II of these Findings.
- Any remaining significant effects on the environment found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the factors described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Section III, above.

VI. APPROVALS

The Board hereby takes the following actions:

- 1) The Board certifies the Final EIR, as described in Section I, above.

RESEARCH BUILDING AT THE ZSFG SAN FRANCISCO CAMPUS

CEQA FINDINGS

November 16, 2016

Page 27

- 2) The Board hereby adopts as conditions of approval of the Research Building component of the Project all mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University set forth in Section II of the Findings, above.
- 3) The Board hereby adopts the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the Project accompanying the Final EIR and discussed in Section II.D of the Findings, above.
- 4) The Board hereby adopts the Findings in their entirety as set forth in Sections I - V, above, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations.
- 5) Having certified the Final EIR, independently reviewed and analyzed the Final EIR, incorporated mitigation measures into the Research Building component of the Project, and adopted the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program and the foregoing Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board hereby approves the ground lease of the B/C parking lot and the LDDA in support of the Research Building component of the Project. This approval will occur in several steps, with the initial approval of the ground lease of the B/C parking lot and the LDDA, followed by budget, design and external finance approval in the future. The Board directs staff to prepare and file a Notice of Determination for the Research Building component of the Project.