

CHAPTER 2

Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

2.1 Introduction

This EIR evaluates the potential for environmental impacts from the implementation of the UCSF 2014 LRDP. As detailed in section 1.8 *Report Organization*, Chapter 5 of this EIR provides a program-level analysis of the proposed 2014 LRDP, evaluates the effects of maximum growth that could occur throughout the UCSF campus sites under the proposed LRDP through the year 2035 and identifies the LRDP-level mitigation measures to reduce potentially significant effects of the LRDP. In addition to the program-level analysis of the proposed 2014 LRDP in Chapter 5, this EIR also analyzes a number of specific and foreseeable 2014 LRDP development proposals at a project-level per CEQA Guidelines Section 15161 in Chapters 6, 7, 8 and 9. These project-level analyses are intended to provide sufficient detail to permit approval and implementation of these proposals following certification of the EIR.

This summary highlights the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed 2014 LRDP, as required by Section 15123 of the CEQA Guidelines. It provides a brief description of the 2014 LRDP, the project objectives, alternatives to the 2014 LRDP and areas of controversy known to the University. In addition, this chapter provides **Table 2-1**, summarizing: (1) the potential environmental impacts that would occur as the result of implementation of the 2014 LRDP; (2) the recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and (3) the level of impact significance after mitigation measures are implemented.

The potential environmental impacts of 2014 LRDP proposals, and any necessary mitigation measures, at the Parnassus Heights (PH), Mission Bay (MB), Mount Zion (MZ) and Mission Center (MC) campus sites are listed in **Tables 2-2, 2-3, 2-4** and **2-5**, respectively.

2.2 Project Description

The 2014 LRDP is a comprehensive physical land use plan and policy document that articulates a long-term development strategy for achieving the academic, clinical and research missions of UCSF through the year 2035. It contains objectives to guide decisions for developing future facilities to meet UCSF's needs over the next 20 years and projects the quantities and uses of new building space needed during this time frame and sets forth planning principles formalizing

UCSF's commitment to communicate with neighbors regarding its space needs and potential future development.

The 2014 LRDP proposes land use designations, program square footage and population growth through the LRDP planning horizon of 2035 and will be presented to the Regents for their review and consideration. Land use designations are described in the LRDP using functional zones, which provide guidance for where certain types of uses are best located based on desired land use adjacencies and other geographic considerations.

The 2014 LRDP proposes to develop up to an additional 2.39 million gsf, for a total of 11.56 million gsf, in owned and leased buildings across all of UCSF's campus sites through 2035. For the purposes of the EIR analysis, total campus growth in 2035 assumes that the Phase 2 Medical Center at Mission Bay would be constructed during the LRDP horizon although the 2014 LRDP contemplates a later construction date. Thus, the total projected campus growth under the 2014 LRDP analyzed in the EIR is 3.18 million gsf.

Specifically, the 2014 LRDP proposes that major physical changes would occur only at four campus sites: Parnassus Heights, Mission Bay, Mount Zion and Mission Center. These changes entail: 1) at Parnassus Heights to demolish buildings to reduce existing building space, to renovate two existing buildings to make office and new housing space available, and by 2030, to decommission and reuse Moffitt Hospital and build a new addition to Long Hospital; 2) at Mount Zion to demolish existing buildings on the main block to make room for a new office and research building; 3) at Mission Bay, to construct new housing, office, research and clinical buildings, as well as infrastructure and, 4) at Mission Center, to construct a new office building and parking structure.

2.3 Project Objectives

The 2014 LRDP contains five main campus-wide objectives to guide UCSF's physical development:

- 1) Respond to the City and Community Context
- 2) Accommodate UCSF's Growth Through 2035
- 3) Ensure UCSF's Facilities are Seismically Safe
- 4) Promote Environmental Sustainability
- 5) Minimize Facility Costs

2.4 Impact Summary

Table 2-1, provides a complete list of all impacts and mitigation measures. Each impact lists applicable mitigation measures and the level of significance of the impact before and after the implementation of the mitigation measure(s).

2.5 Alternatives to the Proposed Project

The following alternatives were analyzed in detail in the EIR and compared to the proposed 2014 LRDP. The objective of the alternatives analysis is to determine whether an alternative would feasibly attain some or most of the project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening some of the significant effects of the proposed 2014 LRDP.

- 1) No Project—No Development
- 2) No Project—Development Under Existing LRDP
- 3) Reduced Program
- 4) No Demolition of Historical Resources

Detailed descriptions and an analysis of potential impacts of each alternative are presented in Chapter 11, *Alternatives*.

The No Project—No Development Alternative would avoid all environmental impacts of development under the proposed 2014 LRDP. However, the No Project—No Development Alternative would not meet any of the 2014 LRDP objectives.

If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2) requires that the EIR also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Other than the No Project Alternative, the No Project—Development Under Existing LRDP Alternative is the environmentally superior alternative, because it would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the 2014 LRDP more than the other alternatives. Significant and unavoidable air quality and noise, as well as traffic impacts related to construction and operation of the UCSF campus sites would be reduced in magnitude, even if not necessarily reduced to less than significant levels.

2.6 Known Areas of Controversy

This EIR addresses issues associated with the 2014 LRDP that are known to UCSF or were raised by agencies or interested parties during the Notice of Preparation public and agency review period. These issues include:

- Traffic, parking, noise and construction effects at the Parnassus Heights campus site
- Compliance with the space ceiling at the Parnassus Heights campus site

**TABLE 2-1
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures ¹	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
AES-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not degrade the existing visual character or quality of UCSF campus sites and surrounding area.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in flood lighting during nighttime construction activities that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area.	Potentially Significant	AES-LRDP-1: UCSF shall 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.	Less than Significant
AES-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could create new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Potentially Significant	<p>AES-LRDP-2: Minimize light and glare resulting from new buildings through the orientation of the building, use of landscaping materials and choice of primary facade materials. Design standards and guidelines to minimize light and glare shall be adopted for the new buildings, 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 standards for illumination and/or UCSF design guidelines. • Exterior light fixtures shall be configured to emphasize close spacing and lower intensity light. Light fixtures shall use luminaries that do not direct the cone of light towards off-campus structures. 	Less than Significant
AES-LRDP-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could create street-level winds that could be hazardous to pedestrians in the area.	Potentially Significant	AES-LRDP-3: Proposed buildings that would exceed 100 feet in height shall be evaluated by a qualified wind consultant to determine the potential of the design to cause a wind hazard as defined in City Planning Code Section 148. If a hazard cannot be judged unlikely, the design shall be wind tested to verify compliance with the hazardous wind criterion of City Planning Code Section 148. Wind tunnel testing would provide site- and design-specific information pertaining to potential wind effects. Feasible means of eliminating or reducing wind hazards include modulating facades through architectural devices (e.g., articulation, variation of planes and building heights, etc.); incorporating building setbacks/terraces into building designs; and, landscaping in appropriate locations (e.g., using plantings to create wind screens). If preliminary wind testing indicates that the building design would increase pedestrian-level wind hazards, UCSF shall modify the proposed building or develop other measures to eliminate increases in hazardous pedestrian-level wind effects.	Less than Significant

¹ Mitigation measures apply to each subsequent development project at each campus site.

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics (cont.)			
AES-LRDP-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could substantially reduce sunlight or significantly increase shadows in public open space areas. (Less than Significant with Mitigation)	Potentially Significant	AES-LRDP-4: UCSF shall assure that final building designs would not increase shadow on Recreation and Park Department property between one hour after sunrise and one hour before sunset, in such a way that the use of the property would be adversely affected.	Less than Significant
Air Quality			
AIR-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would be consistent with the primary goals of the Bay Area Clean Air Plan (CAP) and would not fundamentally conflict with the CAP because the LRDP demonstrates reasonable efforts to implement control measures contained in the CAP.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AIR-LRDP-2: The 2014 LRDP would provide sufficient buffer distances between sensitive land uses and those land uses associated with toxic air contaminants (TACs) such as freeways, high traffic roadways and stationary sources.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AIR-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP proposals would provide sufficient buffer distances between sensitive land uses and sources of odors.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AIR-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during demolition and construction activities.	Potentially Significant	<p>AIR-LRDP-1: Best Management Practices for Controlling Particulate Emissions</p> <p>The following BAAQMD Best Management Practices for particulate control will be required for all construction activities. 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</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered two times per day. 2. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. 3. All visible mud or dirt track-out 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. 4. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 	Significant and Unavoidable

**TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)			
AIR-LRDP-4 (cont.)		<p>5. 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.</p> <p>6. 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, § 2485 of California Code of Regulations [CCR]). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points.</p> <p>7. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturer's specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation.</p> <p>8. Post a publically visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at UCSF regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The Air District's telephone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations.</p> <p>AIR-LRDP-2: Architectural Coatings</p> <p>ROG emissions from the use of architectural coatings shall be reduced by implementing either or both of the following measures if total emissions of ROG exceed 54 pounds per day on average over the construction period.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Architectural coatings shall be applied over the course of 4 months or longer, in order to reduce daily ROG emissions to below the significance threshold. • A minimum of 67% of exterior building materials shall be prefinished to reduce ROG emissions. <p>AIR-LRDP-3: Off-Road Equipment Control Measures for NO_x</p> <p>All off-road equipment greater than 25 hp and operating for more than 20 total hours over the duration of construction activities shall <u>have engines that meet or exceed U.S. EPA Tier 3 off-road emission standards</u>. meet the following requirements that will not be fully implemented via regulation until 2018 (i.e., the equipment is available for purchase or rental at present but its use not mandated throughout all fleets until 2018):</p> <p>a. All off road equipment shall have:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Engines that meet or exceed either U.S. EPA Tier 3 off-road emission standards, or ii. Engines that are retrofitted with an ARB Level 3 Verified Diesel Emissions Control Strategy (VDECS). 	

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)			
AIR-LRDP-4 (cont.)		<p><i>Mitigation Measure AIR-LRDP-1: Best Management Practices for Controlling Particulate Emissions will be required for all construction activities to reduce those impacts to less than significant. Mitigation Measure AIR-LRDP-2: Architectural Coatings would reduce average daily construction emissions of ROG to less than 54 pounds per day of ROG. Mitigation Measure AIR-LRDP-3: Off-Road Equipment Control Measures for NOx would reduce average daily NOx emissions during building construction, but NOx would still exceed the 54 pound per day threshold. For that reason, the impact of increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during demolition and construction activities would be significant and unavoidable.</i></p>	
<p>AIR-LRDP-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during operation.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>AIR-LRDP-4: BAAQMD-Suggested Operational Measures</p> <p>The following measures identified in the 2012 BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines shall be considered for implementation for site-specific development projects if not already in place:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide and maintain secure bike parking (at least one space per 20 vehicle spaces); • Provide and maintain showers and changing facilities for employees; • Provide information on transportation alternatives to employees; • Provide and maintain preferential carpool and vanpool parking for non-residential uses; • Increase building energy efficiency below Title 24 (reduces NOx related to natural gas combustion); • Require use of electrically powered landscape equipment, where feasible; • Use low VOC architectural coatings in maintaining buildings; • Meet California Green Building Code standards in new construction (reduces NO_x related to natural gas combustion); • Adopt policies supporting infill development; • Create and enhance landscaped greenway, trail, and sidewalk connections between neighborhoods, commercial areas, activity centers, and parks; and • Ensure that proposed land uses are supported by a multi-modal transportation system and that the land uses themselves support the development of the transportation system. 	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)			
AIR-LRDP-5 (cont.)		<i>Mitigation Measure AIR-LRDP-4 would not result in the 78% reduction necessary (for ROG) or 41% (for NOx) to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This amount of traffic reduction exceeds the best reduction estimates for TDM programs (BAAQMD, 2012b). Assuming a conservative 12% reduction in vehicle miles travelled associated with TDM measures, emissions of ROG and NOx would still exceed thresholds. Consequently, development under the 2014 LRDP with implementation of feasible mitigation measures would still result in significant environmental effects on air quality and contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation (ozone precursors and particulate matter). Therefore, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-LRDP-4, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable for emissions of ROG and NOx.</i>	
AIR-LRDP-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of toxic air contaminants that could increase health risks for nearby residents during demolition and construction activities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Biological Resources			
BIO-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
BIO-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
BIO-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.	No Impact	None required	No Impact

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (cont.)			
BIO-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.	Potentially Significant	BIO-LRDP-1: Bird-Safe Building Treatments. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Employ glazing options such as use of either fritted glass, Dichroic glass, etched glass, translucent glass, or glass that reflects ultraviolet light in appropriate portions of the façade. • Minimize light and glare resulting from new buildings through the orientation of the building, use of landscaping materials and choice of primary facade materials. Design standards and guidelines to minimize light and glare shall be adopted for the new buildings, including: reflective metal walls and mirrored glass walls shall not be used as primary building materials for facades. 	Less than Significant
BIO-LRDP-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not conflict with any applicable policies protecting biological resources.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
BIO-LRDP-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan or other applicable habitat conservation plan.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
BIO-LRDP-7: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not exceed the LRDP EIR standard of significance by damaging or removing heritage or landmark trees or native oak trees of a diameter specified in a local ordinance.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Cultural Resources			
CUL-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LDP could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	Potentially Significant	CUL-LRDP-1: Before altering or otherwise affecting a building or structure 50 years old or older, the campus shall retain a qualified architectural historian to record it on a California Department of Parks and Recreation DPR 523 form. Its significance shall be assessed by a qualified architectural historian, using the significance criteria set forth for historic resources under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. For historic buildings, structures or features that do not meet the CEQA criteria for historical resource, no further mitigation is required and the impact is less than significant. For a building or structure that qualifies as a historic resource, the architectural historian and UCSF shall consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. These could include project redesign or other measures that would avoid altering the building. All rehabilitation work of an historic building or structure shall be conducted in compliance with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's</i>	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)			
CUL-LRDP-1 (cont.)		<p><i>Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings, to the extent feasible. Alterations to cultural landscapes shall be conducted in compliance with the Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes.</i></p> <p><i>If it is not feasible to meet the Secretary's Standards, the impact could be a significant and unavoidable impact.</i></p>	
CUL-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in demolition of historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	Potentially Significant	<p>CUL-LRDP-2: If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for substantial alteration or demolition, UCSF shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still photography and a written documentary record of the building to the National Park Service's standards of the Historic American Building Survey or Historic American Engineering Record, including accurate scaled mapping and architectural descriptions. If available, scaled architectural plans will also be included. Photos include large-format (4"X5") black-and-white negatives and 8"X10" enlargements. Digital photography may be substituted for large-format negative photography if archived locally. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate. A copy of the record shall be archived with the UCSF archives, the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library, the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University, and the San Francisco Planning Department.</p> <p>UCSF shall install interpretive materials at or near the site to enhance public awareness in the form of a historical marker, kiosk, or other display that contains historical photos and text about the building's historical significance.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
CUL-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse change to archaeological resources.	Potentially Significant	<p>CUL-LRDP-3: Should an archaeological artifact be discovered during project construction and excavation, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (f), "provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction" shall 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 (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 shall meet to</p>	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)			
CUL-LRDP-3 (cont.)		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 FR44716)).	
CUL-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse change to paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant	CUL-LRDP-4: If paleontological resources, such as fossilized bone, teeth, shell, tracks, trails, casts, molds, or impressions are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, all ground disturbing activities within 50 feet of the find shall be halted until a qualified paleontologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate salvage measures in consultation with UCSF and in conformance with Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Guidelines (SVP, 1995; SVP, 1996).	Less than Significant
CUL-LRDP-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse change to human remains.	Potentially Significant	CUL-LRDP-5: If the discovery includes human remains, CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (e)(1) shall be followed: 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: (1) There shall be no further excavation or disturbance of the site or any nearby area reasonably suspected to overlie adjacent human remains until: (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 (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 (2) Where the following conditions occur, the landowner 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.	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)			
CUL-LRDP-5 (cont.)		<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>	
Geology, Soils and Seismicity			
GEO-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in adverse effects to people and structures resulting from geologic hazards.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
GEO-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related greenhouse gas emissions.	Potentially Significant	<p>GHG-LRDP-1: Construction-Related GHG Reduction Measures</p> <p>The following BAAQMD-suggested measures shall be implemented during demolition and construction activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use alternative fueled (e.g., biodiesel, electric) construction vehicles/equipment where feasible; • Use 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. 	Less than Significant
GHG-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in operational greenhouse gas emissions.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
GHG-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not conflict with the AB32 Scoping Plan, the UCSF Climate Action Plan or the UCSF GHG Reduction Strategy.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	Potentially Significant	HAZ-LRDP-1: An Excavation Management Plan shall be prepared by a qualified consultant to include the California Air Resource Board (CARB) Asbestos Airborne Toxic Control Measure (ATCM) for Construction, Grading, Quarrying and Surface Mining Operations to minimize naturally occurring asbestos through the application of best management practices for fugitive dust from construction, grading and excavation operations. Unless site specific testing by a certified laboratory can demonstrate the absence of encountering naturally occurring asbestos, construction specifications shall include implementation of this CARB ATCM.	Less than Significant
HAZ-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of existing or proposed schools.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HAZ-LRDP-3: 2014 LRDP proposals are located on campus sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, could create a significant hazard to the public.	Potentially Significant	HAZ-LRDP-2: Prior to development on the Mission Center campus site, a Soil Management Plan shall be prepared by a qualified environmental consulting firm to reflect current regulatory requirements and risk management protocols that are in accordance with Regional Water Quality Control Board oversight. The Plan shall include measures to address protocols for identifying, handling, and characterizing suspect contaminated soils. Notification and sampling requirements for adequate characterization shall be in accordance with the overseeing agency (RWQCB or SFDEH) and any additional removal or remediation work completed prior to occupancy of the new structure.	Less than Significant
HAZ-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HAZ-LRDP-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan. (Less than Significant)	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HAZ-LRDP-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. (Less than Significant)	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality			
HYD-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HYD-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the area in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on- or off-site.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HYD-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not generate runoff that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems, or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HYD-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, potentially impede flood flows and potentially expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury or death associated with flooding.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HYD-LRDP-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to tsunami, seiche or mudflow.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HYD-LRDP-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would expose people or structures to an increased risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding from sea level rise.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Land Use and Planning			
LU-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
LU-LRDP-2: The 2014 LRDP would not be incompatible with the City of San Francisco land use regulations.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise			
<p>NOI-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased ambient noise levels during demolition and construction activities.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>NOI-LRDP-1a: Construction Noise Control Measures</p> <p>UCSF contractors shall employ site-specific noise attenuation measures during construction to reduce the generation of construction noise. These measures shall be included in a Noise Control Plan that shall be submitted for review and approval by UCSF to ensure that construction noise is consistent with the standards set forth in the City's Noise Ordinance. Measures specified in the Noise Control Plan and implemented during project construction shall include, at a minimum, the following noise control strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment and trucks used for construction shall use the best available noise control techniques (e.g., improved mufflers, equipment redesign, use of intake silencers, ducts, engine enclosures, and acoustically attenuating shields or shrouds. • Impact tools (e.g., jack hammers, pavement breakers, and rock drills) used for construction shall be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible to avoid noise associated with compressed air exhaust from pneumatically powered tools. Where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler on the compressed air exhaust shall be used; this muffler can lower noise levels from the exhaust by up to about 10 dBA. External jackets on the tools themselves shall be used where feasible; this could achieve a reduction of 5 dBA. Quieter procedures, such as use of drills rather than impact tools, shall be used where feasible. • Stationary noise sources shall be located as far from adjacent receptors as possible, and they shall be muffled and enclosed within temporary sheds, incorporate insulation barriers, or include other measures. <p>NOI-LRDP-1b: Construction Hours</p> <p>Construction hours are restricted to the hours listed in the table below. In rare circumstances, work may need to occur outside of these work hour limits. In such cases, UCSF Community and Government Relations will receive advance notice from the project manager, at least one week in advance as feasible, and will engage the community to identify measures to minimize potential impacts.</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures				Level of Significance After Mitigation			
Noise (cont.)									
NOI-LRDP-1 (cont.)			“Not Noisy” Work¹		Noisy Work				
			Regular hours	Extended hours²	Regular hours	Extended hours			
		Monday - Friday	7:00 am to 5:00 pm	5:00 pm to 8:00 pm	8:00 am to 5:00 pm				
		Saturday		8:00 am to 5:00 pm		9:00 am to 4:00 pm			
		Sunday		8:00 am to 5:00 pm					
¹ “Not Noisy” work = 80 decibels or less at 100 feet; “Noisy” work = more than 80 decibels at 100 feet. ² Extended hours to be considered by UCSF Community and Government Relations with advance notice from the project manager.									
NOI-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased ambient noise levels during pile-driving activities.	Potentially Significant	NOI-LRDP-2: Pile Driving Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices Noise-reducing pile-driving techniques shall be employed during project construction. These techniques shall include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installing cast in place concrete piles. Noise from auger drilling is 17 dBA less than an impact pile driver. • Vibrating piles into place, and installing shrouds around the pile-driving hammer where feasible. • Installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile-driving equipment • Implement “quiet” pile-driving technology (such as pre-drilling of piles and the use of more than one pile driver to shorten the total pile driving duration). • Use cushion blocks to dampen impact noise. Cushion blocks are blocks of material that are used with impact hammer pile drivers. They consist of blocks of material placed atop a piling during installation to minimize noise generated when driving the pile. Materials typically used for cushion blocks include wood, nylon and micarta (a composite material). • At least 48 hours prior to pile-driving activities, UCSF shall notify building owners and occupants within 600 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities. 				Significant and Unavoidable			

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise (cont.)			
NOI-LRDP-2 (cont.)		<p><i>Mitigation Measure NOI-LRDP-2 would reduce the severity of noise generated by pile-driving activities and reduce the potential annoyance to nearby residents and others who could be disturbed by pile-driving to the extent feasible. If piles can be installed through drilling and cast in place measures then this mitigation measure would result in a less than significant impact.</i></p> <p><i>However, if geotechnical conditions exist such that impact or vibratory pile-driving is required, then construction noise would be significant. Although pile-driving noise would be intermittent and would occur over a short duration, even after mitigation the noise level above the ambient noise level would likely exceed 20 dBA during pile-driving activities, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.</i></p>	
NOI-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would generate ground-borne vibration during demolition and construction activities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could cause a long-term increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-LRDP-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in exposure of persons (new residents) to noise levels in excess of standards established in the City of San Francisco General Plan.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Population and Housing			
POP-LRDP-1: The 2014 LRDP would induce population growth in the San Francisco Bay area, which could create demand for housing outside the market area.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Public Services			
PUB-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Public Services (cont.)			
PUB-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police facilities, need for new or physically altered police facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
PUB-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered public school facilities, need for new or physically altered public school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Recreation			
REC-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
REC-LRDP-2: The 2014 LRDP includes new recreational facilities, the construction of which could have an adverse impact on the environment.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Transportation and Traffic			
TRAF-LRDP-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would be consistent with the primary goals of the City and County of San Francisco (CCSF) with respect to transportation and would not fundamentally conflict with the CCSF's Transit First Policy because the 2014 LRDP demonstrates reasonable efforts to continue transportation services (e.g., the UCSF Shuttles) that encourage alternatives to use of single-occupant automobiles.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)			
<p>TRAF-LRDP-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP 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.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>TRAF-LRDP-1: Construction Coordination and Monitoring Measures.</p> <p>Traffic Control Plan for Construction –In order to reduce potential conflicts between construction activities and pedestrians, transit and autos during construction activities at the four campus sites, UCSF shall require construction contractor(s) to prepare a traffic control plan for major phases of project construction (e.g. demolition, construction, or renovation of individual buildings). UCSF and its construction contractor(s) will meet with relevant City agencies to coordinate feasible measures to reduce traffic congestion, including temporary transit stop relocations (e.g. Parnassus Avenue (Parnassus Heights), Sutter Street (Mount Zion), etc.) and other measures to reduce potential traffic and transit disruption and pedestrian circulation effects during major phases of construction of the 2014 LRDP Projects. For any work within the public right-of-way, the contractor would be required to comply with the City of San Francisco’s Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets (the Blue Book), which establish rules and permit requirements so that construction activities can be done safely and with the least possible interference with pedestrians, bicyclists, transit, and vehicular traffic. 2 In addition to the regulations in the Blue Book, UCSF shall require the construction contractor(s) to comply with all state and federal codes, rules and regulations.</p> <p>In the event that the construction timeframes of the major phases and other development projects adjacent to UCSF overlap, such as the adjacent proposed development at Mission Bay Blocks 29-32, UCSF shall coordinate with City Agencies through the Transportation Advisory Staff Committee (TASC) and the adjacent developers to minimize the severity of any disruption to adjacent land uses and transportation facilities from overlapping construction transportation impacts. UCSF, in conjunction with the adjacent developer, shall propose a construction traffic control plan that includes measures to reduce potential construction traffic conflicts, such as staggering start and end times, coordinated material drop offs, collective worker parking and transit to job site and other measures.</p> <p>Reduce_SOV Mode Share for Construction Workers – In order to minimize parking demand and vehicle trips associated with construction workers, UCSF shall require the construction contractor 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.</p>	Less than Significant

² The SFMTA Blue Book, 8th Edition (2012), is available online through SFMTA (sfmta.com).

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)			
TRAF-LRDP-2 (cont.)		Project Construction Updates for Adjacent Residents and Businesses – In order to minimize construction impacts on access for nearby residences, institutions and businesses, UCSF 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.	
TRAF-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in temporary increases in traffic volumes on roadways in the vicinity of each of the four campus sites during demolition and construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement TRAF-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
TRAF-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would increase traffic (vehicles, transit ridership, pedestrian and bicycle volumes) on the roadway network that serves each of the four campus sites, as well as increase loading and parking demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems			
UTIL-LRDP-1: There would be sufficient water supplies available to serve the 2014 LRDP from existing entitlements and resources and no new or expanded water treatment facilities would be required.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
UTIL-LRDP-2: The wastewater treatment provider has adequate capacity to serve UCSF's projected demand resulting from implementation of the 2014 LRDP and no new or expanded wastewater treatment facilities would be required.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
UTIL-LRDP-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not exceed the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
UTIL-LRDP-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-1 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)			
UTIL-LRDP-5: UCSF be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate solid waste needs resulting from implementation of the 2014 LRDP and would comply with federal, state and local statutes and regulation related to solid waste.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
UTIL-LRDP-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would not result in the wasteful, inefficient and unnecessary consumption of energy.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
UTIL-LRDP-7: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in the construction of new electrical or natural gas facilities, which could cause significant environmental effects.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-2
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures ³	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
AES-PH-1: The New Hospital Addition and faculty housing at the Proctor site and Fifth and Parnassus avenues at the Parnassus Heights campus site would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-PH-2: The New Hospital Addition, new faculty housing and the Parnassus Avenue Streetscape Plan at the Parnassus Heights campus site would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-PH-3: Construction of the New Hospital Addition and faculty housing at the Parnassus Heights campus site could result in flood lighting sites during nighttime construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
AES-PH-4: The New Hospital Addition and new faculty housing at the Parnassus Heights campus site could create new sources of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-2	Less than Significant
AES-PH-5: The demolition of 8 existing buildings, including LPPI, and construction of the New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site would create street-level winds that could be hazardous to pedestrians in the area.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
Air Quality			
AIR-PH-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during demolition and construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-1, AIR-LRDP-2, and AIR-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
AIR-PH-2: Demolition and construction activities at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would increase emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and increase health risks for nearby residents.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AIR-PH-3: Operations at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-4	Less than Significant
AIR-PH-4: Operations at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would expose persons (new receptors) to substantial levels of TACs, which may lead to adverse health effects.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

³ This table references the mitigation measures in Table 2-1, as well as additional mitigation measures that apply to the Parnassus Heights campus site.

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)			
AIR-PH-5: Operations at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would cumulatively expose persons (existing and new receptors) to substantial levels of TACs, which may lead to adverse health effects.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Biological Resources			
BIO-PH-1: Demolition and construction activities at the Parnassus Heights campus site could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS.	Potentially Significant	<p>BIO-PH-1a: Preconstruction Surveys for Monarch Butterfly Winter Roosts and Avoidance.</p> <p>Prior to demolition activities, a qualified biologist familiar with monarch butterfly aggregating behavior and habitat shall conduct a preconstruction survey for the presence of overwintering monarch butterfly aggregations. The survey shall be conducted in December or January during the period when overwintering aggregations appear. Should an overwintering aggregation be identified in trees adjacent to individual proposal sites within the Reserve, a 200-foot buffer shall be established around the occupied trees until the aggregation has dispersed.</p> <p>BIO-PH-1b: Preconstruction Breeding Bird Surveys and Nest Avoidance.</p> <p>Should construction activities associated with the new retaining wall, new trails, demolition of buildings, relocation, expansion, and replacement of the medical gas and diesel fuel tank storage, and construction of the new hospital addition within the Parnassus Heights campus site, commence during breeding bird season (February 15 – August 15) annually, UCSF shall retain a qualified biologist to conduct preconstruction nesting bird surveys in surrounding habitat for nesting birds. Specific measures to avoid and minimize impacts on nesting birds include, but are not limited to, those described below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To avoid and minimize potential impacts on nesting raptors and other birds, preconstruction surveys shall be performed not more than two weeks prior to initiating vegetation removal and/or construction and demolition activities during the breeding season (i.e., February 15 through August 15). • To avoid and minimize potential impacts on nesting raptors and other birds, a no-disturbance buffer zone shall be established around active nests during the breeding season until the young have fledged and are self-sufficient, when no 	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (cont.)			
BIO-PH-1 (cont.)		<p>further mitigation would be required. Typically, the size of individual buffers ranges from a minimum of 250 feet for raptors to a minimum of 50 feet for other birds but can be adjusted based on an evaluation of the site by a qualified biologist in cooperation with the USFWS and/or CDFW.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Birds that establish nests after construction starts are assumed to be habituated to and tolerant of the indirect adverse impacts resulting from construction noise and human activity. However, direct take of nests, eggs, and nestlings is still prohibited and an appropriate buffer must be established around the nest according to species and proximity to project activities in order to avoid nest abandonment or destruction. • If construction or demolition activities ceases for a period of more than two weeks, or vegetation removal is required after a period of more than two weeks has elapsed from the preconstruction surveys, then new nesting bird surveys must be conducted. <p>BIO-PH-1c: Avoidance and Minimization Measures for Special-Status Bats.</p> <p>A qualified wildlife biologist shall conduct preconstruction special-status bat surveys of suitable roost sites in the vicinity of construction and demolition sites that abut the forest of Mount Sutro Open Space Reserve. If active day or night roosts are found, the wildlife biologist shall take actions to make such roosts unsuitable habitat before construction and demolition activities begin. A no-disturbance buffer of 100 feet shall be created around active bat roosts being used for maternity or hibernation purposes. Bat roosts that are established during active construction or demolition are presumed to be unaffected by these activities, and no buffer would be necessary.</p> <p>BIO-PH-1d: Preconstruction Surveys for Special-Status Plants and Plant Avoidance.</p> <p>Prior to construction activities, a qualified botanist shall conduct preconstruction surveys for special-status plants, coastal triquetrella and San Francisco gumplant, within the footprints of and in suitable habitat adjacent to locations of the new retaining wall, new trail alignments, and any access routes and staging areas to be used in support of these projects. Surveys for coastal</p>	

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (cont.)			
BIO-PH-1 (cont.)		<p>triquetrella can be conducted at any time of the year however surveys for San Francisco gumplant shall occur in the summer (June – September). Should special-status plant species be found during surveys, occurrences shall be marked in the field for avoidance during construction.</p> <p>BIO-PH-1e: Relocation of Special-Status Plants.</p> <p>If special-status plants are located within the retaining wall or new trails footprint and cannot be avoided, then a rare plant salvage and relocation plan shall be developed to relocate individuals to suitable habitat within the Reserve. A qualified botanist shall develop and implement the plan according to CDFW guidelines and in coordination with CDFW. At a minimum, the plan shall include collection of reproductive structures from affected plants, a full description of microhabitat conditions necessary for each affected species, seed germination requirements, restoration techniques for temporarily disturbed occurrences, assessments of potential transplant and enhancement sites, success and performance criteria, and monitoring programs, as well as measures to ensure long-term population viability. The mitigation methods shall include either salvage and transplantation or collection and propagation of seeds or other vegetative material. Any plant relocation shall be done under the supervision of a qualified restoration botanist.</p>	
<p>BIO-PH-2: Demolition and construction activities at the Parnassus Heights campus site could interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>Implement BIO-LRDP-1: Bird-Safe Building Treatments and BIO-PH-2a: Night Lighting Minimization during Construction</p> <p>Construction areas set up for nighttime activity and requiring lights shall implement the following measures as long as the safety of workers is not compromised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction related lighting shall be fully shielded and focused down to ensure no significant illumination passes beyond the immediate work area. Lighting shall be positioned around the perimeter of the work area positioned toward activity and not surrounding habitat of the Reserve. • Yellow or orange light shall be used where possible. • Construction personnel shall reduce the amount of lighting to the minimum necessary to safely accomplish the work. 	Less than Significant

**TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Biological Resources (cont.)			
<p>BIO-PH-2 (cont.)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Night construction near suitable habitat for nesting and migratory birds and bats (i.e. the Reserve forest and understory vegetation) shall be avoided during nesting season (February 15 – August 15). If night construction near these areas cannot be avoided, light shall not be allowed to shine directly into suitable habitat. • Construction areas set-up for night time activity are subject to all of the same preconstruction surveys for nesting birds and roosting bats listed in this section, above. <p>BIO-PH-2b: Operational Night Lighting Minimization.</p> <p>In addition to minimizing night lighting during demolition and construction of the 2014 LRDP proposals, UCSF shall similarly ensure that the design and specifications for buildings implement design elements to reduce lighting usage, change light direction, and contain light. These include, but are not limited to, the following general considerations that shall be applied wherever feasible throughout 2014 LRDP proposals within the Parnassus Heights campus site to reduce night lighting impacts on avian and bat species:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Avoid installation of lighting in areas where not required for public safety. • Examine and adopt alternatives to bright, all-night, floor-wide lighting when interior lights would be visible from the exterior or when exterior lights must be left on at night, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Installing motion-sensitive lighting – Installing task lighting – Installing programmable timers – Installing fixtures that use lower-wattage, sodium, and yellow-red spectrum lighting (if compatible with personnel safety requirements). • Install strobe or flashing lights in place of continuously burning lights for any obstruction lighting that may be required. • Where exterior lights are to be left on at night, install fully shielded lights to contain and direct light away from the sky. 	

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources			
CUL-PH-1: Demolition of seven buildings at the Parnassus Heights campus site would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources.	No Impact	None required	No Impact
CUL-PH-2: Demolition of the Surge building at the Parnassus Heights campus site would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-2	Significant and Unavoidable
CUL-PH-3: Renovation of Moffitt Hospital, UC Hall and Millberry Union towers at the Parnassus Heights campus site would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
CUL-PH-4: Seismic rehabilitation of the historic Faculty Alumni House could result in a significant impact to this historic structure if not completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards.	Potentially Significant	CUL-PH-4: UCSF shall ensure that the proposed seismic upgrades to the Faculty Alumni House at 745 Parnassus Avenue would comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. UCSF may need to hire a qualified professional architectural historian to review the proposed seismic upgrade plans for compliance with the Standards, and prepare a technical memorandum which describes any changes to the seismic design (if any) that may be needed to meet the Standards. Generally, under CEQA, projects that comply with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards are considered to have a less-than-significant impact on the environment.	Less than Significant
CUL-PH-5: Renovation of Saunders Court at the Parnassus Heights campus site could alter the features and spaces which convey its historic significance as a cultural landscape, which could result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources.	Potentially Significant	CUL-PH-5: Prior to undertaking any further designs for the renovation of Saunders Court, UCSF shall: 1) complete additional research at the UCSF Archives and the Robert R. Royston Collection (1946-1972) at the Environmental Design Library at UC Berkeley to determine the relative significance of this cultural landscape within Royston's overall body of work, 2) identify the character-defining features of the landscape itself (i.e., those features which convey its historic significance), and 3), hire a professional landscape architect and/or landscape historian to design the renovation project in a manner that is respectful of, and compatible with, the character-defining features of the landscape and is consistent with the <i>Secretary of the Interior's Guidelines for Rehabilitating Cultural Landscapes</i> .	Less than Significant
CUL-PH-6: Construction of the New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-3	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)			
CUL-PH-7: Construction of the New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-4	Less than Significant
CUL-PH-8: Construction of the New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-5	Less than Significant
CUL-PH-9: Infrastructure and utilities improvements proposed at the Parnassus Heights campus site, including the Parnassus Avenue Streetscape Plan, would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-3, CUL-LRDP-4, and CUL-LRDP-5	Less than Significant
Geology, Soils and Seismicity			
Geology, soils and seismicity impacts at the Parnassus Heights campus site are included in evaluation of overall 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact GEO-LRDP-1 and GEO-LRDP-2 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG-PH-1: Development at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions.	Potentially Significant	Implement GHG-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
GHG-PH-2: Development at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in operational GHG emissions.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ-PH-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	Potentially Significant	Implement HAZ-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
HAZ-PH-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site could result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of existing or proposed schools.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HAZ-PH-3: 2014 LRDP proposals located at the Parnassus Heights campus sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, could create a significant hazard to the public.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)			
HAZ-PH-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Hydrology and water quality impacts at the Parnassus Heights campus site are included in evaluation of overall 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact HYD-LRDP-1 through HYD-LRDP-4 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Land Use and Planning			
LU-PH-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
LU-PH-2: The proposed New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site would be compatible with adjacent land uses.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
LU-PH-3: The proposed renovations of Moffitt Hospital, UC Hall Millberry Union towers, and the Faculty Alumni House at the Parnassus Heights campus site would be compatible with existing City regulations.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Noise			
NOI-PH-1: Demolition activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-1 <i>Mitigation Measure NOI-LRDP-1 would reduce noise levels associated with demolition activities by 5 to 10 dBA. However it is likely that intermittent hoe-ram operations to break up concrete structures could result in noise levels at sensitive receptors in excess of 70 dBA during one to two weeks of the demolition of Proctor, even after mitigation. Consequently, this impact, although temporary, would be significant and unavoidable.</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
NOI-PH-2: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site would result in increases in ambient noise levels over the term of the exterior construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-1 and NOI-LRDP-2 <i>Mitigation Measures LRDP-NOI-1 and NOI-LRDP-2 would reduce the severity of noise generated by construction and pile-driving activities and reduce the potential annoyance to nearby residents</i>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise (cont.)			
NOI-PH-2 (cont.)		<p><i>and others who could be disturbed by pile-driving to the extent feasible. If piles can be installed through drilling and cast in place measures then these mitigation measures would result in a less than significant impact.</i></p> <p><i>However, if geotechnical conditions exist such that impact or vibratory pile-driving is required, then construction noise would be significant. Although pile-driving noise would be intermittent and would occur over a short duration (up to about six weeks in total), even after mitigation the noise level would likely exceed ambient noise levels by 20 dBA during pile-driving activities, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.</i></p>	
NOI-PH-3: Demolition and construction and demolition activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site could generate ground-borne vibration.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-PH-4: Operational noise generated by development under the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site could cause a long-term increase in ambient noise levels in the campus vicinity.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-PH-5: Operations under the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights site would result in exposure of persons (new residents) to noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Population and Housing			
No site-specific impacts			
Public Services			
No site-specific impacts			
Recreation			
No site-specific impacts			
Transportation and Traffic			
TRAF-PH-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Parnassus Heights campus site 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.	Potentially Significant	Implement TRAF-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
TRAF-PH-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Parnassus Heights campus site would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-2 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – PARNASSUS HEIGHTS IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)			
TRAF-PH-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Parnassus Heights campus site would increase transit ridership demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-PH-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Parnassus Heights campus site would not cause a substantial conflict with pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-PH-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Parnassus Heights campus site would not would not cause a substantial conflict with bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-PH-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Parnassus Heights campus site would increase loading demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-PH-7: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Parnassus Heights campus site would increase parking demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems			
No site-specific impacts			

**TABLE 2-3
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION BAY IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures ⁴	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
AES-MB-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-MB-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-MB-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site could create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
AES-MB-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site could result in flood lighting during nighttime construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-2	Less than Significant
AES-MB-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site could create street-level winds that could be hazardous to pedestrians in the area.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
AES-MB-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site could substantially reduce sunlight or significantly increase shadows in public open space areas or could shadow the potential school site on Block 14.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Air Quality			
AIR-MB-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-1, AIR-LRDP-2, and AIR-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
AIR-MB-2: Construction activities at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would increase emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and increase health risks for nearby residents.	Potentially Significant	AIR-MB-1: Obtain written verification from BAAQMD that the facility has been issued a permit from BAAQMD, if required by law, or that permit requirements do not apply to the facility. (Modified from <i>Mission Bay Subsequent EIR Mitigation Measure F.03</i>)	Less than Significant
AIR-MB-3: Operations at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-4 <i>Mitigation Measure AIR-LRDP-4 would not result in the 59% reduction necessary (for ROG) or 27% (for NOx) to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This amount of traffic reduction exceeds the best reduction estimates for TDM programs (BAAQMD, 2012b). Assuming a conservative 12% reduction in vehicle miles travelled</i>	Significant and Unavoidable

⁴ This table references the mitigation measures in Table 2-1, as well as additional mitigation measures that apply to the Mission Bay campus site.

TABLE 2-3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION BAY IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Air Quality (cont.)			
AIR-MB-3 (cont.)		<i>associated with TDM measures, operational emissions of ROG at the Mission Bay campus site would be reduced to 126.8 pounds per day and emissions of NOx would be reduced to 62.68 pounds per day. Consequently, 2014 LRDP development at the campus site with implementation of feasible mitigations would still result in significant environmental effects on air quality and contribute substantially to an existing air quality violation (ozone precursors and particulate matter). Therefore, even with implementation of Mitigation Measure AIR-MB-4, this impact would remain significant and unavoidable for emissions of ROG, NOx and PM₁₀.</i>	
AIR-MB-4: Operations at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would expose persons (new receptors) to substantial levels of TACs, which may lead to adverse health effects.	Potentially Significant	AIR-MB-4: Particulate Filtration Systems for Block 15 Housing and Child Care. <i>Air Filtration and Ventilation Requirements for Sensitive Land Uses.</i> As part of the building design, UCSF shall include a ventilation plan for the proposed housing and day care building. The ventilation plan shall show that the building ventilation system removes at least 80% of the outdoor PM _{2.5} concentrations from habitable areas and be designed by an engineer certified by ASHRAE, who shall provide a written report documenting that the system meets the 80% performance standard and offers the best available technology to minimize outdoor to indoor transmission of PM _{2.5} . <i>Maintenance Plan.</i> UCSF shall prepare a plan that ensures ongoing maintenance for the ventilation and filtration systems.	Less than Significant
AIR-MB-5: Operations at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would cumulatively expose persons (existing and new receptors) to substantial levels of TACs, which may lead to adverse health effects.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Biological Resources			
None			
Cultural Resources			
CUL-MB-1: Construction of 2014 LRDP proposals at the Mission Bay campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
CUL-MB-2: Construction of 2014 LRDP proposals at the Mission Bay campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-4	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION BAY IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)			
CUL-MB-3: Construction of 2014 LRDP proposals at the Mission Bay campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-5	Less than Significant
Geology, Soils and Seismicity			
Geology, soils and seismicity impacts at the Mission Bay campus site are included in evaluation of overall 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact GEO-LRDP-1 and GEO-LRDP-2 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG-MB-1: Development at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions.	Potentially Significant	Implement GHG-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
GHG-MB-2: Development at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in operational GHG emissions.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ-MB-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	Potentially Significant	Implement HAZ-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
HAZ-MB-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay site could result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of existing or proposed schools.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HAZ-MB-3: 2014 LRDP proposals located at the Mission Bay campus sites that are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, could create a significant hazard to the public.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
HAZ-MB-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the vicinity of a private airstrip.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION BAY IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>HYD-MB-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site could violate water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>HYD-MB-1a: Participate in the City's existing Water Pollution Prevention Program. UCSF shall 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. (<i>Mission Bay Subsequent EIR Mitigation Measure K.02</i>).</p> <p>HYD-MB-1b: UCSF shall design and construct sewer improvements such that potential 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. (<i>Mission Bay Subsequent EIR Mitigation Measure K.03</i>).</p> <p>HYD-MB-1c: 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 remove particulates from streets and parking lots. (Modified from <i>Mission Bay Subsequent EIR Mitigation Measure K.04</i>).</p>	Less than Significant
<p>HYD-MB-2: Development of proposed housing on Block 15 at the Mission Bay campus site would place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on the preliminary (2013) FIRM map for San Francisco, potentially impede flood flows, and potentially expose people to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death associated with flooding.</p>	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
<p>HYD-MB-3: Development of 2014 LRDP proposals on the Mission Bay campus site would expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death due to inundation by seiches or tsunamis.</p>	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
<p>HYD-MB-4: Development of 2014 LRDP proposals on the Mission Bay campus site would expose people or structures to an increased risk of loss, injury or death due to flooding from sea level rise.</p>	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION BAY IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Land Use and Planning			
LU-MB-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
LU-MB-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would be compatible with existing land uses, density, and height and bulk restrictions.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Noise			
NOI-MB-1: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would result in increases in ambient noise levels over the term of the exterior construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
NOI-MB-2: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would result in increases in ambient noise levels during pile-driving activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-2 <i>Mitigation Measure NOI-LRDP-2 would reduce the severity of noise generated by pile-driving activities and reduce the potential annoyance to nearby residents and others who could be disturbed by pile-driving to the extent feasible. If piles can be installed through drilling and cast in place measures then this mitigation measure would result in a less than significant impact.</i> <i>However, if geotechnical conditions exist such that impact or vibratory pile-driving is required, then construction noise would be significant. Although pile-driving noise would be intermittent and would occur over a short duration, even after mitigation the noise level would likely exceed 20 dBA during pile-driving activities, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
NOI-MB-3: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site could generate ground-borne vibration.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-MB-4: Operational noise generated by development under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site could cause a long-term increase in ambient noise levels in the campus vicinity.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-MB-5: Operations under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would result in exposure of persons (new residents) to noise levels in excess of standards established in the general plan.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Population and Housing			
No site-specific impacts			

TABLE 2-3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION BAY IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Public Services			
No site-specific impacts			
Recreation			
No site-specific impacts			
Transportation and Traffic			
TRAF-MB-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site could cause substantial adverse impacts to traffic flow, circulation and access as well as to transit, pedestrian, and parking conditions during construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement TRAF-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
TRAF-MB-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MB-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site would increase transit ridership demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MB-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site would not cause a substantial conflict with pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MB-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site would not cause a substantial conflict with bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MB-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site would increase loading demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MB-7: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site would increase parking demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems			
The overall effects on utilities at the Mission Bay campus site are included in evaluation of 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact UTIL-LRDP-1 through UTIL-LRDP-7 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
UTIL-MB-1: There would be sufficient water supply infrastructure to serve 2014 LRDP development at the Mission Bay campus site.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-3 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION BAY IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Utilities and Service Systems (cont.)			
<p>UTIL-MB-2: There may be impacts related to wastewater infrastructure as a result of 2014 LRDP development at the Mission Bay campus site.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>UTIL-MB-1: UCSF will monitor sanitary sewer flows to the P15 pump station in congruence with on-going monitoring conducted by the SFPUC. If the SFPUC determines that improvements are required to increase the capacity of the P15 pump station as a result of development within the pump station basin, including 2014 UCSF LRDP development at the Mission Bay campus site, UCSF will contribute its <u>fair proportionate</u> share to SFPUC for the potential required pump capacity improvements.</p> <p>UCSF will monitor sanitary sewer flows to the Mariposa Pump Station in congruence with on-going monitoring conducted by the SFPUC. If the SFPUC determines that improvements are required to increase the capacity of the Mariposa Pump Station as a result of development within the pump station basin, including 2014 UCSF LRDP development at the Mission Bay campus site, UCSF will contribute its <u>fair proportionate</u> share to SFPUC for the potential required improvements.</p> <p><i>Because potential improvements are outside UCSF jurisdiction to implement, the impact is considered significant and unavoidable even with the incorporation of the above-noted mitigation measures.</i></p>	Significant and Unavoidable
<p>UTIL-MB-3: There would be sufficient storm drainage infrastructure to serve 2014 LRDP development at the Mission Bay campus site.</p>	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

**TABLE 2-4
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MOUNT ZION IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures⁵	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
AES-MZ-1: The proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the campus site and its surroundings.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-MZ-2: The proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
AES-MZ-3: Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could result in flood lighting sites during nighttime construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-2	Less than Significant
AES-MZ-4: The proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site would cast shadow on the Hamilton Recreation Center.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-4	Less than Significant
AES-MZ-5: The demolition of the three existing buildings and construction of the Office / Research building at the Mount Zion campus site would create street-level winds that could be hazardous to pedestrians in the area.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-43	Less than Significant
Air Quality			
AIR-MZ-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during demolition and construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-1, AIR-LRDP-2, and AIR-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
AIR-MZ-2: Demolition and construction activities at the Mount Zion campus site under the 2014 LRDP would increase emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and increase health risks for nearby residents.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AIR-MZ-3: Operations at the Mount Zion campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-4	Less than Significant
AIR-MZ-4: Operations at the Mount Zion campus site under the 2014 LRDP would increase emissions of TACs and increase health risks for nearby residents.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Biological Resources			
None			

⁵ This table references the mitigation measures in Table 2-1, as well as additional mitigation measures that apply to the Mount Zion campus site.

TABLE 2-4 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MOUNT ZION IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources			
CUL-MZ-1: Demolition of the Hellman building at the Mount Zion campus site would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.	Potentially Significant	<p>CUL-MZ-1: Typical mitigation for the demolition of a historic resource includes HABS-level photodocumentation, as well as public interpretation. HABS-level photodocumentation was already completed in 2006. UCSF shall furnish copies of the report to local depositories of historical information to enhance public understanding and increase the availability of these materials for future research. Such depositories shall include the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library (Main Branch), San Francisco Heritage, and the Northwest Information Center at Sonoma State University.</p> <p>As part of the design for the proposed new office/research building to be constructed in this location, UCSF shall install interpretive materials at or near the site to enhance public awareness in the form of a historical marker, kiosk, or other display which contains historical photos and text about the Hellman building's historical significance. The contents of the display can be obtained from the HABS documentation effort.</p>	Significant and Unavoidable
CUL-MZ-2: Renovation of the Main Hospital at the Mount Zion campus site would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
CUL-MZ-3: Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to historical resources.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
CUL-MZ-4: Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
CUL-MZ-5: Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-4	Less than Significant
CUL-MZ-6: Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-5	Less than Significant
Geology, Soils and Seismicity			
Geology, soils and seismicity impacts at the Mount Zion campus site are included in evaluation of overall 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact GEO-LRDP-1 and GEO-LRDP-2 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-4 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MOUNT ZION IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG-MZ-1: Development at the Mount Zion campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions.	Potentially Significant	Implement GHG-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
GHG-MZ-2: Development at the Mount Zion campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in operational GHG emissions.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ-MZ-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials, or through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions.	Potentially Significant	Implement HAZ-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
HAZ-MZ-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site could result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of existing or proposed schools.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Hydrology and water quality impacts at the Mount Zion campus site are included in evaluation of overall 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact HYD-LRDP-1 through HYD-LRDP-3 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Land Use and Planning			
LU-MZ-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
LU-MZ-2: Renovation of the Main Hospital at the Mount Zion campus site would be compatible with existing land uses, density, and height and bulk restrictions.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
LU-MZ-3: The proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site would be compatible with adjacent land uses.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-4 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MOUNT ZION IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise			
NOI-MZ-1: Demolition activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-1 <i>Mitigation Measure NOI-LRDP-1 would reduce noise levels associated with demolition activities by 5 to 10 dBA. However, it is likely that intermittent hoe-ram operations to break up concrete structures could result in noise levels at sensitive receptors in excess of 70 dBA, even after mitigation. Consequently, this impact, although temporary, would be significant and unavoidable.</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
NOI-MZ-2: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site would result in increases in ambient noise levels over the term of the exterior construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-1 and NOI-LRDP-2 <i>Mitigation Measures NOI-LRDP-1 and 2 would reduce the severity of noise generated by construction and pile-driving activities and reduce the potential annoyance to nearby residents and others who could be disturbed by pile-driving to the extent feasible. If piles can be installed through drilling and cast in place measures then these mitigation measures would result in a less than significant impact.</i> <i>However, if geotechnical conditions exist such that impact or vibratory pile-driving is required, then construction noise would be significant. Although pile-driving noise would be intermittent and would occur over a short duration (up to about six weeks in total), even after mitigation the noise level would likely exceed 20 dBA during pile-driving activities, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.</i>	Significant and Unavoidable
NOI-MZ-3: Demolition and construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site could generate ground-borne vibration.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-MZ-4: Operational noise generated by development under the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site could cause a long-term increase in ambient noise levels in the campus vicinity.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Population and Housing			
No site-specific impacts			
Public Services			
No site-specific impacts			
Recreation			
No site-specific impacts			

TABLE 2-4 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MOUNT ZION IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Traffic			
TRAF-MZ-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mount Zion campus site 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.	Potentially Significant	Implement TRAF-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
TRAF-MZ-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mount Zion campus site would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MZ-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mount Zion campus site would increase transit ridership demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MZ-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mount Zion campus site would not cause a substantial conflict with pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MZ-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mount Zion campus site would not would not cause a substantial conflict with bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MZ-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mount Zion campus site would increase loading demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MZ-7: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mount Zion campus site would increase parking demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems			
No site-specific impacts			

**TABLE 2-5
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION CENTER IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures⁶	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
AES-MC-1: The proposed office building and parking structure at the Mission Center campus site would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the campus site and its surroundings.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AES-MC-2: The proposed office building and parking structure at the Mission Center campus site could create new sources of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
AES-MC-3: Construction of the proposed office building and parking structure at the Mission Center campus site could result in flood lighting sites during nighttime construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement AES-LRDP-2	Less than Significant
AES-MC-4: The proposed office building and parking structure at the Mission Center campus site could cast shadow on City park property protected by City Planning Code Section 295 or create street-level winds that could be hazardous to pedestrians in the area.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Air Quality			
AIR-MC-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-1, AIR-LRDP-2, and AIR-LRDP-3	Less than Significant
AIR-MC-2: Construction activities at the Mission Center campus site under the 2014 LRDP would increase emissions of toxic air contaminants (TACs) and increase health risks for nearby residents.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
AIR-MC-3: Operations at the Mission Center campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants.	Potentially Significant	Implement AIR-LRDP-4	Less than Significant
AIR-MC-4: Operations at the Mission Center campus site under the 2014 LRDP would increase emissions of TACs and increase health risks for nearby residents.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Biological Resources			
None			

⁶ This table references the mitigation measures in Table 2-1, as well as additional mitigation measures that apply to the Mission Center campus site.

TABLE 2-5 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION CENTER IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources			
CUL-MC-1: Construction of the proposed office building at the Mission Center campus site would not result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
CUL-MC-2: Construction of the proposed office building at the Mission Center campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources.	Potentially Significant	<p>CUL-MC-1: Archaeological Testing Program.</p> <p>Based on a reasonable presumption that archeological resources may be present within the Mission Center campus site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from the proposed project on buried archaeological resources. UCSF shall retain the services of an archaeological consultant that meets Secretary of Interior standards for archaeology, and has knowledge of California prehistory and historical archaeology. The archeological consultant shall perform sufficient archival and background research to determine if an archeological testing program is appropriate. The archeological consultant shall prepare an archeological testing plan (ATP). The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA.</p> <p>If required, an archeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. After the completion of the archeological testing program, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings. If based on the archeological testing program the archeological consultant finds that significant archeological resources may be present, the archeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. If feasible, the proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archeological resource. If avoidance is not feasible, additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archeological testing, archeological monitoring, and/or an archeological data recovery program. These measures would be undertaken to reduce to a less than significant level any potential effects on a significant archeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Sect. 15064.5 (a)(c).</p>	Less than Significant

**TABLE 2-5 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION CENTER IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)			
<p>CUL-MC-2 (cont.)</p>		<p>CUL-MC-2: Consultation with Descendant Communities.</p> <p>On discovery of an archeological site associated with a specific Native American or other descendant group, an appropriate representative of the descendant group shall be contacted. Topics may include archeological field investigations, appropriate archeological treatment of resources, and, if applicable, interpretative treatment of the associated archeological site. A copy of the Final Archaeological Resources Report shall be provided to the representative of the descendant group.</p> <p>CUL-MC-3: Archaeological Monitoring.</p> <p>The ATP (Mitigation Measure CUL-MC-1) will determine the need for archaeological monitoring. Should it be required before or after archaeological testing and/or data recovery, an archaeologist that meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for professional archaeologists will monitor ground-disturbing activities in areas proposed for ground disturbing activities associated with the building construction. The monitor will be empowered to temporarily halt construction in the immediate vicinity of a discovery while it is evaluated for significance. With the archaeologist’s approval, work may continue on other portions of the site. If the discovery proves to be significant, additional measures will be implemented; these may include avoidance, capping beneath a layer of sterile soil, or data recovery through archaeological excavation.</p> <p>Should an archaeological artifact be discovered at the Mission Center campus site during project construction and excavation, pursuant to CEQA Guidelines 15064.5 (f), “provisions for historical or unique archaeological resources accidentally discovered during construction” shall 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 (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 shall meet to determine the appropriate avoidance measures or other appropriate</p>	

TABLE 2-5 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION CENTER IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Cultural Resources (cont.)			
CUL-MC-2 (cont.)		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 FR44716)). Whether or not significant archeological resources are encountered during monitoring, the archeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings.	
CUL-MC-3: Construction of the proposed office building at the Mission Center campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-LRDP-4	Less than Significant
CUL-MC-4: Construction of the proposed office building at the Mission Center campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains.	Potentially Significant	Implement CUL-MC-1, CUL-MC-2, and CUL-LRDP-5	Less than Significant
Geology, Soils and Seismicity			
Geology, soils and seismicity impacts at the Mission Center campus site are included in evaluation of overall 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact GEO-LRDP-1 and GEO-LRDP-2 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
GHG-MC-1: Development at the Mission Center campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions.	Potentially Significant	Implement GHG-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
GHG-MC-1: Development at the Mission Center campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in operational GHG emissions.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Hazards and Hazardous Materials			
HAZ-MC-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site could result in hazardous emissions or the handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances or waste within one-quarter mile of existing or proposed schools.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-5 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION CENTER IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)			
HAZ-MC-2: 2014 LRDP proposals located at Mission Center campus sites are included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, could create a significant hazard to the public.	Potentially Significant	Implement HAZ-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
Hydrology and Water Quality			
Hydrology and water quality impacts at the Mission Center campus site are included in evaluation of overall 2014 LRDP effects as discussed under Impact HYD-LRDP-1 through HYD-LRDP-3 (see Table 2-1).	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Land Use and Planning			
LU-MC-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site would be consistent with applicable land use plans, policies and regulations adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
LU-MC-2: The proposed new office building at the Mission Center campus site would be compatible with height and bulk restrictions established by the City for this site.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Noise			
NOI-MC-1: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site would result in increases in ambient noise levels over the term of the exterior construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
NOI-MC-2: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site would result in increases in ambient noise levels during pile-driving activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement NOI-LRDP-2 <i>Mitigation Measure NOI-LRDP-2 would reduce the severity of noise generated by pile-driving activities and reduce the potential annoyance to nearby residents and others who could be disturbed by pile-driving to the extent feasible. If piles can be installed through drilling and cast in place measures then these mitigation measures would result in a less than significant impact.</i> <i>However, if geotechnical conditions exist such that impact or vibratory pile driving is required, then construction noise would be significant. Although pile-driving noise would be intermittent and would occur over a short duration, even after mitigation the increase in ambient noise level would likely exceed 10 dBA during pile-driving activities, resulting in a significant and unavoidable impact.</i>	Significant and Unavoidable

TABLE 2-5 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION CENTER IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Noise (cont.)			
NOI-MC-3: Construction activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site could generate ground-borne vibration.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
NOI-MC-4: Operational noise generated by development under the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site could cause a long-term increase in ambient noise levels in the campus vicinity of.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Population and Housing			
No site-specific impacts			
Public Services			
No site-specific impacts			
Recreation			
No site-specific impacts			
Transportation and Traffic			
TRAF-MC-1: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Center campus site could cause substantial adverse impacts to traffic flow, circulation and access as well as to transit, pedestrian, and parking conditions during construction activities.	Potentially Significant	Implement TRAF-LRDP-1	Less than Significant
TRAF-MC-2: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Center campus site would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MC-3: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Center campus site would increase transit ridership demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MC-4: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Center campus site would not cause a substantial conflict with pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MC-5: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Center campus site would not would not cause a substantial conflict with bicycle facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
TRAF-MC-6: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Center campus site would increase loading demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant

TABLE 2-5 (Continued)
SUMMARY OF 2014 LRDP PROPOSALS – MISSION CENTER IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

Environmental Impact	Level of Significance Before Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Transportation and Traffic (cont.)			
TRAF-MC-7: Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Center campus site would increase parking demand.	Less than Significant	None required	Less than Significant
Utilities and Service Systems			
No site-specific impacts			