

# CHAPTER 11

---

## Alternatives

### 11.1 Introduction

CEQA requires that an EIR describe and evaluate the comparative effects of “a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives” to the project. A primary criterion for selecting alternatives to be considered is that such alternatives “would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a); CEQA Section 21002).

The EIR need only discuss alternatives that could feasibly attain most of the project’s basic objectives. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines generally define a “feasible” alternative as one that is capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, technological, and legal factors, including regulatory constraints and jurisdictional boundaries.

The range of alternatives is governed by the “rule of reason” which requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(f)). Evaluation of a No Project Alternative and identification of an environmentally superior alternative are required. The significant effects of the alternatives shall be discussed, but in less detail than the significant effects of the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(d)).

### 11.2 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of the 2014 LRDP

The following significant and unavoidable impacts would result from implementation of the 2014 LRDP:

#### **2014 LRDP**

- **Impact AIR-LRDP-4:** Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during demolition and construction activities.
- **Impact AIR-LRDP-5:** Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during operation.
- **Impact CUL-LRDP-2:** Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in demolition of historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.

- **Impact NOI-LRDP-2:** Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased ambient noise levels during pile-driving activities.

#### ***2014 LRDP Proposals at the Parnassus Heights Campus Site***

- **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.
- **Impact 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.
- **Impact 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.

#### ***2014 LRDP Proposals at the Mission Bay Campus Site***

- **Impact AIR-MB-3:** Operations at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants.
- **Impact 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.
- **Impact UTIL-MB-2:** There may be impacts related to wastewater infrastructure as a result of 2014 LRDP development at the Mission Bay campus site.

#### ***2014 LRDP Proposals at the Mount Zion Campus Site***

- **Impact 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.
- **Impact 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.
- **Impact 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.

#### ● ***2014 LRDP Proposals at the Mission Center Campus Site***

- **Impact 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.

## 11.3 Alternatives Analyzed in the EIR

The project alternatives selected for evaluation would have the potential to lessen or avoid one or more of the identified significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP. The alternatives addressed in this EIR were selected in consideration of one or more of the following factors:

- The extent to which the alternative would accomplish most of the basic objectives of the proposed 2014 LRDP (identified in Chapter 3, *Project Description*)
- The extent to which the alternative would avoid or lessen any of the identified significant environmental effects of the proposed 2014 LRDP
- The feasibility of the alternative, taking into account site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, and consistency with applicable plans regulatory limitations, and jurisdictional boundaries;
- The appropriateness of the alternative in contributing to a range of reasonable alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice; and
- The requirement of the CEQA Guidelines to consider a “no project” alternative and to identify an “environmentally superior” alternative that differs from the no project alternative.

This chapter describes four alternatives to the proposed 2014 LRDP: (1) No Project—No Development (2) No Project—Development Under the Existing LRDP; (3) Reduced Program; and (4) No Demolition of Historical Resources. These alternatives are described below, followed by a discussion of their impacts and how the impacts would differ from those of the proposed 2014 LRDP.

### 11.3.1 Alternative 1: No Project—No Development

CEQA requires an evaluation of the “no project” alternative so that decision makers can compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(3), when the no project alternative is the revision of an existing land use plan, such as the 2014 LRDP, the no project alternative will be the continuation of the existing plan into the future.

This “No Project—No Development” alternative, by contrast considers the impacts of a no project alternative where development currently approved under the existing 1996 LRDP would not be undertaken and, buildings proposed for demolition under the 1996 LRDP would not be demolished. While buildings currently under construction at the Mission Bay campus site would be completed (Mission Hall and the Phase 1 Medical Center), the remaining existing entitlement for the campus site would not be developed under Alternative 1. This alternative was selected for evaluation because it would avoid the significant and unavoidable air quality impacts during operation at the Mission Bay campus site; avoid the significant and unavoidable noise impacts during construction at all four main campus sites; and avoid the significant and unavoidable cultural resources impacts to resulting from demolition of Surge at the Parnassus Heights campus

site and the demolition of Hellman at the Mount Zion campus site. Because building demolitions proposed at the Parnassus Heights campus site would not occur under Alternative 1, the space ceiling would continue to be exceeded.

The No Project – No Development alternative would consist of:

- No demolition of existing buildings at Parnassus Heights or Mount Zion campus sites.
- No new development proposed under the 2014 LRDP.
- No further development of currently approved projects under the existing 1996 LRDP.
- Complete and operate Mission Bay campus site buildings now under construction: Mission Hall and Phase 1 of the Medical Center at Mission Bay.
- Decommission and reuse Moffitt Hospital for uses other than inpatient care.
- No development of Blocks 33 or 34 at Mission Bay; leave land vacant.

### **11.3.1.1 Comparison to Impacts of the 2014 LRDP**

No further development under the 1996 LRDP or the 2014 LRDP, with the exception of Mission Hall and Phase 1 of the Medical Center at Mission Bay, would greatly reduce most construction and operational significant impacts, including air quality and noise impacts, as well as generally reducing the effects of a number of other less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP.

Not demolishing existing buildings at the Parnassus Heights or Mount Zion campus sites would eliminate the significant adverse impact to historic resources, and would reduce related air quality, noise, and traffic effects at those campus sites.

The environmental effects of the alternatives are classified by the level of significance for each environmental topic.<sup>1</sup> A comparison to the effects of the 2014 LRDP is also listed.

#### ***Impacts that are Significant and Unavoidable under the 2014 LRDP***

##### **Air Quality**

**(LTSM, much less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential air quality impacts under Alternative 1 would be much less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no buildings would be demolished and no new buildings would be constructed. As a result, the related air quality effects of construction and operation would be greatly reduced. Traffic-related air quality effects would also be greatly reduced.

##### **Cultural Resources**

**(LTSM, much less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential cultural resources impacts under Alternative 1 would be much less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because the demolition of the Surge and

---

<sup>1</sup> LTS=Less than Significant  
LTSM=Less than Significant with Mitigation  
SU=Significant and Unavoidable

Hellman buildings on the Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion campus sites, respectively, would not occur. Thus, these significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP would not occur.

**Noise** **(LTSM, much less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential construction or demolition noise impacts under Alternative 1 would be much less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no demolition or development other than completion of under-construction projects would occur. Traffic-related noise effects would also be greatly reduced.

**Transportation and Traffic** **(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential cumulative transportation and traffic impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no new development would occur on the Mission Bay campus site that could result in transportation and traffic effects.

**Utilities and Service Systems** **(SU, similar to 2014 LRDP)**

The potential wastewater infrastructure impact at the Mission Bay campus site under Alternative 1 would be similar to the significant and unavoidable impact of the 2014 LRDP because Mission Hall and Phase 1 of the Medical Center at Mission Bay have been constructed and will be opening, and may require wastewater infrastructure improvements.

***Impacts that are Less Than Significant or Mitigated under the 2014 LRDP***

**Aesthetics** **(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential aesthetic impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the 2014 LRDP as no new development would occur that could result in aesthetic effects.

**Biological Resources** **(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential biological impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the 2014 LRDP as no buildings would be demolished and no new buildings, utilities, infrastructure, or open space proposals would be constructed on the Parnassus Heights campus site that could result in adverse effects.

**Geology, Soils and Seismicity** **(LTS, greater than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential geology and soils impacts under Alternative 1 would be similar to the 2014 LRDP although no new development would occur that could result in geology and soils effects. A potential exists for a greater adverse effect at the Parnassus Heights campus site than under the 2014 LRDP if the hillside instability is not corrected.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions** **(LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP as no new development would occur that could result in increased GHG emissions. However, the potential reductions in GHG emissions that could occur with implementation of the GHG Reduction Strategy would also not occur under this alternative, and therefore impacts would actually be greater over time.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no new construction would occur and there would be no increase in storage, handling, and use of hazardous materials. An Excavation Management Plan and Soil Management Plan would not be required to reduce effects from naturally occurring asbestos and on-site contamination (Mission Center campus site), respectively.

**Hydrology and Water Quality****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The less than significant potential hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no new development would occur that could result in hydrology and water quality effects.

**Land Use and Planning****(LTS, greater than 2014 LRDP)**

The less than significant potential land use impacts under Alternative 1 would be greater than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because proposed building demolitions on the Parnassus Heights campus site would not occur under this alternative and, the space ceiling overage would not be reduced.

**Population and Housing****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential population and housing impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no new development would occur that could result in population and housing effects.

**Public Services****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential public services impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no new development would occur that could result in public services effects.

**Recreation****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential recreation impacts under Alternative 1 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no new development would occur that could result in recreation effects.

**Transportation and Traffic****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential construction or demolition traffic impacts under Alternative 1 would be much less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no demolition or development other than completion of under-construction projects would occur.

**11.3.1.2 Relationship to Project Objectives**

This section examines how Alternative 1 would compare with the 2014 LRDP in terms of achieving the five campus-wide objectives.

- *Respond to the City and Community Context:* Demolitions proposed under the 1996 LRDP for the Parnassus Heights campus site would not occur; therefore, the University would not

be responding to the 1976 Regents' Resolution by reducing the space ceiling exceedance. In addition, UCSF would not replace the decommissioned Moffitt Hospital, which would eliminate an important medical resource at a location in San Francisco that serves the Sunset District and other neighborhoods in the southwestern portion of the City. As a result, Alternative 1 would not meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.

- *Accommodate UCSF's Growth Through 2035:* This alternative would only develop buildings already under construction at the Mission Bay campus site; therefore, growth proposed through 2035 under the 2014 LRDP at this and the other three main campus sites would not occur. As a result, Alternative 1 would not meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.
- *Ensure UCSF's Facilities are Seismically Safe:* While Moffitt Hospital would not be seismically retrofitted under this alternative, by moving inpatient care to other facilities the facility could be reused for other purposes. The Faculty Alumni House, Hellman, the Harold Brunn Institute, and 2255 Post Street are seismically compromised and they would not be retrofitted under this alternative. As a result, Alternative 1 would not meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.
- *Promote Environmental Sustainability:* This alternative would not reduce commute travel as new on-site housing would not be provided. The GHG Reduction Strategy would not be implemented; therefore, reductions in GHG emissions proposed by this plan would not occur. This objective would only be partially met under this alternative.
- *Minimize Facility Costs:* Because no new development would occur under this alternative, facility costs would be far less than compared to the 2014 LRDP. However, this alternative may preclude the consolidation of leased facilities at UCSF-owned facilities and may require the continued operation or possible expansion of remote campus sites, which would not meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.

### 11.3.2 Alternative 2: No Project—Development Under Existing LRDP

As mentioned above under Alternative 1, when the no project alternative is the revision of an existing land use plan, the no project alternative represents the continuation of the existing plan, which in this case is the University's 1996 LRDP. Alternative 2 would either renovate Moffitt Hospital for inpatient use or decommission this facility for acute care and accelerate construction of the Phase 2 Medical Center at Mission Bay. Under either scenario the New Hospital Addition would not be constructed at the Parnassus Heights campus site. Development on the North and South Campuses of the Mission Bay campus site would continue under existing entitlement and Blocks 33 and 34 would be developed according to existing City entitlement. Buildings proposed for demolition under the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site would be demolished under this alternative, but no new replacement buildings would be constructed. Likewise, no development would occur at the Mission Center campus site.

This alternative was selected for evaluation because it would avoid the significant and unavoidable air quality impacts during operation at the Mission Bay campus site and avoid the significant and unavoidable noise impacts during construction at the Parnassus Heights, Mount Zion, and Mission Center campus sites. Alternative 2 would result in significant and unavoidable

cultural resources impacts resulting from demolition of the Surge building at the Parnassus Heights campus site and the demolition of the Hellman building at the Mount Zion campus site. The GHG Reduction Strategy would not be adopted under this alternative.

The No Project – Development Under the Existing LRDP alternative would consist of:

- No new development under proposed 2014 LRDP.

#### **Parnassus Heights Campus Site**

- No New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site.
- Renovate Moffitt Hospital for inpatient use or decommission Moffitt for other uses and accelerate construction of Phase 2 of the Medical Center at Mission Bay.
- Demolish the following buildings at the Parnassus Heights campus site to get closer to space ceiling: Aldea, UC Hall, Surge, Woods, Environmental Health and Safety, Proctor, Medical Research 4, and the Laboratory of Radiobiology.

#### **Mission Bay Campus Site**

- Continue buildout of North Campus of the Mission Bay campus site to 2.65 million gsf.
- Develop remainder of the entitlement on South Campus of the Mission Bay campus site: Outpatient Cancer building and Phase 2 Medical Center.
- Develop Blocks 33 and 34 according to existing City entitlement.

#### **Mount Zion Campus Site**

- Demolish the Hellman, Harold Brunn Institute, and the Dialysis Center buildings. Renovate existing buildings at Mount Zion for outpatient use.

#### **Mission Center Campus Site**

- No new development.

### **11.3.2.2 Comparison to Effects of the 2014 LRDP**

#### ***Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of the 2014 LRDP***

##### **Air Quality**

**(LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential air quality impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur at the Parnassus Heights, Mission Bay, and Mount Zion campus sites and no development would occur at the Mission Center campus site. As a result, the related air quality effects of construction and operation would be greatly reduced. Traffic-related air quality effects would also be greatly reduced.

**Cultural Resources** (SU, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential cultural resources impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because the demolition of the Surge and Hellman buildings on the Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion campus sites, respectively, would still occur.

**Noise** (SU, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential construction and demolition noise impacts under Alternative 2 would be generally less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur at the Parnassus Heights, Mission Bay, and Mount Zion campus sites and no development would occur at the Mission Center campus site. Traffic-related noise effects would also be reduced. However, if pile driving is required during construction at the Mission Bay campus site noise impacts from construction would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 2.

**Transportation and Traffic** (SU, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential cumulative transportation and traffic impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur on the Mission Bay campus site that could result in transportation and traffic effects. It is not known with certainty whether the reduction in development proposed under this alternative would be sufficient to reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact identified under the 2014 LRDP to a less-than-significant level.

**Utilities and Service Systems** (SU, similar 2014 LRDP)

The potential wastewater infrastructure impact at the Mission Bay campus site under Alternative 2 would be similar to the significant and unavoidable impact of the 2014 LRDP because Mission Hall and the Phase 1 Medical Center will open soon, in addition to other proposed development under this Alternative, and may require wastewater infrastructure improvements.

***Less than Significant or Mitigated Impacts of the 2014 LRDP***

**Aesthetics** (LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential aesthetic impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur at the Parnassus Heights, Mission Bay, and Mount Zion campus sites and no development would occur at the Mission Center campus site.

**Biological Resources** (LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential biological impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the 2014 LRDP because the proposed New Hospital Addition would not be constructed on the Parnassus Heights campus site thereby reducing potential adverse effects to birds.

**Geology, Soils and Seismicity** (LTS, similar to 2014 LRDP)

The potential geology and soils impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the 2014 LRDP because new development would occur that could result in geology and soils effects. A potential

exists for a larger adverse effect at the Parnassus Heights campus site if the hillside instability is not corrected.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions** (LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP as less development would occur that could result in GHG effects. However, the potential reductions in GHG emissions that could occur with implementation of the GHG Reduction Strategy might not occur under this alternative.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials** (LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less construction would occur and there would be less increase in storage, handling, and use of hazardous materials.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** (LTS, similar to 2014 LRDP)

The potential hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because new development would occur that could result in hydrology and water quality effects.

**Land Use and Planning** (LTS, similar to 2014 LRDP)

The potential land use impacts under Alternative 2 would be similar to the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because proposed building demolitions on the Parnassus Heights campus site would still occur under this alternative; therefore, the University would be responding to the 1976 Regents' Resolution by reducing the space ceiling coverage.

**Population and Housing** (LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential population and housing impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur that could result in population and housing effects.

**Public Services** (LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential public services impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no less development would occur that could result in public services effects.

**Recreation** (LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential recreation impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur that could result in recreation effects.

**Transportation and Traffic** (LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential construction or demolition traffic impacts under Alternative 2 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP, because less development would occur that could result in construction and demolition traffic effects.

### 11.3.2.3 Relationship to Project Objectives

This section examines how Alternative 2 would compare with the 2014 LRDP in terms of achieving the five campus-wide objectives.

- Respond to the City and Community Context:* Demolitions proposed under the 1996 LRDP for the Parnassus Heights campus site would occur under this alternative; therefore, the University would be responding to the 1976 Regents' Resolution by reducing building space. If UCSF decommissioned Moffitt Hospital or retrofitted it for inpatient use without constructing the New Hospital Addition, then this alternative would eliminate an important medical resource at a location in San Francisco that serves the Sunset District and other neighborhoods in the southwestern portion of the City. Therefore, Alternative 2 would only partially meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.
- Accommodate UCSF's Growth Through 2035:* This alternative would result in much less development at the Parnassus Heights, Mount Zion, and Mission Bay campus sites and no development at the Mission Center campus site; therefore, growth proposed by UCSF through 2035 under the 2014 LRDP at the four main campus sites would not be accommodated. Therefore, Alternative 2 would only partially meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.
- Ensure UCSF's Facilities are Seismically Safe:* Moffitt Hospital could be seismically retrofitted under this alternative, but the Faculty Alumni House would not. Hellman and the Harold Brunn Institute are seismically compromised and they would be demolished under this alternative. Therefore, Alternative 2 would only partially meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.
- Promote Environmental Sustainability:* This alternative would not reduce commute travel as new on-site housing would not be provided. The GHG Reduction Strategy would not be implemented; therefore, reductions in GHG emissions proposed by this plan would not occur. Therefore, Alternative 2 would only partially meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.
- Minimize Facility Costs:* Because less new development would occur under this alternative, facility costs would be less than compared to the 2014 LRDP. However, this alternative may preclude the consolidation of leased facilities at UCSF-owned facilities and may require the continued operation or possible expansion of remote campus sites, which would not meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.

### 11.3.3 Alternative 3: Reduced Program

The Reduced Program Alternative would either renovate Moffitt Hospital for inpatient use or decommission this facility for acute care and accelerate construction of the Phase 2 Medical Center at Mission Bay. Under either scenario the New Hospital Addition would not be constructed at the Parnassus Heights campus site. The Mission Bay campus site would be developed under the existing entitlement and Blocks 33 and 34 would be developed as proposed under the 2014 LRDP. The Mount Zion and Mission Center campus sites would be developed as proposed under the 2014 LRDP. This alternative was selected to avoid the significant and unavoidable air quality impacts during operation at the Mission Bay campus site and avoid the significant and unavoidable noise impacts during construction at the Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay campus sites. Alternative 3 would result in significant and unavoidable cultural

resources impacts resulting from demolition of the Surge building at the Parnassus Heights campus site and the demolition of the Hellman building at the Mount Zion campus site.

The Reduced Program alternative would consist of:

- Implement the GHG Reduction Strategy.

#### **Parnassus Heights Campus Site**

- No New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site.
- Renovate Moffitt Hospital for inpatient use; or decommission Moffitt and accelerate construction of the Phase 2 Medical Center at Mission Bay.
- Renovate and reuse UC Hall and Millberry Union towers.
- Demolish the following buildings at the Parnassus Heights campus site to get closer to space ceiling: Surge, Woods, Environmental Health and Safety, Proctor, Medical Research 4, Laboratory of Radiobiology, and Koret.

#### **Mission Bay Campus Site**

- Continue buildout of Mission Bay North Campus to 2.65 million gsf.
- Develop remainder of entitlement on South Campus: Phase 2 Medical Center.
- Develop Blocks 33 and 34 as proposed under the 2014 LRDP.

#### **Mount Zion Campus Site**

- Demolish Hellman, Harold Brunn Institute, the Dialysis Center and possibly 2255 Post Street. Renovate existing Mount Zion hospital for outpatient use.
- Develop Mount Zion as proposed under the 2014 LRDP.

#### **Mission Center Campus Site**

- Develop Mission Center building as proposed under the 2014 LRDP.

### **11.3.3.2 Comparison to Effects of the 2014 LRDP**

#### ***Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of the 2014 LRDP***

##### **Air Quality**

**(SU, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential air quality impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur at the Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay campus sites. As a result, the related air quality effects of construction and operation would be reduced. Traffic-related air quality effects would also be reduced. It is not known with certainty whether the reduction in development proposed under this alternative would be sufficient to reduce the significant and unavoidable impact identified under the 2014 LRDP to a less-than-significant level.

**Cultural Resources****(SU, similar to the 2014 LRDP)**

The potential cultural resources impacts under Alternative 3 would be similar to the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because the demolition of the Surge and Hellman buildings on the Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion campus sites, respectively, would still occur.

**Noise****(SU, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential construction or demolition noise impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur at the Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay campus sites. Traffic-related noise effects would also be reduced. However, if pile driving is required during construction the impact would remain significant and unavoidable under Alternative 3.

**Transportation and Traffic****(SU, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential cumulative transportation and traffic impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the significant and unavoidable impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur on the Mission Bay campus site that could result in transportation and traffic effects. It is not known with certainty whether the reduction in development proposed under this alternative would be sufficient to reduce the significant and unavoidable cumulative impact identified under the 2014 LRDP to a less-than-significant level.

**Utilities and Service Systems****(SU, similar 2014 LRDP)**

The potential wastewater infrastructure impact at the Mission Bay campus site under Alternative 3 would be similar to the significant and unavoidable impact of the 2014 LRDP because Mission Hall and the Phase 1 Medical Center will open soon, in addition to other proposed development under this Alternative, and may require wastewater infrastructure improvements.

***Less than Significant or Mitigated Impacts of the 2014 LRDP*****Aesthetics****(LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential aesthetic impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur at the Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay campus sites.

**Biological Resources****(LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential biological impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the 2014 LRDP because the proposed New Hospital Addition would not be constructed on the Parnassus Heights campus site thereby reducing potential adverse effects to birds.

**Geology, Soils and Seismicity****(LTS, similar to 2014 LRDP)**

The potential geology and soils impacts under Alternative 3 would be similar to the 2014 LRDP because new development would occur that could result in geology and soils effects.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions****(LTSM, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP as less development would occur that could result in GHG effects.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials****(LTSM, similar to 2014 LRDP)**

The potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts under Alternative 3 would be similar to the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP because new development would occur that could result in hazards and hazardous materials effects.

**Hydrology and Water Quality****(LTS, similar to 2014 LRDP)**

The potential hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 3 would be similar to the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because new development would occur that could result in hydrology and water quality effects.

**Land Use and Planning****(LTS, similar to 2014 LRDP)**

The potential land use impacts under Alternative 3 would be similar to the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because proposed building demolitions on the Parnassus Heights campus site would still occur under this alternative; therefore, the University would be responding to the 1976 Regents' Resolution.

**Population and Housing****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential population and housing impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur that could result in population and housing effects.

**Public Services****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential public services impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because no less development would occur that could result in public services effects.

**Recreation****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential recreation impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the less than significant impacts of the 2014 LRDP because less development would occur that could result in recreation effects.

**Transportation and Traffic****(LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)**

The potential construction or demolition traffic impacts under Alternative 3 would be less than the mitigated impacts of the 2014 LRDP, because less development would occur that could result in construction and demolition traffic effects.

### 11.3.3.3 Relationship to Project Objectives

This section examines how Alternative 3 would compare with the 2014 LRDP in terms of achieving the five campus-wide objectives.

- *Respond to the City and Community Context:* Demolitions proposed under the 1996 LRDP for the Parnassus Heights campus site would occur under this alternative; therefore, the University would be responding to the 1976 Regents' Resolution by reducing building space. If UCSF decommissioned Moffitt Hospital or retrofitted it for inpatient use without the New Hospital Addition, then this alternative would eliminate an important medical resource at a location in San Francisco that serves the Sunset District and other neighborhoods in the southwestern portion of the City. Therefore, this objective would only be partially met under this alternative.
- *Accommodate UCSF's Growth Through 2035:* This alternative would result in less development at the Parnassus Heights and Mission Bay campus sites; therefore, growth proposed by UCSF through 2035 at the four main campus sites would not be accommodated and the objective would only be partially met under this alternative.
- *Ensure UCSF's Facilities are Seismically Safe:* Moffitt Hospital could be seismically retrofitted under this alternative. Hellman and the Harold Brunn Institute are seismically compromised and they would be demolished under this alternative. Therefore, Alternative 3 would only partially meet this objective of the 2014 LRDP.
- *Promote Environmental Sustainability:* This alternative would reduce commute travel as new on-site housing would be provided at the Parnassus Heights campus site and possibly at the Mission Bay campus site. The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Strategy would be implemented; therefore, reductions in GHG emissions proposed by this plan would occur.
- *Minimize Facility Costs:* Because less new development would occur under this alternative, facility costs would be less than compared to the 2014 LRDP. However, this alternative may preclude the consolidation of leased facilities at UCSF-owned facilities and may require the continued operation or possible expansion of remote campus sites. Therefore, this object would only be partially met under this alternative.

### 11.3.4 Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources

The No Project – No Demolition of Historical Resources alternative would include all elements of the 2014 LRDP, with the exceptions that the Surge building at the Parnassus Heights campus site and the Hellman building at the Mount Zion campus site would not be demolished. Rather, these two buildings would be preserved and rehabilitated per the Secretary of the Interior's Standards, and then reused in order to avoid the 2014 LRDP's significant and unavoidable impacts on historical resources. The proposed new office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site would still be constructed, but it would have a smaller footprint as it would only be built in the area currently occupied by the Harold Brunn Institute and the Dialysis Center buildings.

### **11.3.4.1 Comparison to Effects of the 2014 LRDP**

#### ***Significant and Unavoidable Impacts of the 2014 LRDP***

**Air Quality** (SU, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential air quality impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Cultural Resources** (LTSM, less than the 2014 LRDP)

The potential cultural resources impacts under Alternative 4 would be less than the 2014 LRDP as the demolition of Surge and Hellman buildings on the Parnassus Heights and Mount Zion campus sites, respectively, would not occur.

**Noise** (SU, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential noise impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Transportation and Traffic** (SU, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential transportation and traffic impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Utilities and Service Systems** (SU, similar 2014 LRDP)

The potential wastewater infrastructure impact at the Mission Bay campus site under Alternative 3 would be similar to the significant and unavoidable impact of the 2014 LRDP because Mission Hall and the Phase 1 Medical Center will open soon and all development proposed at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

#### ***Less than Significant or Mitigated Impacts of the 2014 LRDP***

**Aesthetics** (LTSM, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential aesthetic impacts under Alternative 4 would generally be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative. Depending on the final building design for the proposed office/research building on the Mount Zion campus site, shadow effects on the Hamilton Recreation Center may be reduced because the building would not be constructed in the space currently occupied by the Hellman building.

**Biological Resources** (LTSM, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential biological resources impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site would be constructed under this alternative.

**Geology, Soils and Seismicity** (LTS, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential geology and soils impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Greenhouse Gas Emissions** (LTSM, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential greenhouse gas impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials** (LTSM, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential hazards and hazardous materials impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Hydrology and Water Quality** (LTS, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Land Use and Planning** (LTS, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential land use impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative. Not demolishing Surge would have an effect on the space ceiling.

**Population and Housing** (LTS, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential population and housing impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Public Services** (LTS, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential public services impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Recreation** (LTS, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential recreation impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Transportation and Traffic** (LTS, less than 2014 LRDP)

The potential construction or demolition traffic impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

**Utilities and Service Systems** (LTS, similar to the 2014 LRDP)

The potential utilities and service systems impacts under Alternative 4 would be the same as the 2014 LRDP as Mission Hall and the Phase 1 Medical Center will open soon and all development proposed under the 2014 LRDP would be constructed under this alternative.

### 11.3.4.2 Relationship to Project Objectives

The relationship of Alternative 4 to the project objectives would generally be the same as the 2014 LRDP; however, the seismically compromised Hellman building on the Mount Zion campus site would not be retrofitted or replaced under this alternative and therefore this alternative would only partially meet the objective to endure seismic safety. In addition, because the proposed office/research building would not be constructed at least partially on the space currently occupied by the Hellman building, the new building may by necessity be smaller than proposed under the 2014 LRDP, thereby reducing the space needed to accommodate UCSF growth through 2035.

## 11.4 Summary Comparison of the 2014 LRDP Alternatives<sup>2</sup>

	Alternative 1: No Project-No Development	Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP	Alternative 3: Reduced Program	Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources
<b>Significant Impacts (before mitigation)</b>				
<b>Aesthetics</b>				
<b>Impact AES-LRDP-3:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in flood lighting during nighttime construction activities that would adversely affect nighttime views in the area. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AES-LRDP-4:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AES-LRDP-5:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could create street-level winds that could be hazardous to pedestrians in the area. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AES-LRDP-6:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could substantially reduce sunlight or significantly increase shadows in public open space areas. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AES-PH-3:</b> Construction of the New Hospital Addition and faculty housing buildings at the Parnassus Heights campus site could result in flood lighting on the sites during nighttime construction activities. (LSM)	L+	L+	L+	E
<b>Impact AES-PH-4:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	L+	E

<sup>2</sup> E = Impacts are similar or the same as the 2014 LRDP  
 L = Impacts are less  
 L+ = Impacts are much less  
 G = Impacts are greater  
 G+ = Impacts are much greater

Significant Impacts (before mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project-No Development	Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP	Alternative 3: Reduced Program	Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources
<b>Aesthetics (cont.)</b>				
<b>Impact AES-PH-5:</b> The demolition of 8 existing buildings, including LPP1, 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. (LSM)	E	E	E	E
<b>Impact AES-MB-5:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	E	E	E
<b>Impact AES-MZ-2:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact AES-MZ-3:</b> Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could result in flood lighting sites during nighttime construction activities. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact AES-MZ-4:</b> The proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site would cast shadow on the Hamilton Recreation Center. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact AES-MZ-5:</b> 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. (LSM)	E	E	E	E
<b>Impact AES-MC-2:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact AES-MC-3:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Air Quality</b>				
<b>Impact AIR-LRDP-4:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during demolition and construction activities. (SU)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AIR-LRDP-5:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during operation. (SU)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AIR-PH-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E

	<b>Alternative 1: No Project-No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Reduced Program</b>	<b>Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources</b>
<b>Significant Impacts (before mitigation)</b>				
<b>Air Quality (cont.)</b>				
<b>Impact AIR-PH-3:</b> Operations at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants. (LSM)	L+	L+	L+	E
<b>Impact AIR-MB-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants during construction activities. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AIR-MB-2:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact AIR-MB-3:</b> Operations at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants. (SU)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact AIR-MB-4:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	E	E
<b>Impact AIR-MZ-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact AIR-MZ-3:</b> Operations at the Mount Zion campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants. (LSM)	L+	L	E	E
<b>Impact AIR-MC-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Center campus site would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact AIR-MC-3:</b> Operations at the Mission Center campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in increased emissions of criteria air pollutants. (LSM)	L	L	E	E
<b>Biological Resources</b>				
<b>Impact BIO-LRDP-4:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact BIO-PH-1:</b> 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	L+	L	L	E

	<b>Alternative 1: No Project-No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Reduced Program</b>	<b>Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources</b>
<b>Significant Impacts (before mitigation)</b>				
<b>Biological Resources (cont.)</b>				
special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the CDFW or USFWS. (LSM)				
<b>Impact BIO-PH-2:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Cultural Resources</b>				
<b>Impact CUL-LRDP-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LDP would result in a substantial adverse change in the significance of historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. (PS)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact CUL-LRDP-2:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in demolition of historical resources as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5.	L+	E	E	L+
<b>Impact CUL-LRDP-3:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse change to archaeological resources. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact CUL-LRDP-4:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse change to paleontological resources. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact CUL-LRDP-5:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP could result in a substantial adverse change to human remains. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact CUL-PH-2:</b> 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. (SU)	L+	E	E	L+
<b>Impact CUL-PH-4:</b> Seismic rehabilitation of the historic Faculty Alumni House could result in significant impact to this historic structure if not completed in accordance with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards. (LSM)	L+	E	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-PH-5:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	E	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-PH-6:</b> Construction of the New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources. (LSM)	L+	L+	L+	E
<b>Impact CUL-PH-7:</b> Construction of the New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources. (LSM)	L+	L+	L+	E

Significant Impacts (before mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project-No Development	Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP	Alternative 3: Reduced Program	Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources
<b>Cultural Resources (cont.)</b>				
<b>Impact CUL-PH-8:</b> Construction of the New Hospital Addition at the Parnassus Heights campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains. (LSM)	L+	L+	L+	E
<b>Impact CUL-PH-9:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	E	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-MB-1:</b> Construction of 2014 LRDP proposals at the Mission Bay campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact CUL-MB-2:</b> Construction of 2014 LRDP proposals at the Mission Bay campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact CUL-MB-3:</b> Construction of 2014 LRDP proposals at the Mission Bay campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact CUL-MZ-1:</b> 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. (SU)	L+	E	E	L+
<b>Impact CUL-MZ-4:</b> Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-MZ-5:</b> Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-MZ-6:</b> Construction of the proposed office/research building at the Mount Zion campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-MC-2:</b> Construction of the proposed office building and parking structure at the Mission Center campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to archaeological resources. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-MC-3:</b> Construction of the proposed office building and parking structure at the Mission Center campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to paleontological resources. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact CUL-MC-4:</b> Construction of the proposed office building and parking structure at the Mission Center campus site could cause substantial adverse changes to human remains. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E

	<b>Alternative 1: No Project-No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Reduced Program</b>	<b>Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources</b>
<b>Significant Impacts (before mitigation)</b>				
<b>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>				
<b>Impact GHG-LRDP-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related greenhouse gas emissions. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact GHG-PH-1:</b> Development at the Parnassus Heights campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions. (LSM)	L+	L+	L	E
<b>Impact GHG-MB-1:</b> Development at the Mission Bay campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact GHG-MZ-1:</b> Development at the Mount Zion campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact GHG-MC-1:</b> Development at the Mission Center campus site under the 2014 LRDP would result in an increase in construction-related GHG emissions. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>				
<b>Impact HAZ-LRDP-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	E	E
<b>Impact HAZ-LRDP-3:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	E	E
<b>Impact HAZ-PH-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	L	E
<b>Impact HAZ-MB-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP at the Mission Bay campus site 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact HAZ-MB-3:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E

	<b>Alternative 1: No Project-No Development</b>	<b>Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP</b>	<b>Alternative 3: Reduced Program</b>	<b>Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources</b>
<b>Significant Impacts (before mitigation)</b>				
<b>Hazards and Hazardous Materials (cont.)</b>				
<b>Impact HAZ-MZ-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	E	E
<b>Impact HAZ-MC-2:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Hydrology</b>				
<b>Impact HYD-MB-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L	E	E	E
<b>Noise</b>				
<b>Impact NOI-LRDP-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased ambient noise levels during demolition and construction activities. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact NOI-LRDP-2:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP would result in increased ambient noise levels during pile-driving activities. (SU)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact NOI-PH-1:</b> Demolition activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Parnassus Heights campus site would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels. (SU)	L+	L+	L+	E
<b>Impact NOI-PH-2:</b> 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. (SU)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact NOI-MB-1:</b> 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. (SU)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact NOI-MB-2:</b> 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. (SU)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact NOI-MZ-1:</b> Demolition activities proposed under the 2014 LRDP at the Mount Zion campus site would result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels. (SU)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact NOI-MZ-2:</b> 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. (SU)	L+	L+	L	L

	Alternative 1: No Project-No Development	Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP	Alternative 3: Reduced Program	Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources
<b>Significant Impacts (before mitigation)</b>				
<b>Noise (cont.)</b>				
<b>Impact NOI-MC-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact NOI-MC-2:</b> 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. (SU)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Transportation and Traffic</b>				
<b>Impact TRAF-LRDP-2:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact TRAF-LRDP-3:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact TRAF-PH-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	L+	E
<b>Impact TRAF-MB-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Impact TRAF-MZ-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact TRAF-MC-1:</b> 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. (LSM)	L+	L+	E	E
<b>Impact TRAF-MB-C-1:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP on the Mission Bay campus site in combination with foreseeable 2040 traffic volumes would increase traffic at intersections on the adjacent roadway network. (SU)	L+	L	L	E

Significant Impacts (before mitigation)	Alternative 1: No Project-No Development	Alternative 2: No Project- Development Under Existing LRDP	Alternative 3: Reduced Program	Alternative 4: No Demolition of Historical Resources
<b>Transportation and Traffic (cont.)</b>				
<b>Impact TRAF-MB-C-2:</b> Implementation of the 2014 LRDP with the LRDP Variant on the Mission Bay campus site in combination with foreseeable 2040 traffic volumes would increase traffic at the Sixteenth/Seventh Street and the Mariposa Street/Third Street intersections on the adjacent roadway network. (LSM)	L+	L	L	E
<b>Utilities and Service Systems</b>				
<b>Impact UTIL-MB-2:</b> There may be impacts related to wastewater infrastructure as a result of 2014 LRDP development at the Mission Bay campus site. (SU)	E	E	E	E

## 11.5 Alternatives Withdrawn from Consideration

No other alternatives were proposed for consideration during the scoping process.

In the early stages of the LRDP planning process, UCSF considered additional research and office space at the Mission Bay campus site to meet considerable needs for space in these areas, but no additional housing was contemplated beyond the existing Block 20 campus housing complex. As the plan evolved, additional housing was proposed to advance UCSF's housing goals, to reduce travel to and from the campus site, and to further the jobs-housing balance in San Francisco. In recognition of the importance of on-campus housing, UCSF is no longer considering the prior iteration of the plan that included only additional research and office space on the Mission Bay campus site, which would have resulted in greater traffic and parking impacts compared to the current mix of uses proposed under the LRDP.

## 11.6 Environmentally Superior Alternative

Of the alternatives assessed in this EIR, the environmentally superior alternative, that is the alternative with the least environmental impact, is the No Project–No Development Alternative. Section 15126.6(e)(2) of the CEQA Guidelines directs that if the environmentally superior alternative is the no project alternative, the EIR shall also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

Other than the No Project Alternative, the No Project—Development Under Existing LRDP is the environmentally superior alternative, because it would reduce the significant and unavoidable impacts associated with the 2014 LRDP more than would the other alternatives. Significant and unavoidable Air Quality, Noise, and Traffic impacts related to construction and operation would be reduced in magnitude, even if not necessarily reduced to less than significant levels.