



**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT  
VOLUME 1  
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC)  
Long Range Development Plan**

PLANNING DEPARTMENT CASE NO. 2005.0555E

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2006062157



**SAN FRANCISCO  
PLANNING  
DEPARTMENT**

Draft EIR Publication Date:	JULY 21, 2010
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	SEPTEMBER 23, 2010
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	JULY 21, 2010 – SEPTEMBER 29, 2010

*Written comments should be sent to:*  
Environmental Review Officer | 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 | San Francisco, CA 94103

# DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT VOLUME 1 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC) Long Range Development Plan

PLANNING DEPARTMENT CASE NO. 2005.0555E

STATE CLEARINGHOUSE NO. 2006062157



SAN FRANCISCO  
**PLANNING**  
DEPARTMENT

Draft EIR Publication Date:	JULY 21, 2010
Draft EIR Public Hearing Date:	SEPTEMBER 23, 2010
Draft EIR Public Comment Period:	JULY 21, 2010 – SEPTEMBER 29, 2010

*Written comments should be sent to:*  
Environmental Review Officer | 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400 | San Francisco, CA 94103

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Chapter/Section</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....</b>	<b>xix</b>
<b>GLOSSARY .....</b>	<b>xxix</b>
<b>SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>S-1</b>
S.1 Purpose of the Summary .....	1
S.2 Project Synopsis .....	1
S.2.1 Cathedral Hill Campus .....	2
S.2.2 Pacific Campus.....	8
S.2.3 California Campus.....	12
S.2.4 Davies Campus.....	13
S.2.5 St. Luke’s Campus .....	15
S.3 Project Objectives.....	20
S.4 Required Project Approvals .....	22
S.5 Unresolved Issues and Areas of Controversy.....	22
S.6 Alternatives .....	28
S.7 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....	35
<b>1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND .....</b>	<b>1-1</b>
1.1 Project Overview.....	1-1
1.2 Environmental Review Process.....	1-3
1.2.1 Purpose of This Environmental Impact Report .....	1-3
1.2.2 The EIR Process .....	1-4
1.2.3 Revisions and Refinements to the LRDP .....	1-5
1.2.4 2009 Notice of Preparation and Summary of Public Comments.....	1-5
1.2.5 Changes to the Proposed Project Since Publication of the 2009 NOP .....	1-8
1.2.6 EIR Certification and Project Approval Process.....	1-11
1.2.7 CEQA Findings for Project Approval.....	1-11
1.3 CEQA Analysis of CPMC Long Range Development Plan: Near-Term versus Long-Term Project Components.....	1-12
1.3.1 Near-Term Projects .....	1-13
1.3.2 Long-Term Projects.....	1-14
1.4 EIR Organization.....	1-14
1.5 Project Background .....	1-17
1.5.1 Overview .....	1-17
1.5.2 Seismic Requirements for Hospitals .....	1-17
1.5.3 Review Process for Compliance with Seismic Requirements.....	1-19
1.5.4 CPMC Institutional Master Plan .....	1-20
<b>2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION.....</b>	<b>2-1</b>
2.1 Project Overview.....	2-1
2.1.1 Introduction .....	2-1
2.1.2 Project Variants.....	2-3
2.1.3 Project Schedule and Phasing.....	2-3
2.1.4 Project Objectives .....	2-7
2.1.5 Sustainability .....	2-11
2.1.6 Required Project Approvals .....	2-11
2.1.7 Project Construction Cost.....	2-18

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.2 Cathedral Hill Campus .....	2-19
2.2.1 Existing Conditions .....	2-19
2.2.2 Proposal for the Cathedral Hill Campus.....	2-26
2.2.3 Construction Schedule and Activities .....	2-38
2.2.4 Required Project Approvals for Cathedral Hill Campus.....	2-43
2.3 Pacific Campus.....	2-103
2.3.1 Existing Conditions .....	2-103
2.3.2 Proposal for the Pacific Campus .....	2-114
2.3.3 Construction Schedule and Activities .....	2-118
2.3.4 Required Project Approvals for the Pacific Campus.....	2-119
2.4 California Campus.....	2-125
2.4.1 Existing Conditions .....	2-125
2.4.2 Proposal for the California Campus .....	2-131
2.4.3 Construction Schedule and Activities .....	2-132
2.4.4 Required Project Approvals for the California Campus.....	2-132
2.5 Davies Campus.....	2-137
2.5.1 Existing Conditions .....	2-137
2.5.2 Proposal for the Davies Campus .....	2-143
2.5.3 Construction Schedule and Activities .....	2-149
2.5.4 Required Project Approvals for the Davies Campus.....	2-151
2.6 St. Luke’s Campus .....	2-173
2.6.1 Existing Conditions .....	2-173
2.6.2 Proposal for the St. Luke’s Campus .....	2-179
2.6.3 Construction Schedule and Activities .....	2-187
2.6.4 Required Project Approvals for the St. Luke’s Campus .....	2-191
<b>3 PLANS AND POLICIES .....</b>	<b>3-1</b>
3.1 Introduction .....	3-1
3.2 City and County of San Francisco Plans and Policies.....	3-2
3.2.1 San Francisco General Plan.....	3-2
3.2.2 Van Ness Avenue Area Plan .....	3-10
3.2.3 Market & Octavia Area Plan .....	3-11
3.2.4 Mission Area Plan .....	3-12
3.2.5 San Francisco Planning Code (Zoning Ordinance).....	3-12
3.2.6 Accountable Planning Initiative .....	3-19
3.2.7 Transit Effectiveness Project.....	3-20
3.2.8 San Francisco Bicycle Plan .....	3-21
3.2.9 Climate Action Plan for San Francisco .....	3-21
3.2.10 Sustainability Plan for the City of San Francisco.....	3-22
3.2.11 San Francisco Green Building Ordinance .....	3-23
3.2.12 Japantown Better Neighborhood Plan .....	3-24
3.2.13 Draft San Francisco Better Streets Plan .....	3-24
3.2.14 Draft Mission District Streetscape Plan .....	3-25
3.2.15 Draft Cesar Chavez Streetscape Plan .....	3-26
3.3 Regional Plans and Policies .....	3-26
3.3.1 Air Quality Plans.....	3-26
3.3.2 Bay Area Air Quality Management District Climate Protection Program.....	3-28

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>		<b>Page</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION .....</b>	<b>4-1</b>
4.1	Land Use and Planning.....	4.1-1
4.1.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.1-1
4.1.2	Regulatory Framework.....	4.1-35
4.1.3	Cumulative Conditions.....	4.1-35
4.1.4	Significance Criteria.....	4.1-36
4.1.5	Impact Evaluations.....	4.1-37
4.1.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	4.1-66
4.2	Aesthetics .....	4.2-1
4.2.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.2-1
4.2.2	Regulatory Framework.....	4.2-90
4.2.3	Cumulative Conditions.....	4.2-93
4.2.4	Significance Criteria.....	4.2-93
4.2.5	Impact Evaluations.....	4.2-94
4.2.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	4.2-192
4.3	Population, Employment, and Housing.....	4.3-1
4.3.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.3-1
4.3.2	Regulatory Framework.....	4.3-10
4.3.3	Cumulative Conditions.....	4.3-11
4.3.4	Significance Criteria.....	4.3-11
4.3.5	Impact Evaluations.....	4.3-12
4.3.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	4.3-45
4.4	Cultural and Paleontological Resources.....	4.4-1
4.4.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.4-1
4.4.2	Regulatory Framework.....	4.4-20
4.4.3	Significance Criteria.....	4.4-28
4.4.4	Cumulative Conditions.....	4.4-29
4.4.5	Impact Evaluations.....	4.4-29
4.4.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	4.4-49
4.5	Transportation and Circulation.....	4.5-1
4.5.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.5-1
4.5.2	Regulatory Framework.....	4.5-52
4.5.3	Significance Criteria.....	4.5-53
4.5.4	Impact Evaluations.....	4.5-87
4.5.5	Cumulative Impacts.....	4.5-215
4.6	Noise.....	4.6-1
4.6.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.6-1
4.6.2	Regulatory Framework.....	4.6-30
4.6.3	Cumulative Conditions.....	4.6-38
4.6.4	Significance Criteria.....	4.6-38
4.6.5	Impact Evaluations.....	4.6-39
4.6.6	Cumulative Impacts.....	4.6-96
4.7	Air Quality.....	4.7-1
4.7.1	Environmental Setting.....	4.7-1
4.7.2	Regulatory Framework.....	4.7-14
4.7.3	Cumulative Conditions.....	4.7-24
4.7.4	Significance Criteria.....	4.7-25
4.7.5	Impact Evaluations.....	4.7-26

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.7.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	4.7-85
4.8 Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....	4.8-1
4.8.1 Environmental Setting.....	4.8-1
4.8.2 Regulatory Framework.....	4.8-2
4.8.3 Cumulative Conditions.....	4.8-13
4.8.4 Significance Criteria.....	4.8-13
4.8.5 Impact Evaluations.....	4.8-21
4.9 Wind and Shadow .....	4.9-1
4.9.1 Environmental Setting.....	4.9-1
4.9.2 Regulatory Framework.....	4.9-15
4.9.3 Cumulative Conditions.....	4.9-17
4.9.4 Significance Criteria.....	4.9-18
4.9.5 Impact Evaluations.....	4.9-20
4.9.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	4.9-59
4.10 Recreation.....	4.10-1
4.10.1 Environmental Setting.....	4.10-1
4.10.2 Regulatory Framework.....	4.10-27
4.10.3 Cumulative Conditions.....	4.10-29
4.10.4 Significance Criteria.....	4.10-29
4.10.5 Impact Evaluations.....	4.10-30
4.10.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	4.10-52
4.11 Public Services .....	4.11-1
4.11.1 Environmental Setting.....	4.11-1
4.11.2 Regulatory Framework.....	4.11-11
4.11.3 Cumulative Conditions.....	4.11-13
4.11.4 Significance Criteria.....	4.11-13
4.11.5 Impact Evaluations.....	4.11-14
4.11.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	4.11-36
4.12 Utilities and Service Systems .....	4.12-1
4.12.1 Environmental Setting.....	4.12-1
4.12.2 Regulatory Framework.....	4.12-15
4.12.3 Significance Criteria.....	4.12-23
4.12.4 Impact Evaluations.....	4.12-24
4.12.5 Cumulative Impacts.....	4.12-45
4.13 Biological Resources.....	4.13-1
4.13.1 Environmental Setting.....	4.13-1
4.13.2 Regulatory Framework.....	4.13-10
4.13.3 Cumulative Conditions.....	4.13-15
4.13.4 Significance Criteria.....	4.13-16
4.13.5 Impact Evaluations.....	4.13-17
4.13.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	4.13-29
4.14 Geology and Soils .....	4.14-1
4.14.1 Environmental Setting.....	4.14-1
4.14.2 Regulatory Framework.....	4.14-31
4.14.3 Cumulative Conditions.....	4.14-36
4.14.4 Significance Criteria.....	4.14-36
4.14.5 Impact Evaluations.....	4.14-41
4.14.6 Cumulative Impacts.....	4.14-70

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.15 Hydrology and Water Quality .....	4.15-1
4.15.1 Environmental Setting .....	4.15-1
4.15.2 Regulatory Framework .....	4.15-13
4.15.3 Cumulative Conditions .....	4.15-24
4.15.4 Significance Criteria .....	4.15-24
4.15.5 Impact Evaluations .....	4.15-25
4.15.6 Cumulative Impacts .....	4.15-44
4.16 Hazards and Hazardous Materials .....	4.16-1
4.16.1 Environmental Setting .....	4.16-2
4.16.2 Regulatory Framework .....	4.16-21
4.16.3 Cumulative Conditions .....	4.16-36
4.16.4 Significance Criteria .....	4.16-36
4.16.5 Impact Evaluations .....	4.16-37
4.16.6 Cumulative Impacts .....	4.16-78
4.17 Mineral and Energy Resources .....	4.17-1
4.17.1 Environmental Setting .....	4.17-1
4.17.2 Regulatory Framework .....	4.17-3
4.17.3 Cumulative Conditions .....	4.17-5
4.17.4 Significance Criteria .....	4.17-5
4.17.5 Impact Evaluations .....	4.17-6
4.17.6 Cumulative Impacts .....	4.17-10
4.18 Agricultural and Forest Resources .....	4.18-1
4.18.1 Environmental Setting .....	4.18-1
4.18.2 Regulatory Framework .....	4.18-1
4.18.3 Cumulative Conditions .....	4.18-1
4.18.4 Significance Criteria .....	4.18-1
4.18.5 Impact Evaluations .....	4.18-2
4.18.6 Cumulative Impacts .....	4.18-6
<b>5 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS.....</b>	<b>5-1</b>
5.1 Significant Environmental Effects of the Project .....	5-1
5.2 Significant and Unavoidable Impacts .....	5-1
5.3 Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes .....	5-8
5.3.1 Changes in Land Use that Would Commit Future Generations .....	5-8
5.3.2 Consumption of Nonrenewable Resources .....	5-11
5.3.3 Irreversible Changes from Environmental actions .....	5-15
5.4 Effects Not Found To Be Significant .....	5-15
5.5 Direct or Indirect Economic or Population and Growth inducement .....	5-16
5.6 Urban Decay .....	5-17
5.6.1 Overview .....	5-17
5.6.2 Cathedral Hill Campus .....	5-19
5.6.3 Pacific Campus .....	5-20
5.6.4 California Campus .....	5-20
5.6.5 Davies Campus .....	5-21
5.6.6 St. Luke's Campus .....	5-21
5.6.7 Summary .....	5-21
5.7 Unresolved Issues and Areas of Controversy .....	5-22

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>6 ALTERNATIVES .....</b>	<b>6-1</b>
6.1 Introduction .....	6-1
6.2 Project Objectives.....	6-5
6.2.1 Overarching Objectives.....	6-5
6.2.2 Specific Objectives.....	6-6
6.3 Alternatives Considered but Rejected .....	6-8
6.3.1 Background .....	6-8
6.3.2 Off-Site Alternatives .....	6-10
6.3.3 Alternatives Considered but Rejected at CPMC Campuses.....	6-20
6.4 Description of alternatives to the proposed LRDP.....	6-30
6.5 Analysis of project Alternatives.....	6-32
6.6 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.....	6-34
6.6.1 Description .....	6-34
6.6.2 Impacts of Alternative 1 .....	6-72
6.6.3 Attainment of Project Objectives for Alternative 1: No Project Alternative.....	6-161
6.7 Alternative 2: Four-Campus Rebuilding/Retrofit/Redevelopment Alternative.....	6-162
6.7.1 Description .....	6-162
6.7.2 Impacts of Alternative 2.....	6-195
6.7.3 Attainment of Project Objectives for Alternative 2: Four-Campus Rebuilding/Retrofit/Redevelopment Alternative.....	6-262
6.8 Alternative 3: Reduced Development at Cathedral Hill Alternative.....	6-263
6.8.1 Description .....	6-263
6.8.2 Impacts of Alternative 3.....	6-299
6.8.3 Attainment of Project Objectives for Alternative 3: Reduced Development at Cathedral Hill Campus Alternative .....	6-399
6.9 Environmentally Superior Alternative .....	6-401
6.9.1 Discussion of Alternatives.....	6-401
6.9.2 Conclusion.....	6-403
<b>7 REFERENCES AND PERSONS CONSULTED .....</b>	<b>7-1</b>
<b>8 REPORT PREPARATION .....</b>	<b>8-1</b>
8.1 EIR Authors.....	8-1
8.2 EIR Consultants.....	8-1
8.3 Project Sponsor.....	8-4
8.4 Project Attorneys.....	8-6
8.5 Project Architect.....	8-6

## Appendices

- A Notice of Preparation
- B Construction Schedule
- C Requested Amendments to the General Plan and Zoning Maps



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
<b>Figures</b>	
2-1	CPMC Campus Locations..... 2-2
2-2	Cathedral Hill Campus Area..... 2-49
2-3	Cathedral Hill Campus—Existing Site Plan ..... 2-51
2-4	Cathedral Hill Campus—Proposed Site Plan ..... 2-53
2-5	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Two-Way Post Street Variant ..... 2-55
2-6	Cathedral Hill MOB—MOB Access Variant ..... 2-57
2-7	Cathedral Hill Hospital and MOB Stacking Diagram ..... 2-59
2-8	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Proposed North Elevation..... 2-61
2-9	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Proposed East Elevation ..... 2-62
2-10	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Proposed South Elevation..... 2-63
2-11	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Proposed West Elevation..... 2-64
2-12	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Proposed Stacking Diagram ..... 2-65
2-13	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Proposed Stacking, Section A-A ..... 2-67
2-14	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Proposed Stacking, Section B-B..... 2-68
2-15	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level P3 ..... 2-69
2-16	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level P2 ..... 2-71
2-17	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level 1/P1 ..... 2-73
2-18	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level 2 ..... 2-75
2-19	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level 3 ..... 2-77
2-20	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level 4 ..... 2-79
2-21	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level 5 ..... 2-81
2-22	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level 10 ..... 2-83
2-23	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Level 15 ..... 2-85
2-24	Cathedral Hill Hospital—Roof Level ..... 2-87
2-25	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Proposed North Elevation ..... 2-89
2-26	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Proposed East Elevation ..... 2-90
2-27	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Proposed South Elevation ..... 2-91
2-28	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Proposed West Elevation ..... 2-92
2-29	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Proposed Cross Sectional Diagram..... 2-93
2-30	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Proposed Longitudinal Sectional Diagram ..... 2-94
2-31	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Typical Parking Level (G5) ..... 2-95
2-32	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Level G1..... 2-96
2-33	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Main Access Floor, Level 1 ..... 2-97
2-34	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Level F2 ..... 2-98
2-35	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Typical Floor Level (F5)..... 2-99
2-36	Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building—Roof Level ..... 2-100
2-37	Cathedral Hill Campus—Proposed Streetscape Plan..... 2-101
2-38	Pacific Campus Area..... 2-120
2-39	Pacific Campus—Existing Site Plan..... 2-121
2-40	Pacific Campus—Proposed Site Plan ..... 2-123
2-41	California Campus Area ..... 2-133
2-42	California Campus—Existing Site Plan ..... 2-135
2-43	Davies Campus Area..... 2-152
2-44	Davies Campus—Existing Site Plan..... 2-153
2-45	Davies Campus—Proposed Site Plan ..... 2-155
2-46	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Proposed North Elevation ..... 2-157

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
2-47	Neuroscience Institute—Proposed East Elevation..... 2-158
2-48	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Proposed South Elevation ..... 2-159
2-49	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Proposed West Elevation ..... 2-160
2-50	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Proposed Stacking Diagram..... 2-161
2-51	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Proposed Stacking Diagram A-A..... 2-163
2-52	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Main Access Floor, Level 1 ..... 2-165
2-53	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Medical Offices, Level 2..... 2-167
2-54	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Neuromuscular Clinic, Level 3 ..... 2-168
2-55	Davies Campus Neuroscience Institute—Outpatient, Level 4..... 2-169
2-56	Davies Campus Streetscape Plan ..... 2-171
2-57	St. Luke’s Campus Area ..... 2-194
2-58	St. Luke’s Campus—Existing Site Plan ..... 2-195
2-59	St. Luke’s Campus—Proposed Site Plan..... 2-197
2-60	St. Luke’s Campus Variant 1—Alternate Emergency Department Location ..... 2-199
2-61	St. Luke’s Campus Variant 2—Cesar Chavez Street Utility Line Alignment..... 2-201
2-62	St. Luke’s Campus—San Jose Avenue Utility Relocation ..... 2-203
2-63	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed North Elevation ..... 2-205
2-64	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed South Elevation ..... 2-207
2-65	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital—Proposed East-West Elevation ..... 2-209
2-66	St. Luke’s MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed East-West Elevation..... 2-211
2-67	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital—Proposed Stacking Diagram ..... 2-213
2-68	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital—Proposed North-South Stacking Diagram ..... 2-215
2-69	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital—Proposed East-West Stacking Diagram..... 2-217
2-70	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed Level P1 ..... 2-219
2-71	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed Level 1 ..... 2-221
2-72	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed Level 2 ..... 2-223
2-73	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed Level 3 ..... 2-225
2-74	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed Level 4 ..... 2-227
2-75	St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital—Proposed Level 5..... 2-229
2-76	St. Luke’s Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Proposed Roof..... 2-231
2-77	St. Luke’s Streetscape Plan..... 2-233
4.1-1	Cathedral Hill Campus—Surrounding Land Uses ..... 4.1-2
4.1-2	Cathedral Hill Campus Vicinity—Existing Zoning..... 4.1-4
4.1-3	Cathedral Hill Campus Vicinity—Existing Height and Bulk Districts ..... 4.1-6
4.1-4	Pacific Campus—Surrounding Land Uses ..... 4.1-12
4.1-5	Pacific Campus Vicinity—Existing Zoning ..... 4.1-14
4.1-6	Pacific Campus Vicinity—Existing Height and Bulk Districts ..... 4.1-15
4.1-7	California Campus—Surrounding Land Uses ..... 4.1-18
4.1-8	California Campus Vicinity—Existing Zoning ..... 4.1-20
4.1-9	California Campus Vicinity—Existing Height and Bulk Districts ..... 4.1-21
4.1-10	Davies Campus—Surrounding Land Uses ..... 4.1-24
4.1-11	Davies Campus Vicinity—Existing Zoning ..... 4.1-25
4.1-12	Davies Campus Vicinity—Existing Height and Bulk Districts ..... 4.1-26
4.1-13	St. Luke’s Campus—Surrounding Land Uses ..... 4.1-29
4.1-14	St. Luke’s Campus Vicinity—Existing Zoning ..... 4.1-31

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.1-15 St. Luke’s Campus Vicinity—Existing Height and Bulk Districts.....	4.1-32
4.2-1 Map of Cathedral Hill Campus Viewpoint Locations .....	4.2-13
4.2-2 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 1—Looking East on Starr King Way at Gough Street .....	4.2-14
4.2-3 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 2—Looking West on Geary Street near Larkin Street .....	4.2-15
4.2-4 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 3—Looking North on Van Ness Avenue at Fulton Street.....	4.2-16
4.2-5 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 4—Looking East on Geary Boulevard at Fillmore Street .....	4.2-17
4.2-6 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 5—Looking Southeast from Alta Plaza Park .....	4.2-18
4.2-7 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 6—Looking Northeast from Alamo Square Park .....	4.2-19
4.2-8 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 7—Looking South on Van Ness Avenue at California Street .....	4.2-20
4.2-9 Cathedral Hill Campus: View 8—Looking Southwest on Van Ness Avenue at Post Street (close-up nighttime view) .....	4.2-22
4.2-10 Map of Pacific Campus Viewpoint Locations .....	4.2-36
4.2-11 Pacific Campus: View 9—Looking East on Clay Street at Fillmore Street .....	4.2-37
4.2-12 Pacific Campus: View 10—Looking East on Sacramento Street between Webster Street and Fillmore Street.....	4.2-38
4.2-13 Pacific Campus: View 11—Looking North on Webster Street at Sacramento Street .....	4.2-39
4.2-14 Pacific Campus: View 12—Looking West on Sacramento Street near Buchanan Street.....	4.2-40
4.2-15 Pacific Campus: View 13—Looking Southwest on Buchanan Street at Washington Street.....	4.2-41
4.2-16 Pacific Campus: View 14—Looking South on Webster Street between Washington Street and Jackson Street.....	4.2-42
4.2-17 Pacific Campus: View 15—Looking East from Alta Plaza Park.....	4.2-43
4.2-18 Map of Davies Campus Viewpoint Locations .....	4.2-62
4.2-19 Davies Campus: View 16—Looking West on 14th Street at Noe Street.....	4.2-63
4.2-20 Davies Campus: View 17—Looking Northeast on Castro Street near 14th Street.....	4.2-64
4.2-21 Davies Campus: View 18—Looking North on Castro Street near 14th Street.....	4.2-65
4.2-22 Davies Campus: View 19—Looking East on Duboce Avenue at Buena Vista Avenue.....	4.2-66
4.2-23 Davies Campus: View 20—Looking Southwest on Noe Street at Duboce Avenue.....	4.2-67
4.2-24 Davies Campus: View 21—Looking Northwest on Noe Street near 14th Street .....	4.2-68
4.2-25 Map of St. Luke’s Campus Viewpoint Locations.....	4.2-82
4.2-26 St. Luke’s Campus: View 22—Looking Northeast on San Jose Avenue at Duncan Street .....	4.2-83
4.2-27 St. Luke’s Campus: View 23—Looking East on Cesar Chavez Street at Guerrero Street .....	4.2-84
4.2-28 St. Luke’s Campus: View 24—Looking South on Valencia Street between 25th Street and 26th Street .....	4.2-85
4.2-29 St. Luke’s Campus: View 25—Looking Northwest from Bernal Heights Park .....	4.2-86
4.2-30 St. Luke’s Campus: View 26—Looking West on Cesar Chavez Street at Capp Street.....	4.2-87
4.3-1 Employee Housing by CPMC Campus (2006).....	4.3-11
4.5-1 Cathedral Hill Campus—Study Area and Project Location .....	4.5-2
4.5-2 Pacific Campus—Study Area and Project Location .....	4.5-3
4.5-3 California Campus—Study Area and Project Location.....	4.5-4
4.5-4 Davies Campus—Study Area and Project Location .....	4.5-5
4.5-4 St. Luke's Campus—Study Area and Project Location .....	4.5-6
4.5-6 Cathedral Hill Campus—Existing Transit Network .....	4.5-18
4.5-7 Pacific Campus—Existing Transit Network.....	4.5-19
4.5-8 California Campus—Existing Transit Network.....	4.5-20

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.5-9 Davies Campus—Existing Transit Network.....	4.5-21
4.5-10 St. Luke's Campus—Existing Transit Network.....	4.5-22
4.5-11 Cathedral Hill Campus Site—Existing Bicycle Route Network.....	4.5-34
4.5-12 Pacific Campus—Existing Bicycle Route Network.....	4.5-35
4.5-13 California Campus—Existing Bicycle Route Network.....	4.5-37
4.5-14 Davies Campus—Existing Bicycle Route Network.....	4.5-38
4.5-15 St. Luke's Campus—Existing Bicycle Route Network.....	4.5-40
4.5-16 Cathedral Hill Campus Access.....	4.5-91
4.5-17 Cathedral Hill Campus— 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project Conditions— Intersection Level of Service, A.M. Peak Hour.....	4.5-96
4.5-18 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project Conditions— Intersection Level of Service, P.M. Peak Hour.....	4.5-97
4.5-19 Cathedral Hill Campus—Garage Entrance Queues.....	4.5-101
4.5-20 Pedestrian Circulation at the Cathedral Hill Campus.....	4.5-131
4.5-21 Cathedral Hill Campus—Proposed Passenger Zones.....	4.5-143
4.5-22 Cathedral Hill Campus—Construction Activity Summary.....	4.5-149
4.5-23 2020 Modified Baseline plus Project Conditions— Intersection Level of Service, P.M. Peak Hour.....	4.5-170
4.5-24 Davies Campus—Proposed Truck and Service Vehicle Loading.....	4.5-190
4.5-25 Davies Campus—Proposed Passenger Zones.....	4.5-191
4.5-26 St. Luke's Campus—Proposed Passenger Zones.....	4.5-207
4.5-27 Cathedral Hill Campus— 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions— Intersection Level of Service, A.M. Peak Hour.....	4.5-217
4.5-28 2030 Cumulative plus Project Conditions— Intersection Level of Service, P.M. Peak Hour.....	4.5-218
4.6-1 Sound Wave Properties.....	4.6-2
4.6-2 Typical Noise Levels.....	4.6-4
4.6-3 Noise Monitoring Locations—Cathedral Hill Campus.....	4.6-13
4.6-4 Noise Monitoring Locations—Pacific Campus.....	4.6-18
4.6-5 Noise Monitoring Locations—Davies Campus.....	4.6-24
4.6-6 Noise Monitoring Locations—St. Luke's Campus.....	4.6-28
4.9-1 Cathedral Hill Campus—Wind Tunnel Test Point Locations.....	4.9-26
4.9-2 Cathedral Hill Hospital and MOB—Projected Winter Shadows.....	4.9-35
4.9-3 Cathedral Hill Hospital and MOB—Projected Spring Shadows.....	4.9-36
4.9-4 Cathedral Hill Hospital and MOB—Projected Summer Shadows.....	4.9-37
4.9-5 Cathedral Hill Hospital and MOB—Projected Fall Shadows.....	4.9-38
4.9-6 Neuroscience Institute—Projected Shadows, December 13, 3:35 p.m.....	4.9-44
4.9-7 Neuroscience Institute—Projected Shadows, September 22, 5:00 p.m.....	4.9-45
4.9-8 St. Luke's Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Projected Winter Shadows.....	4.9-49
4.9-9 St. Luke's Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Projected Spring Shadows.....	4.9-50
4.9-10 St. Luke's Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building—Projected Summer Shadows.....	4.9-51
4.9-11 St. Luke's Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building —Projected Fall Shadows.....	4.9-52

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.10-1	Parks and Open Spaces within One-Half Mile of All CPMC Campuses ..... 4.10-2
4.10-2	Parks and Open Spaces within One-Half Mile of the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus..... 4.10-5
4.10-3	Parks and Open Spaces within One-Half Mile of the Pacific Campus ..... 4.10-10
4.10-4	Parks and Open Spaces within One-Half Mile of the California Campus ..... 4.10-14
4.10-5	Parks and Open Spaces within One-Half Mile of the Davies Campus ..... 4.10-18
4.10-6	Parks and Open Spaces within One-Half Mile of the St. Luke’s Campus..... 4.10-234.13-1
4.13-1	Special-Status Species Occurrences within 1 Mile of the CPMC Campuses ..... 4.13-3
4.14-1	Major Faults and Earthquake Epicenters in the San Francisco Bay Area..... 4.14-4
6-1	Alternative 1—Cathedral Hill Campus Site Plan ..... 6-65
6-2	Alternative 1—Pacific Campus Site Plan ..... 6-66
6-3	Alternative 1—Davies Campus Site Plan ..... 6-67
6-4	Alternative 1A—St. Luke's Campus Site Plan ..... 6-68
6-5	Alternative 1A—St. Luke's Campus Massing Diagram ..... 6-69
6-6	Alternative 1B—St. Luke’s Campus Site Plan ..... 6-70
6-7	Alternative 1B—St. Luke’s Campus Massing Diagram ..... 6-71
6-8	Alternative 2—Cathedral Hill Campus Site Plan ..... 6-188
6-9	Alternative 2—Pacific Campus Site Plan ..... 6-189
6-10	Alternative 2—Pacific Campus Massing Diagram..... 6-190
6-11	Alternative 2—California Campus Site Plan ..... 6-191
6-12	Alternative 2—California Campus Massing Diagram..... 6-192
6-13	Alternative 2—Davies Campus Site Plan ..... 6-193
6-14	Alternative 2 – St. Luke’s Campus Site Plan..... 6-194
6-15	Alternatives 3A and 3B—Cathedral Hill Campus Site Plan..... 6-289
6-16	Alternatives 3A and 3B—Cathedral Hill Campus Massing Diagram ..... 6-290
6-17	Alternative 3B—California Campus Site Plan ..... 6-291
6-18	Alternative 3B—California Campus Massing Diagram ..... 6-292
6-19	Alternative 3A—St. Luke's Campus Site Plan, Phase 1 ..... 6-293
6-20	Alternative 3A—St. Luke's Campus Site Plan, Phases 2 and 3 ..... 6-294
6-21	Alternative 3A—St. Luke’s Campus Massing Diagram, Phase 1 ..... 6-295
6-22	Alternative 3A—St. Luke’s Campus Massing Diagram, Phases 2 and 3 ..... 6-296
6-23	Alternative 3B—St. Luke’s Campus Site Plan ..... 6-297
6-24	Alternative 3B—St. Luke’s Campus Massing Diagram ..... 6-298
<b>Tables</b>	
S-1	Required Project Approvals..... S-23
S-2	Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures..... S-37
2-1	CPMC Long Range Development Plan Schedule..... 2-5
2-2	CPMC Existing and Proposed LRDP Licensed Hospital Bed Uses ..... 2-10
2-3	Required Project Approvals..... 2-13
2-4	Cathedral Hill Campus: Existing Site Characteristics ..... 2-20
2-5	Cathedral Hill Campus: Project Summary Table..... 2-21
2-6	Pacific Campus—Existing Site Characteristics ..... 2-104
2-7a	Pacific Campus: Project Summary Table—Existing Conditions by Building..... 2-105
2-7b	Pacific Campus: Project Summary Table ..... 2-109

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Continued	Page
2-8	California Campus—Existing Site Characteristics ..... 2-125
2-9	California Campus: Project Summary Table ..... 2-127
2-10	Davies Campus—Existing Site Characteristics ..... 2-137
2-11	Davies Campus: Project Summary Table ..... 2-139
2-12	St. Luke’s Campus: Existing Site Characteristics ..... 2-173
2-13	St. Luke’s Campus: Project Summary Table ..... 2-175
3-1	Existing Zoning and Height and Bulk Districts ..... 3-13
3-2	Adjacent Zoning and Height and Bulk Districts ..... 3-14
4.1-1	Daily Populations at CPMC Campuses under Existing Conditions and the Proposed LRDP ..... 4.1-58
4.3-1	Population Trends and ABAG Projections, San Francisco, 1990–20301 ..... 4.3-2
4.3-2	San Francisco Inpatient Care (2006)..... 4.3-3
4.3-3	San Francisco Outpatient Care (2004)—Total Number of Annual Visits ..... 4.3-4
4.3-4	San Francisco Employment Trends and Projections, 1990–2030 ..... 4.3-5
4.3-5	San Francisco Employed Residents and Jobs, 2000–2030 ..... 4.3-5
4.3-6	2006 CPMC Full-Time Equivalent Personnel and Share of Citywide Employment ..... 4.3-6
4.3-7	Household Trends and ABAG Projections for San Francisco, 1990–2030a ..... 4.3-8
4.3-8	Housing Occupancy and Vacancy in San Francisco in 2000, 2006, and 2009 ..... 4.3-9
4.3-9	CPMC Household and Population Growth Projections for San Francisco ..... 4.3-14
4.3-10	Projections of CPMC Full-Time Equivalent Personnel and Share of Citywide Employment..... 4.3-16
4.3-11	Development Proposals on File with the San Francisco Planning Department..... 4.3-45
4.5-1	Muni Lines Serving the proposed Cathedral Hill Campus—Existing Conditions..... 4.5-23
4.5-2	Muni Lines Serving the Pacific Campus—Existing Conditions ..... 4.5-24
4.5-3	Muni Lines Serving the California Campus—Existing Conditions..... 4.5-25
4.5-4	Muni Lines Serving the Davies Campus—Existing Conditions ..... 4.5-26
4.5-5	Muni Lines Serving the St. Luke’s Campus—Existing Conditions ..... 4.5-27
4.5-6	Golden Gate Transit Lines in the Vicinity of the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus— Existing Conditions..... 4.5-30
4.5-7	Golden Gate Transit Peak Hour Capacity Utilization—Existing Conditions ..... 4.5-31
4.5-8	CPMC Shuttle Service Daily Capacity Utilization—Existing Conditions ..... 4.5-32
4.5-9	Level of Service Definitions for Signalized and Unsignalized Intersections..... 4.5-57
4.5-10	Daily and Peak-Hour Person Trip-Generation by Population Group by Campus1 ..... 4.5-76
4.5-11	Net-New Peak-Hour Person Trips by Mode and Vehicle Trips by Campus 1 ..... 4.5-77
4.5-12	Trip Distribution Patterns by Campus ..... 4.5-78
4.5-13	Parking Demand by Campus1 ..... 4.5-80
4.5-14	Service Vehicle and Truck Loading Space Demand by Campus1 ..... 4.5-83
4.5-15	Peak Hour Passenger Loading/Unloading Zone Demand by Campus1 ..... 4.5-84
4.5-16	Daily CPMC Shuttle Demand..... 4.5-86
4.5-17	Levels of Service at Cathedral Hill Campus Study Intersections—A.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-94
4.5-18	Levels of Service at Cathedral Hill Campus Study Intersections—P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-95

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.5-19	Levels of Service at Cathedral Hill Campus Study Intersections for Project Access Variants—A.M. Peak-Hour Conditions..... 4.5-103
4.5-20	Levels of Service at Cathedral Hill Campus Study Intersections for Project Access Variants—P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-104
4.5-21	Muni Corridor Analysis—Cathedral Hill, St. Luke’s, and California Campuses..... 4.5-119
4.5-22	Transit Corridor Delay Analysis—Cathedral Hill Campus ..... 4.5-121
4.5-23	Additional Muni Transit Vehicle Requirements— 2015 Modified Baseline—Weekday A.M. and P.M. Peak Hours ..... 4.5-122
4.5-24	Transit Corridor Delay Analysis—Cathedral Hill Campus Two-Way Post Street Variant and MOB Access Variant Conditions..... 4.5-125
4.5-25	Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS Analysis for the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus— MIDDAY Peak-Hour Conditions..... 4.5-133
4.5-26	Pedestrian Crosswalk LOS Analysis for the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus— P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions..... 4.5-134
4.5-27	Summary of Service Vehicle and Truck Loading/Unloading Space Supply and Demand by Campus ..... 4.5-137
4.5-28	Summary of Passenger Loading/Unloading Zone Supply and Demand by Campus—P.M. Peak Hour ..... 4.5-144
4.5-29	Cathedral Hill Campus—Worker Population by Construction Phase ..... 4.5-150
4.5-30	Cathedral Hill Campus—Average Trucks per Day and per Shift by Construction Phase ..... 4.5-151
4.5-31	Cathedral Hill Campus Truck Generation—Excavation Phase ..... 4.5-151
4.5-32	Average Midweek Traffic Volumes on Van Ness Avenue1 ..... 4.5-157
4.5-33	Van Ness Avenue Tunnel Construction—Intersection LOS during Evening and Overnight Work Hours1 ..... 4.5-158
4.5-34	Summary of Parking Supply and Demand by Campus..... 4.5-164
4.5-35	Levels of Service at Pacific Campus Study Intersections—P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-169
4.5-36	Muni Corridor Analysis—Pacific and Davies Campuses—P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-172
4.5-37	Levels of Service at California Campus Study Intersections—P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-180
4.5-38	Levels of Service at Davies Campus Study Intersections—P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-185
4.5-39	Levels of Service at St. Luke’s Campus Study Intersections—P.M. Peak-Hour Conditions ..... 4.5-202
4.5-40	Daily CPMC Shuttle Demand and Capacity Utilization..... 4.5-214
4.6-1	Subjective Reaction to Changes in Noise Levels of Similar Sources..... 4.6-5
4.6-2	World Health Organization—Recommended Community Noise Limits ..... 4.6-8
4.6-3	Human Response to Different Levels of Groundborne Vibration ..... 4.6-9
4.6-4	Existing Ambient Noise Levels—Cathedral Hill Campus ..... 4.6-14
4.6-5	Existing 24-Hour Ambient Noise Levels—Cathedral Hill Campus..... 4.6-15
4.6-6	Summary of Modeled Noise Levels from Existing Vehicular Traffic—Cathedral Hill Campus ..... 4.6-16
4.6-7	Existing Ambient Noise Levels—Pacific Campus ..... 4.6-19
4.6-8	Existing 24-Hour Ambient Noise Levels—Pacific Campus..... 4.6-19
4.6-9	Summary of Modeled Noise Levels from Existing Vehicular Traffic—Pacific Campus..... 4.6-20
4.6-10	Summary of Modeled Noise Levels from Existing Vehicular Traffic—California Campus ..... 4.6-22
4.6-11	Existing Ambient Noise Levels—Davies Campus ..... 4.6-25
4.6-12	Existing 24-Hour Ambient Noise Levels—Davies Campus..... 4.6-25
4.6-13	Summary of Modeled Noise Levels from Existing Vehicular Traffic—Davies Campus..... 4.6-26
4.6-14	Existing Ambient Noise Levels—St. Luke’s Campus ..... 4.6-29
4.6-15	Summary of Modeled Noise Levels from Existing Vehicular Traffic—St. Luke’s Campus ..... 4.6-30

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.6-16 Summary of EPA-Recommended Noise Level Standards.....	4.6-31
4.6-17 Summary of FTA-Recommended Groundborne Vibration Impact Criteria .....	4.6-32
4.6-18 Summary of FTA-Recommended Vibration Damage Criteria .....	4.6-32
4.6-19 City and County of San Francisco Land Use Compatibility Chart for Community Noise .....	4.6-35
4.6-20 Significant Change in Ambient Noise Levels.....	4.6-38
4.6-21 Noise Levels of Typical Construction Equipment.....	4.6-42
4.6-22 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors near the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus to Demolition/Excavation/Construction Noise .....	4.6-44
4.6-23 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors near the Davies Campus to Construction Noise.....	4.6-49
4.6-24 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors near the St. Luke’s Campus to Construction Noise .....	4.6-52
4.6-25 Exposure of Sensitive Receptors near the Pacific Campus to Construction Noise.....	4.6-55
4.6-26 Predicted Future Traffic Noise Levels—Cathedral Hill Campus .....	4.6-59
4.6-27 Predicted Future Traffic Noise Levels—Davies Campus .....	4.6-61
4.6-28 Predicted Future Traffic Noise Levels—St. Luke’s Campus.....	4.6-62
4.6-29 Predicted Future Traffic Noise Levels—Pacific Campus .....	4.6-63
4.6-30 Summary of Modeled Future Exterior Traffic-Noise Levels in 2030—Cathedral Hill Campus .....	4.6-85
4.6-31 Summary of Modeled Future Exterior Traffic-Noise Levels in 2030—Davies Campus .....	4.6-87
4.6-32 Summary of Modeled Future Exterior Traffic-Noise Levels in 2030—St. Luke’s Campus .....	4.6-87
4.6-33 Summary of Modeled Future Exterior Traffic Noise Levels in 2030—Pacific Campus .....	4.6-88
4.6-34 Representative Vibration Source Levels for Construction Equipment.....	4.6-91
4.6-35 Modeled Vibration Levels Resulting from Near-Term LRDP-Related On-Campus Demolition Activities— Cathedral Hill, Davies, and St. Luke’s Campuses.....	4.6-92
4.6-36 Modeled Vibration Levels Resulting from LRDP-Related On-Campus Demolition Activities— Pacific Campus.....	4.6-95
4.7-1 California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	4.7-3
4.7-2 Summary of Annual Ambient Air Quality Data (2006–2008)1.....	4.7-10
4.7-3 Attainment Status of the San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin with Respect to the California and National Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	4.7-11
4.7-4 Summary of 2008 Estimated Emissions Inventory for Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors (San Francisco County).....	4.7-12
4.7-5 Screening-Level Analysis of Health Risks from Construction Emissions for All Campuses .....	4.7-35
4.7-6 Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors Attributable to Operations under the LRDP—Modeled Daily Net Changes from Existing Conditions .....	4.7-39
4.7-7 Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors Attributable to Operation of Projects under the LRDP—Modeled Annual Net Changes from Existing Conditions .....	4.7-40
4.7-8 Screening Evaluation of Health Risks Associated with Diesel Particulate Matter (DPM) Emissions from Proposed Generators—Cathedral Hill Campusa .....	4.7-46
4.7-9 Acute Noncancer Hazard Indices Associated with Cumulative Stationary Source TACs for On-Site Receptors .....	4.7-47
4.7-10 Screening Evaluation of Health Risks Associated with Diesel Particulate Matter Emissions from Proposed Generator—Davies Campusa.....	4.7-49
4.7-11 Diesel Particulate Emissions from Emergency Generators—St. Luke’s Campus .....	4.7-50
4.7-12 Near-Term Modeled Average Daily Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors Associated with Construction under the LRDP .....	4.7-63



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.7-13	Long-Term Modeled Average Daily Emissions of Criteria Air Pollutants and Precursors Associated with Construction under the LRDP ..... 4.7-66
4.7-14	Screening-Level Analysis of Health Risks from Construction Emissions for All Campuses under Recently Adopted BAAQMD Significance Criteria ..... 4.7-67
4.8-1	Annual CPMC LRDP Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions ..... 4.8-18
4.8-2	Net Change Greenhouse Gases Generated by Operations Under the Proposed LRDP at CPMC Campuses at Development Buildout (2030) ..... 4.8-19
4.9-1	Seasonal Frequency of Wind Directions (percent) and Average Wind Speeds (knots)1 ..... 4.9-2
4.9-2	Results of the Wind Tunnel Analysis for the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus ..... 4.9-24
4.9-3	Results of the Wind Tunnel Analysis for the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus— Cumulative Wind Impacts ..... 4.9-60
4.10-1	Parks and Related Facilities within One-Half Mile of the Proposed Cathedral Hill Campus ..... 4.10-6
4.10-2	Parks and Related Facilities within One-Half Mile of the Pacific Campus ..... 4.10-11
4.10-3	Parks and Related Facilities within One-Half Mile of the California Campus ..... 4.10-15
4.10-4	Parks and Related Facilities within One-Half Mile of the Davies Campus ..... 4.10-19
4.10-5	Parks and Related Facilities within One-Half Mile of the St. Luke’s Campus ..... 4.10-24
4.10-6	Daily Campus Population, Change in Personnel, and Increase in San Francisco Households and Population, by Campus ..... 4.10-33
4.11-1	Average District Response Time (2007), in Minutes ..... 4.11-7
4.11-2	Daily Campus Population, Change in Personnel, and Increase in San Francisco Households and Population, by Campus ..... 4.11-15
4.12-1	Existing (2006) Annual Water Demand, Wastewater Volumes, and Solid Waste Generation and Recycling by CPMC Campus Location ..... 4.12-1
4.12-2	Existing and Projected Total Annual Water Demands by CPMC Campus ..... 4.12-27
4.12-3	Existing and Projected Total Annual Wastewater Volumes at Each CPMC Campus (not including stormwater) ..... 4.12-31
4.12-4	Existing Solid Waste/Recycling Demands at Each CPMC Campus (2006) ..... 4.12-39
4.12-5	Projected Solid Waste/Recycling Demands at Each CPMC Campus (2030) ..... 4.12-39
4.13-1	Occurrences of Special-Status Plants within 1.5 Miles of a CPMC Campus Site ..... 4.13-4
4.13-2	Summary of Trees at the Cathedral Hill Campus Project Site ..... 4.13-7
4.13-3	Summary of Trees at the Pacific Campus ..... 4.13-8
4.13-4	Summary of Trees at the California Campus ..... 4.13-8
4.13-5	Summary of Trees at the Davies Campus ..... 4.13-9
4.13-6	Summary of Trees at the St. Luke’s Campus ..... 4.13-10
4.14-1	Regional Faults and Seismicity ..... 4.14-5
4.14-2	Modified Mercalli Intensity Scale ..... 4.14-6
4.14-3	USGS Estimates of the 30-Year Probability (2007–2037) of a Magnitude 6.7 or Greater Earthquake ..... 4.14-7
4.14-4	Summary of Site-Specific Geologic Hazards ..... 4.14-16
4.14-5	Summary of Site-Specific Seismic Hazards Related to Soil and Groundwater Conditions ..... 4.14-25

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>	<b>Page</b>
4.16-1 Federal Laws and Regulations Related to Hazardous Materials Management.....	4.16-22
5-1 CPMC LRDP Significant and Unavoidable Impacts.....	5-2
6-1 Summary of Project Alternatives Development Program and Comparison to the Proposed CPMC LRDP .....	6-33
6-2 Comparison of the No Project Alternative (Alternatives 1A and 1B) and CPMC LRDP Buildout .....	6-35
6-3 No Project and Proposed LRDP Buildout at Cathedral Hill .....	6-38
6-4 Alternative 1—Cathedral Hill Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions.....	6-39
6-5 No Project and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the Pacific Campus.....	6-42
6-6 Alternative 1—Pacific Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-45
6-7 No Project and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the Davies Campus.....	6-49
6-8 Alternative 1—Davies Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-51
6-9 No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the St. Luke’s Campus .....	6-60
6-10a Alternative 1A—St. Luke’s Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-61
6-10b Alternative 1B—St. Luke’s Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-63
6-11 Projections of CPMC Full-Time Equivalent Personnel and Share of Citywide Employment (Comparison of No Project Alternative/Alternatives 1A and 1B to LRDP) .....	6-151
6-12 CPMC Household and Population Growth Projections for San Francisco (Comparison of No Project Alternative/Alternatives 1A and 1B to LRDP).....	6-152
6-13 Comparison of Alternative 2 and CPMC LRDP Buildout.....	6-163
6-14 Alternative 2 and Proposed LRDP Buildout at Cathedral Hill .....	6-166
6-15 Alternative 2—Cathedral Hill Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions.....	6-167
6-16 Alternative 2 and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the Pacific Campus.....	6-173
6-17 Alternative 2—Pacific Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-175
6-18 Alternative 2 and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the California Campus.....	6-180
6-19 Alternative 2—California Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-181
6-20 Alternative 2 and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the Davies Campus.....	6-184
6-21 Alternative 2—Davies Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-185
6-22 Projections of CPMC Full-Time Equivalent Personnel and Share of Citywide Employment (Comparison of Alternative 2 to the Proposed LRDP) .....	6-253
6-23 CPMC Household and Population Growth Projections for San Francisco (Comparison of Alternative 2 to the Proposed LRDP) 1 .....	6-254
6-24 Comparison of Alternative 3A and Proposed CPMC LRDP Buildout at All Campuses.....	6-265
6-25 Comparison of Alternative 3B and Proposed CPMC LRDP Buildout at All Campuses.....	6-266
6-26 Alternatives 3A and 3B and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the Cathedral Hill Campus .....	6-270

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Continued</b>		<b>Page</b>
6-27	Alternatives 3A and 3B—Cathedral Hill Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-271
6-28	Alternative 3B and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the California Campus .....	6-275
6-29	Alternative 3B—California Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-277
6-30	Alternative 3A and Proposed LRDP Buildout at the St. Luke’s Campus .....	6-282
6-31	Alternative 3A—St. Luke’s Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-283
6-32	Alternative 3B and Proposed CPMC LRDP Buildout at the St. Luke’s Campus .....	6-286
6-33	Alternative 3B—St. Luke’s Campus Project Summary Table and Comparison to Existing Conditions .....	6-287
6-34	Existing and Alternative 3B Population and Trip Generation, by Population Group, at the California Campus .....	6-359
6-35	Projections of CPMC Full-Time Equivalent Personnel and Share of Citywide Employment (Comparison of Alternatives 3A and 3B to the Proposed LRDP).....	6-390
6-36	CPMC Household and Population Growth Projections for San Francisco (Comparison of Alternatives 3A and 3B to the Proposed LRDP) 1 .....	6-391

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

**Continued**

**Page**

---

This page intentionally left blank.

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

$\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$	micrograms per cubic meter
$\mu\text{in}/\text{sec}$	microinch(es) per second
$^{\circ}\text{C}$	degrees Celsius
$^{\circ}\text{F}$	degrees Fahrenheit
2000 CAP	<i>Bay Area 2000 Clean Air Plan</i>
2005 Bay Area Ozone Strategy	<i>2005 Ozone Strategy for the San Francisco Bay Area</i>
AB	Assembly Bill
AB 32	California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006
ABAG	Association of Bay Area Governments
ACC	Ambulatory Care Center
ADMP	asbestos dust mitigation plan
ADRP	archaeological data recovery plan
ADT	average daily traffic
Alquist-Priolo Act	Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Act
ALS	amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (Lou Gehrig's Disease)
Ambulances	emergency vehicle sirens
amsl	above mean sea level
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
APS	Alternative Planning Strategy
ARB	California Air Resources Board
ARDTP	archaeological research design and treatment plan
AST	aboveground storage tank
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
ATP	archaeological testing plan
BAAQMD	Bay Area Air Quality Management District
BART	Bay Area Rapid Transit
Basin Plan	<i>Water Quality Control Plan for the San Francisco Bay Basin</i>
Bay	San Francisco Bay
Better Streets Plan	<i>San Francisco Better Streets Plan</i>
BLIP	Branch Library Improvement Program
BMP	best management practice
B.P.	Before Present
BRT	Bus Rapid Transit

Btu	British thermal units
BWWF	Bayside Wet Weather Facilities
C&D	Construction and Demolition
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990
CAAQS	California ambient air quality standards
CAFE	corporate average fuel economy
Cal/EPA	California Environmental Protection Agency
Cal/OSHA	California Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Caltrans	California Department of Transportation
CAP	clean air plan
CBC	California Building Code
CBRNE	chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear, high-yield explosives equipment
CCAA	California Clean Air Act
CCAR	California Climate Action Registry
CCR	California Code of Regulations
CDHS	California Department of Health Care Services
CEC	California Energy Commission
CEQA	California Environmental Quality Act
CESA	California Endangered Species Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGS	California Geological Survey
CH <sub>4</sub>	methane
CHP	California Highway Patrol
City	City and County of San Francisco
CIWMB	California Integrated Waste Management Board
Climate Action Plan	<i>Climate Action Plan for San Francisco: Local Actions to Reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>
CMP	Congestion Management Program
CMWMP	California Medical Waste Management Program
CNDDB	California Natural Diversity Database
CNEL	community noise equivalent level
CNRA	California Natural Resources Agency
CO	carbon monoxide
CO <sub>2</sub>	carbon dioxide

CO <sub>2</sub> e	carbon dioxide–equivalent
CPMC	California Pacific Medical Center
CPT	cone penetration test
CPUC	California Public Utilities Commission
CRHR	California Register of Historical Resources
CSO	combined sewer overflow
CSO Policy	Combined Sewer Overflow Control Policy
CU	conditional use
CUPA	Certified Unified Program Agency
CWA	Clean Water Act
CZ	climate zone
dB	decibel(s)
dba	A-weighted decibel(s)
dB/DD	decibels per doubling of distance (attenuation)
dbh	diameter at breast height
DBI	San Francisco Department of Building Inspection
DEIR	draft environmental impact report
DFG	California Department of Fish and Game
DOF	California Department of Finance
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
Downtown Basin	Downtown San Francisco groundwater basin
DPH	California Department of Public Health
DPH RHB	Radiological Health Branch of the California Department of Public Health
DPW	San Francisco Department of Public Works
DSHA	Deterministic seismic hazard analysis
DTSC	California Department of Toxic Substances Control
eb	eastbound
ECP	environmental contingency plan
EDR	Environmental Data Resources
EEA	environmental evaluation application
EEG	electroencephalography
EIR	environmental impact report
EISA	Energy and Independence Security Act of 2007
EMFAC2007	On-Road Mobile-Source Emission Factor model
EMS	emergency medical services

Endangerment Finding	<i>Proposed Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases under the Clean Air Act</i>
EOP	Emergency Operations Plan
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EPCA	Energy Policy and Conservation Act
ERO	Environmental Review Officer
ESA	federal Endangered Species Act of 1973
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
°F	degrees Fahrenheit
FAR	floor area ratio
FARR	final archaeological resources report
FEIR	final environmental impact report
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FHWA RD 77-108	FHWA Traffic Noise Prediction Model
Findings	findings of fact
FR	<i>Federal Register</i>
FTA	Federal Transit Administration
FTE	full-time equivalent
General Plan	<i>San Francisco General Plan</i>
GGT	Golden Gate Transit
GHG	greenhouse gas
GP	General Plan
GVW	gross vehicle weight
GWh	gigawatt-hour(s)
GWP	Global Warming Potential
h	hourly
HAP	hazardous air pollutant
Harry Tracy WTP	Harry Tracy Water Treatment Plant
HAZWOPER	Hazardous Waste Operations and Emergency Response
HCM	<i>Highway Capacity Manual</i>
HFC	hydrofluorocarbons
HHWP	Hetch Hetchy Water and Power
HI	hazard index
HMBP	hazardous materials business plan



HMUPA	Hazardous Materials Unified Program Agency
HRA	health risk assessment
HVAC	heating, ventilation, and air conditioning
Hz	Hertz
I-	interstate highway
IBC	International Building Code
ICC	International Code Council
IHH	Institute for Health and Healing
IMP	institutional master plan
in/sec	inch(es) per second
ISCOTT	Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation
ITE	Institute of Transportation Engineers
kW	kilowatt
lb/day	pounds per day
lb/in	pounds per inch
LED	light-emitting diode
LEED®	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
$L_{dn}$	day-night average noise level
$L_{eq}$	equivalent noise energy level
$L_{eq(24)}$	equivalent noise energy level averaged over a 24-hour period
LID	Low Impact Development
$L_{max}$	maximum noise level
$L_{min}$	minimum noise level
Lobos Basin	Lobos groundwater basin
LOS	level of service
LRDP	<i>Long Range Development Plan</i>
LVW	loaded vehicle weight
$L_v$	root mean square velocity expressed in vibration decibels
$L_x$	noise level exceeded X% of a specific period of time
M	moment magnitude (scale for measuring seismic activity)
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MCE	maximum considered earthquake
MEA	Major Environmental Analysis Division (of the San Francisco Planning Department)
$mg/m^3$	milligrams per cubic meter
mgd	million gallons per day

MLD	Most Likely Descendant
MLP	maximum load point
MMI	Modified Mercalli Intensity (scale of earthquake intensity)
MMRP	mitigation monitoring and reporting plan
MMT	million metric tons
MMTCO <sub>2</sub> E	million gross metric tons of CO <sub>2</sub> e
MOB	Medical Office Building
mpg	miles per gallon
mph	miles per hour
MPO	metropolitan planning organization
MRI	magnetic resonance imaging
MRZ-	Mineral Resource Zone
MS4	municipal separate storm sewer system
MT	metric tons
MT/yr	metric tons per year
MTS	Metropolitan Transportation System
MUN	Municipal and Domestic Supply
Muni	San Francisco Municipal Railway
MY	model year
MW	megawatt(s)
N <sub>2</sub> O	nitrous oxide
NAAQS	national ambient air quality standards
NAHC	Native American Heritage Commission
nb	northbound
NC-3	Neighborhood Commercial District, Moderate-Scale
NCD	Neighborhood Commercial District
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHTSA	National Highway Traffic Safety Administration
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO	nitric oxide
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOP	notice of preparation
NO <sub>x</sub>	oxides of nitrogen
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program

NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWS	National Weather Service
NWIC	Northwest Information Center
OAP	ozone attainment plan
OFFROAD2007	Off-Road Mobile-Source Emission Factor model
OHP	California Office of Historic Preservation
OPR	Governor's Office of Planning and Research
OPR	Outpatient/Research Building
OSHA	U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OSHPD	Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development
PCB	polychlorinated biphenyl
PCE	passenger car equivalent
PEIR	program EIR
Permanent	no fixed
PFC	perfluorocarbons
PG&E	Pacific Gas and Electric Company
PHSH	U.S. Public Health Service Hospital
Planning Code	San Francisco Planning Code
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	fine particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less
PM <sub>10</sub>	respirable particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter of 10 micrometers or less
ppm	parts per million
Port	Port of San Francisco
PPV	peak particle velocity
PRC	Public Resources Code
PSHA	Probabilistic seismic hazard analysis
PUD	Planned Unit Development
R	residential
RC-4	Residential-Commercial Combined Districts, High Density
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
REC	recognized environmental conditions
RH-1	Residential, House, One-Family
RH-1D	One Unit per Lot, Detached
RH-2	Residential, House Districts, Two-Family
RH-3	Residential, House Districts, Three-Family

RHB	Radiological Health Branch of the California Department of Public Health
RM-1	Residential, Mixed Districts, Low Density
RM-2	Residential, Mixed Districts, Moderate Density
RM-4	Residential, Mixed Districts, High Density
RMS	root mean square
ROG	reactive organic gases
ROWD	report of waste discharge
RPP	Residential Permit Parking
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
RWQCB	regional water quality control board
RWMP	<i>Recycled Water Master Plan for the City and County of San Francisco</i>
RWS	Regional Water System
SANDAG	San Diego Association of Governments
sb	southbound
SB	Senate Bill
Scoping Plan	<i>Climate Change Scoping Plan: A Framework for Change</i>
SCS	Sustainable Communities Strategy
SEL	sound exposure level
SF <sub>6</sub>	sulfur hexafluoride
SFBAAB	San Francisco Bay Area Air Basin
SFBC	San Francisco Building Code
SF-CHAMP	San Francisco County Transportation Authority travel demand model
SFCTA	San Francisco County Transportation Authority
SFDPH	San Francisco Department of Public Health
SF Environment	San Francisco Department of the Environment
SFFD	San Francisco Fire Department
SF Guidelines	<i>Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review,</i> San Francisco Planning Department, October 2002
SFMTA	San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
SFMTA Blue Book	<i>Regulations for Working in San Francisco Streets</i>
SFO	San Francisco International Airport
SFPD	San Francisco Police Department
SFPL	San Francisco Public Library
SFPL Strategic Plan	<i>San Francisco Public Library Strategic Plan</i>

SFPUC	San Francisco Public Utilities Commission
SFRPD	San Francisco Recreation and Park Department
SFSU	San Francisco State University
SFUSD	San Francisco Unified School District
SIP	State Implementation Plan
SM&W	Shen Milsom & Wilke
SMP	site mitigation plan
SNF	skilled nursing facility
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SoMa	South of Market
SP	service population
SPC-	Structural Performance Category
sq. ft.	square feet
SR	State Route
SS	Sustainable Sites
State CEQA Guidelines	<i>California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines</i>
STC	Sound Transmission Class
SUD	Special Use District
Sustainability Plan	<i>Sustainability Plan for the City of San Francisco</i>
SVOC	semivolatile organic compound
SVP	Society of Vertebrate Paleontology
SVWTP	Sunol Valley Water Treatment Plant
SWIS	Solid Waste Information System
SWPCP	Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant
SWPPP	storm water pollution prevention plan
SWRCB	State Water Resources Control Board
TAC	toxic air contaminant
TASC	Transportation Advisory Committee
TDM	transportation demand management
TEP	Transit Effectiveness Project
TMDL	total maximum daily load
TMP	transportation management plan
TPY	tons per year
TRU	transportation refrigeration unit
VMT	vehicle miles traveled

UC	University of California
Unified Program	Unified Hazardous Waste and Hazardous Materials Management Regulatory Program
U.S. 101	U.S. Highway 101
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USC	U.S. Code
USF	University of San Francisco
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	U.S. Geological Survey
UST	underground storage tank
UWMP	<i>Urban Water Management Plan for the City and County of San Francisco</i>
v/c	volume-to-capacity
VdB	velocity decibels
VNAP	<i>Van Ness Avenue Area Plan</i>
VNMUSD	Van Ness Medical Use Subdistrict
VOC	volatile organic compound
wb	westbound
WDR	waste discharge requirement
WHO	World Health Organization
WSIP	Water Supply Improvement Program

## GLOSSARY

Term	Definition
acute care	Treatment necessary for only a short period of time, when a patient is treated for a brief but severe episode of illness. Many hospitals are acute-care facilities. The term is also associated with care rendered in an emergency department or other short-term stay facility.
administration	Hospital administration and nursing administration office space within a hospital building or outpatient care center building.
ambulatory care	Health care services provided to patients on an outpatient basis (e.g., practitioner consultations, counseling, care for patients staying less than 24 hours), rather than by admission to a hospital or other health care facility. The services may be in a hospital, augmenting inpatient services, or may be provided at a separate facility.
ancillary and support services	Services other than room, board, and medical and nursing services that are provided in the course of care. They include such services as laboratory, radiology, pharmacy, and physical therapy services.
biologicals	Medicinal preparations made from living organisms and their products, including but not limited to serums, vaccines, antigens, and antitoxins (California Medical Waste Management Act, California Health and Safety Code Sections 117600–118360).
building height based on the Planning Code’s methodology	The height of the building measured from its midpoint relative to the average slope of the curb or ground (see Sections 102.12 and 260 of the San Francisco Planning Code). This measurement is provided in this EIR for each proposed near-term, project-level building so that it can be compared to the applicable maximum height allowed by the height and bulk district.
building infrastructure	Space within buildings for, e.g., (a) mechanical, electrical, telephone, and other building services distribution rooms; (b) shafts and exit stairs; and (c) elevator cores, including elevator shafts, mechanical rooms, and elevator queuing areas.
central plant	Space where mechanical (e.g., chilled water, steam), electrical (e.g., emergency power generation, primary power transformation), and other centralized building services are generated and processed for distribution to several buildings or within a hospital, ambulatory care center or medical office building.
complementary care	Therapeutic practices (acupuncture for instance) that are not currently considered an integral part of conventional allopathic (i.e., biologically based, scientific, Western) medical practice, and which are used in addition to conventional treatments.

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
critical care	Health care provided to a critically ill patient.
diagnostic and treatment	Diagnostic and treatment (D&T) space, in either inpatient and ambulatory care settings, and ancillary to medical office care, including within procedure rooms and associated spaces. Emergency Department space is not included in D&T space. D&T services include surgery; imaging, including radiology and MRI; gastrointestinal/endoscopy; cardiac catheterization; cardio-diagnostics; neuro-diagnostics; pulmonary function testing; rehabilitation/physical therapy/occupational therapy/speech therapy; nuclear medicine; dialysis.
education/conference	Space available for educational and conference meetings or assemblies.
Emergency Department	Emergency Department space within hospital buildings, including waiting/receiving space, procedural space, ambulance bays, and other associated spaces.
inpatient care	Women's and children's, adult, and psychiatric acute-care space, including beds, nursing stations, family rooms, and other associated spaces. Involves care of patients staying longer than 24 hours.
life safety standard	The minimum structural performance of a facility during a seismic event that protects the safety of the patients and staff and allows them to exit after the seismic event.
light industrial	Space within buildings used for light-industrial activities (e.g., auto repair).
loading	Space for delivery of materials, trash and recycling pickup, etc.
mechanical and electrical	Dedicated floors or significant space on a floor of a building for distribution of mechanical, electrical, and other building services.
medical office space	Practitioners' offices and associated spaces within a medical office building (MOB). For all proposed future MOBs, the primary program category will be presumed to be medical office space, and assumptions will be made for lobby space, mechanical and electrical space, and a building grossing factor.
non-RCRA hazardous waste	A solid hazardous waste that is regulated by the State of California that is not regulated by the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). A hazardous waste is presumed to be a RCRA hazardous waste unless it is determined pursuant to California Code of Regulations, Title 22, Section 66261.101 to be a non-RCRA hazardous waste.
offices	Office space within buildings other than hospital buildings, ambulatory care center buildings, or medical office buildings.
operational standard	The structural performance of a facility during a seismic event in which backup utility services maintain functionality and very little structural or nonstructural damage occurs.



<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
parking	Includes parking areas, ramps, access, and other associated spaces.
postacute care	A range of medical care services that support the individual’s continued recovery from illness or management of a chronic illness or disability. Services or programs that fall into the category of postacute care include institutional programs such as inpatient rehabilitation facilities, skilled-nursing facilities, and long-term-care hospitals, as well as home- and community-based services, such as home health and hospice care. Additional specialized services span the acute-care and postacute-care continuum, such as palliative care, hospital case management, and discharge planning.
primary care	Care that provides integrated, accessible health care services by clinicians who are accountable for addressing a large majority of personal health care needs, developing a sustained partnership with patients, and practicing in the context of family and community.
recognized environmental conditions	The presence or likely presence of any hazardous substances or petroleum products on a property under conditions that indicate an existing release, a past release, or a material threat of a release of any hazardous substances or petroleum products into structures on the property or into the ground, groundwater, or surface water of the property.
research	Clinical or basic research space.
residential	Residential space within a residential building.
residential Alzheimer’s	Residential space for patients in the CPMC Alzheimer’s Program.
retail	Space for the sale of goods or commodities directly to consumers (e.g., restaurants, cafes, coffee shops, book stores, gift shops).
secondary care	Care provided by medical specialists who generally do not have first contact with patients (e.g., cardiologists, urologists, dermatologists).
sharps waste	Any device having acute rigid corners, edges, or protuberances capable of cutting or piercing, including but not limited to hypodermic needles and broken glass items (such as pipettes and vials) contaminated with biohazardous waste (California Medical Waste Management Act, California Health and Safety Code Sections 117600–118360).
support	Space for uses such as the pharmacy, pathology, laboratory, food service, materials management, and chapels.

<b>Term</b>	<b>Definition</b>
tertiary referral center	A major hospital that usually has a full complement of specific specialty care services (e.g., pediatrics, general medicine, various branches of surgery, psychiatry). Patients will often be referred from smaller hospitals to a tertiary hospital for major operations and consultations with subspecialists, and when sophisticated intensive care facilities are required.

# SUMMARY

## S.1 PURPOSE OF THE SUMMARY

This summary is intended to highlight major areas of importance in the environmental analysis as required by Section 15123 of the *California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines* (State CEQA Guidelines). This chapter briefly summarizes the California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC) *Long Range Development Plan* (LRDP) (referred to in this environmental impact report [EIR] as “the proposed project” or simply “the project”) and its potential environmental impacts. This chapter provides a synopsis of the proposed project, as well as project objectives and required project approvals; a summary of environmental issues to be resolved and areas of controversy; and description and impacts of the alternatives to the proposed project that are addressed in this EIR. In addition, the summary table for this EIR (Table S-2, “Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures,” beginning on page S-37) provides an overview of:

- ▶ environmental impacts with the potential to occur as a result of the proposed project;
- ▶ the level of significance of the environmental impacts before implementation of any applicable mitigation measures;
- ▶ the recommended mitigation measures that avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and
- ▶ the level of significance for each impact after the mitigation measures are implemented.

## S.2 PROJECT SYNOPSIS

CEQA allows different portions of a phased project to be analyzed at either a program level or a project level, depending on the extent of detail that is known about a particular portion or phase of a project at the time the environmental review is conducted. A program-level EIR is useful in certain cases, because it provides the opportunity to evaluate the overall impacts of a proposed project, program, or plan for an area larger than is generally practical or appropriate for an individual site-specific project. It allows an agency to consider policy implications of areawide mitigation measures earlier than with specific development proposals and provides an analysis of cumulative impacts on an areawide basis. Portions of a proposed project for which detailed development plans are available at the time the EIR is prepared are typically analyzed at the project level in the EIR, whereas portions of a project for which less detail is known at the time the EIR is prepared may be analyzed at the programmatic level. For program-level components, further environmental review would be required at a later time when more detailed plans become available.

This EIR for the proposed CPMC LRDP is a program-level EIR, pursuant to Section 15168 of the State CEQA Guidelines. It is also a project-level EIR, pursuant to Section 15161 of the State CEQA Guidelines; that is, it analyzes development of individual components within the LRDP, where the analysis is performed at a project-specific level. Specifically, the LRDP includes near-term projects and long-term projects. The near-term projects are analyzed in the EIR at the project level. Long-term projects are analyzed at a programmatic level to the extent that impacts associated with those projects can be reasonably forecasted. CPMC's long-term projects would require additional or supplemental project-level environmental review at a later date.

The four existing CPMC medical campuses are the Pacific Campus in Pacific Heights, the California Campus in Presidio Heights, the Davies Campus in Duboce Triangle, and the St. Luke's Campus in the Mission District.

Under the LRDP, CPMC would design, construct, and operate the proposed Cathedral Hill Campus. This campus would include a newly constructed 15-story, 555-bed hospital at the northwest corner of the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard and a medical office building (MOB) at the northeast corner of the intersection of Van Ness Avenue and Geary Street, across Van Ness Avenue from the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital site. A pedestrian tunnel beneath Van Ness Avenue would connect the hospital and MOB. An existing MOB at the intersection of Sutter and Franklin Streets, currently partially used as an MOB, would be fully converted for use as an MOB. Implementing the LRDP would also result in the interior renovation and conversion of an existing hospital into a new ambulatory care center (ACC), a new ACC building addition, additional underground parking, renovation of other existing buildings and demolition of four existing buildings at the Pacific Campus. New development at the Davies Campus would include the construction of a new Neuroscience Institute building, a new MOB, and related parking improvements. Development at the St. Luke's Campus would include demolition of the existing St. Luke's Hospital tower, Redwood Administration Building, and MRI Trailer; construction of the new 80-bed, acute-care St. Luke's Replacement Hospital; and construction of the proposed MOB/Expansion Building and associated underground parking. Additional details of project development are presented for each campus below.

## **S.2.1 CATHEDRAL HILL CAMPUS**

### **CAMPUS PROPOSAL**

The proposed Cathedral Hill Campus would be located on three sites, totaling 3.85 acres, which would be developed with the new Cathedral Hill Hospital and Cathedral Hill MOB, and conversion of an existing office building from a partial MOB to a full MOB at 1375 Sutter Street (referred to in this EIR as the "1375 Sutter MOB").

## Cathedral Hill Hospital

The site of the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital, approximately 106,000 square feet (sq. ft.) of space, would occupy an entire city block (Assessor's Block 0695). The block is bounded by Post Street to the north, Van Ness Avenue to the east, Geary Boulevard to the south, and Franklin Street to the west. Existing pedestrian and vehicular access (from the north) to the site is available along Van Ness Avenue, with secondary pedestrian and vehicular access from the west along Post Street and from the east along Geary Street.

The hospital site block is occupied by two existing buildings on two lots: the former Cathedral Hill Hotel (Lot 006 [approximately 87,300 sq. ft.], 1101 Van Ness Avenue), a 402-room, 10-story, approximately 445,400-sq.-ft. hotel, 120 feet in height with one basement level; and the 1255 Post Street Office Building (Lot 005 [approximately 18,600 sq. ft.], at the intersection of Post and Franklin Streets), an 11-story, approximately 209,700-sq.-ft. building, 180 feet in height with one basement level, on the northwest corner of the block. The Cathedral Hill Hotel was built in 1960 and opened as the Jack Tar Hotel. The Cathedral Hill Hotel and 1255 Post Street Office Building ceased operations on October 31, 2009, and are now closed. The hotel and office building both contained ground-floor retail and shared a 405-space parking garage, which also ceased operations in late 2009. Both of these buildings and the shared parking garage would be demolished for the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital.

The site of the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital is zoned RC-4 (Residential-Commercial Combined Districts, High Density) and is located within the Van Ness Special Use District (SUD); the existing height and bulk district for this site is 130-V.<sup>1</sup> The existing allowable floor area ratio (FAR) for the hospital site is 7:1,<sup>2</sup> as established in the Van Ness SUD.

CPMC proposes to construct a new acute-care hospital (Cathedral Hill Hospital) that would fully comply with the requirements of Senate Bill (SB) 1953 and SB 1661 concerning the seismic safety of acute-care facilities. The approximately 1,163,800-sq.-ft., 555-bed hospital proposed for construction at 1101 Van Ness Avenue would be the primary acute-care, inpatient-treatment facility for the CPMC system, providing centralized hospital care at a new, state-of-the-art facility. The proposed 15-story (plus three-story basement) hospital tower would be 265 feet in height, based on the Planning Code's methodology for measurement of building height.<sup>3</sup> However, because the site is sloped, the structure would vary in height relative to the side from which it is viewed. The length of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Under Section 252 of the San Francisco Planning Code (Planning Code), the 130-V Height and Bulk District allows a maximum building height of 130 feet. Under Section 270, the "V" bulk designation applies to the Van Ness Special Use District (SUD) and would allow the Planning Commission to require a 20-foot setback for portions of buildings above 50 feet in height.

<sup>2</sup> Floor area ratio (FAR) is the gross floor area, as defined by the Planning Code, of a building divided by the square footage of the site. FAR is commonly used to limit the density of construction on a certain site or area.

<sup>3</sup> The final determination of height calculations would be made by the City and County of San Francisco's (City's) Zoning Administrator. This EIR conservatively assumes a height of 265 feet, which would be the height to the top of the mechanical equipment. The exhaust stacks would be approximately 16 feet taller than the mechanical equipment. This is because the stacks are measured from the uphill portion of the site, and the equipment would be measured against the lower, theoretical slope of the site.

proposed hospital building would be approximately 385 feet. The diagonal measurement would be 405 feet for the tower floors and 475 feet for the podium. Because of its architectural design, different portions of the hospital building would have varying heights on the project block. The podium portion of the proposed hospital would be approximately six stories and approximately 43–123 feet in height, because of the site's varying slope. The Cathedral Hill Hospital would also include 513 off-street parking spaces.

The various levels of the proposed hospital would contain the following uses:

- ▶ *Level 1/P1* would contain 17 parking spaces and 14 van loading spaces for hospital support uses. This level would connect with the street at the southeast corner (Van Ness Avenue and Geary Boulevard) and would provide the main pedestrian access.
- ▶ *Level 2*, the main entrance level, would contain the lobby, support space (e.g., patient admissions, environmental services, and materials management), hospital-oriented retail services, a cafeteria, and education and conference space. Level 2 would also provide the hospital's main vehicular access and passenger drop-off zone and would contain a one-way northbound drive-through vehicular access area connecting Geary Boulevard with Post Street.
- ▶ *Level 3* would offer space for administration, support, diagnostic and treatment, loading, and Emergency Department uses. Access for service and emergency vehicles, as well as a separate drop-off zone for emergency-room patients arriving by car, would be on Level 3, with access provided from Franklin Street. The loading area would have four loading docks, an area for dumpsters, and four ambulance drop-off bays adjacent to the Emergency Department.
- ▶ *Level 4* would support diagnostic and treatment uses.
- ▶ *Level 5* would contain the courtyard, areas for inpatient care, and support uses.
- ▶ *Level 6* uses would be similar to those on Level 5 (without a courtyard); this level would also include diagnostic and treatment uses.
- ▶ *Levels 7–14* would contain diagnostic and treatment uses and inpatient-care areas, with between 30 and 70 beds per floor.
- ▶ *Level 15* would house the central utility plant. Air handler units and three emergency generators would be located on the roof above Levels 14 and 15. An additional air handler unit would be located on top of the podium at the Level 6 roof.

Space for medical care–related uses would include approximately 388,100 sq. ft. for inpatient care (Levels 5–14), approximately 130,100 sq. ft. of diagnostic and treatment space (Levels 3, 4, 6, and 7), and approximately 1,500 sq. ft. for outpatient care. The Emergency Department would occupy approximately 19,900 sq. ft. (Level 3) and hospital support facilities would occupy about 80,000 sq. ft. (Levels 1–3, 5, and 13). Other nonmechanical/utility uses that would make up the remainder of the hospital space are hospital administration (approximately 12,100 sq. ft.) (Level 3), retail uses (3,100 sq. ft.) (Level 2), education and conference areas (14,700 sq. ft.) (Levels 2 and 3), a cafeteria (10,800 sq. ft.) (Level 2), and the hospital lobby (9,200 sq. ft.) (Level 2). The proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital would also include about 207,300 sq. ft. of building infrastructure space (e.g., shafts, elevators, and stairways), distributed on all levels; 26,700 sq. ft. of central plant space (Level 15); and 15,600 sq. ft. of loading space (Level 3). The proposed 513 parking spaces would occupy approximately 244,900 sq. ft. on Levels 1/P1 to P3.

The main vehicular access to the hospital would be from the south side of the building along Geary Boulevard, with a one-way (south to north) drive-through lane that would connect Geary Boulevard to Post Street at midblock. Drivers would either enter the adjacent nonemergency passenger drop-off area or descend to the 513-space parking garage. The drive-through area would provide separate and distinct entrances for the proposed acute-care services and the Women’s and Children’s Center. A separate vehicular access would also be provided from Post Street. Egress from the hospital (other than egress onto Geary Boulevard for emergencies only) would be restricted to a right-turn exit (eastbound) onto Post Street.

### **Cathedral Hill Medical Office Building**

The site of the proposed Cathedral Hill MOB, approximately 36,200 sq. ft., is located on the east side of Van Ness Avenue, on the block (Assessor’s Block 0694) bounded by Cedar Street to the north, Polk Street to the east, Geary Street to the south, and Van Ness Avenue to the west. Seven buildings (totaling approximately 100,400 sq. ft.) would be demolished and replaced by the Cathedral Hill MOB. They are located on Lots 010 (1100 Van Ness Avenue), 009A (1062 Geary Street), 009 (1054–1060 Geary Street), 008 (1040–1052 Geary Street), 007 (1034–1036 Geary Street), 006 (1028–1030 Geary Street), and 005 (1020 Geary Street); they range from two to three stories in height (26–40 feet) and are approximately 5,000–40,000 sq. ft. in size.

Present uses in these buildings include retail, nightclubs, a restaurant, a total of five residential dwelling units, and 20 residential hotel units. The remaining building on this block, on Lot 004 (1001 Polk Street) at the eastern end of the block at the intersection of Geary and Polk Streets, houses Episcopal Community Services, a nonprofit organization that assists the homeless. This building is not part of the project site for the proposed Cathedral Hill MOB. Existing pedestrian access to the proposed MOB site is currently available along Cedar Street, Van Ness Avenue, and Geary Street.

The proposed Cathedral Hill MOB would be nine stories and approximately 130 feet tall. The building would contain seven at- or below-grade parking levels that would provide 542 parking spaces. The various levels of the proposed MOB would contain the following uses:

- ▶ *Level 1* would contain a lobby and spaces for retail uses, building support, medical offices, and diagnostic and treatment uses.
- ▶ *Level 2* would provide education uses, conference space, and medical office space.
- ▶ *Levels 3–9* would contain primarily medical offices and related diagnostic and treatment space.

Space for medical uses would include approximately 195,000 sq. ft. of medical office space and approximately 7,500 sq. ft. for diagnostic and treatment space. Support uses would occupy approximately 2,100 sq. ft. The Cathedral Hill MOB would include approximately 7,000 sq. ft. of retail space and approximately 2,900 sq. ft. of education and conference space; the lobby would occupy approximately 3,500 sq. ft. The Cathedral Hill MOB would include 28,600 sq. ft. of building infrastructure (e.g., shafts, elevators, and stairways), distributed on all levels; 5,500 sq. ft. of mechanical and electrical space; and 1,000 sq. ft. of loading space. The proposed 542-space parking garage would occupy approximately 243,000 sq. ft. Screened mechanical equipment located on the roof above Level 9 would be set back from the building's edge. The roof would also include green roof elements, boilers, and emergency generators.

Vehicle entry points for the proposed Cathedral Hill MOB would be located on Geary Street (westbound) and Cedar Street (eastbound). All loading-dock entries are located on Cedar Street and would be right turns. The main pedestrian entrance would be from Van Ness Avenue. Upon implementation of the LRDP, Cedar Street would be converted to a two-way street west of the Cathedral Hill MOB garage's ramp; egress points from the Cathedral Hill MOB would be restricted to a right turn (eastbound) or left turn (westbound) onto Cedar Street. No egress would be provided onto Geary Street.

### **1375 Sutter Medical Office Building**

The existing Pacific Plaza Office Building at 1375 Sutter Street (which currently includes both medical and non-medical offices) is undergoing a phased upgrade and conversion as existing tenants vacate and new physicians lease space in the building. New-tenant improvements and new interior finishes would meet the functional needs of contemporary medical office space. No substantial exterior changes are anticipated other than ongoing maintenance of the exterior plaster skin and window systems. The building features a four-story central open-air atrium that would remain with implementation of the proposed LRDP. No changes to existing pedestrian and vehicular access to and from this building are anticipated. The 1375 Sutter Street site currently contains a 172-space, partially below-grade self-park garage. These parking spaces would be retained with implementation of the



proposed LRDP. Additional parking required to meet the needs of the 1375 Sutter MOB would be provided off-site at the Cathedral Hill Hospital parking garage.

### **Van Ness Avenue Pedestrian Tunnel**

A pedestrian tunnel beneath Van Ness Avenue would connect the eastern portion of the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital to the western portion of the Cathedral Hill MOB. The tunnel would be used by patients, visitors, physicians, and CPMC staff members, allowing them direct connection between the two buildings, particularly during inclement weather. It would also be used for the movement of records and materials. The tunnel would be constructed under Van Ness Avenue approximately 43 feet north of Geary Street.

## **PROJECT VARIANTS FOR THE CATHEDRAL HILL CAMPUS**

### **No Van Ness Avenue Pedestrian Tunnel**

The proposed Cathedral Hill project includes a project variant that would eliminate the Van Ness Avenue pedestrian tunnel from the proposed project. This project variant is intended to provide flexibility in accommodating permit timing and other considerations. This variant is not CPMC's preferred project because it raises substantial operational, health care delivery, and efficiency concerns. The reason for these concerns is that the tunnel would no longer be available for doctors, staff, patients, and visitors to cross Van Ness Avenue, or for moving and transferring goods and materials between the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital and Cathedral Hill MOB. This project variant would instead require that patients, visitors, medical staff, and other employees cross Van Ness Avenue at the Post Street or Geary Boulevard/Geary Street intersection to travel between the proposed hospital and MOB. Median improvements along Van Ness Avenue and other streetscape improvements would still occur under this variant.

### **Two-Way Post Street Variant**

The Two-Way Post Street Variant is being studied to provide flexibility to allow vehicles exiting the Cathedral Hill Hospital onto Post Street the option of traveling westbound or eastbound. The Two-Way Post Street Variant would create two-way vehicular access on Post Street between Van Ness Avenue and Gough Street. Entry points into the Cathedral Hill Hospital and Cathedral Hill MOB would be similar to the entry points under the proposed near-term project, with the exception of the Post Street entrance to the hospital. Because Post Street would become a two-way street from Gough Street to Van Ness Avenue under the Two-Way Post Street Variant, vehicular access to the hospital from Post Street would be available to both eastbound traffic (similar to the access under the proposed near-term projects) and westbound traffic (via a left-hand turn into the hospital). Vehicular exit points from the hospital and MOB would remain similar to those under the near-term project as proposed.

## **MOB Access Variant**

The MOB Access Variant is being studied to provide flexibility, particularly if the proposal to change Cedar Street to two-way west of the Cathedral Hill MOB driveways is not approved. Under the MOB Access Variant, Cedar Street would maintain the one-way eastbound restriction. Vehicular entry points to the Cathedral Hill MOB would be located along Cedar Street (eastbound traffic) and Geary Street (westbound traffic). Vehicular exit points for the Cathedral Hill MOB would be located at Cedar Street (eastbound exit) and Geary Street. There would be no change to the Cathedral Hill Hospital egress or ingress from the proposed near-term project; that is, the Cathedral Hill Hospital driveway onto Post Street would be configured to allow right-in/right-out only access from Post Street (i.e., Post Street would remain eastbound east of Gough Street). Access from Geary Street would be ingress-only for the Cathedral Hill Hospital and both ingress and egress for the Cathedral Hill MOB. Emergency egress onto Geary Street would be allowed at the hospital. All driveways would be single lanes, and all access from Geary Street would be allowed pursuant to a revocable curb-cut permit.

## **S.2.2 PACIFIC CAMPUS**

### **EXISTING CAMPUS CONDITIONS**

The 4.6-acre Pacific Campus occupies several blocks in the Pacific Heights neighborhood (Assessor's Blocks 0612, 0613, 0628, 0629, 0636, and 0637). This campus is generally bounded by Clay Street to the north, Buchanan Street to the east, Sacramento Street to the south, and Webster Street to the west.

Existing zoning on the Pacific Campus is residential, with a mix of RM-1 (Mixed [Apartments and Houses], Low Density) and RM-2 (Mixed [Apartments and Houses], Moderate Density). The portion of the campus bounded by Buchanan, Sacramento, and Webster Streets is mainly zoned RM-2, and adjacent campus portions are mainly zoned RM-1. The Pacific Campus is located within the 40-X and 160-F Height and Bulk Districts. The portion of the campus bounded by Buchanan, Sacramento, and Webster Streets is located mainly within the 160-F Height and Bulk District, and adjacent campus portions are located mainly within the 40-X Height and Bulk District.

The Pacific Campus consists of 15 buildings, including a hospital, medical offices, residential uses, and other uses. The most prominent buildings on the campus are the nine-story, 120-foot-tall 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital building (Assessor's Block 0628, Lot 014 and Assessor's Block 0613, Lot 029) and the seven-story, 99-foot-tall Stanford Building at 2351 Clay Street (Assessor's Block 0628, Lot 014). These buildings are located at or near the corner of Sacramento and Buchanan Streets. The Pacific Campus is licensed for 313 beds, of which 298 are in use.

## **CAMPUS PROPOSAL**

Under the proposed CPMC LRDP, the Pacific Campus would be converted to the primary outpatient-care campus for the area of the City north of Market Street. No near-term projects are proposed at this campus. After completion of the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital by 2015, the acute-care and Emergency Department functions at the Pacific Campus's existing 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital would be decommissioned and transferred to the Cathedral Hill Hospital. Renovations and conversions of existing buildings would commence after the completion of the Cathedral Hill Hospital.

## **PRIMARY BUILDINGS AND PARKING AREAS**

### **Ambulatory Care Center**

After completion of the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital by 2015, all of the inpatient acute-care (approximately 88,800 sq. ft.) and Emergency Department (approximately 12,500 sq. ft.) functions at the Pacific Campus's existing 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital would be decommissioned and transferred to the Cathedral Hill Hospital. This transfer of services would permit the interior renovation and conversion of the existing 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital into the proposed Ambulatory Care Center. Once used as the ACC, the renovated building would no longer provide acute-care and Emergency Department functions. No changes to the building's exterior are expected as a result of converting the 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital into the ACC. Although interior renovation and changes to the existing 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital would occur, the overall square footage would not change upon conversion of the building into the ACC.

In the long term, when the ACC conversion is expected to be substantially completed, CPMC would relocate to the ACC building the uses<sup>4</sup> currently at the seven-story, 76-foot-tall Annex MOB (2340–2360 Clay Street); the five-story, 60-foot-tall Gerbode Research Building (2200 Webster Street); and the seven-story, 99-foot-tall Stanford Building (2351 Clay Street). The approximately 300,800-sq.-ft. ACC would offer outpatient care (approximately 23,200 sq. ft.), diagnostic and treatment services (116,500 sq. ft.), and Alzheimer's residential care (32,500 sq. ft.). Medical support services (56,700 sq. ft.), hospital administration (11,800 sq. ft.), a cafeteria (6,900 sq. ft.), and the building lobby (5,400 sq. ft.) would make up the remainder of the major uses in the ACC.

### **Underground Parking and Ambulatory Care Center Addition**

The Stanford Building and the 2324 Sacramento Street Clinic would be demolished to accommodate the proposed Webster Street/Sacramento Street Underground Parking Garage and ACC Addition (discussed below) by 2020. The uses at the 2324 Sacramento Street Clinic would be relocated off-site. The resulting vacant site of the former Stanford Building would first be excavated to construct an "L"-shaped, two-level, 22-foot-deep, approximately

---

<sup>4</sup> For detailed building uses, refer to Table 2-7a, "Pacific Campus: Project Summary Table—Existing Conditions by Building" (page 2-105).

113,100-sq.-ft. underground parking structure. This structure, the proposed Webster Street/Sacramento Street Underground Parking Garage, would also extend north of Clay Street, beneath the locations of the existing Gerbode Research Building and Annex MOB, which would be demolished. The structure would provide about 248 parking spaces and would be completed in 2018. A new street, Campus Drive, would be built to supplement existing vehicular access to the campus from Webster Street; provide vehicular access to the entrance/exit to and from Clay Street from the proposed Webster Street/Sacramento Street Underground Parking Garage; and allow egress from Sacramento Street for loading and unloading.

In the long term, CPMC proposes to construct a nine-story, 138-foot-tall, approximately 205,000-sq.-ft. ACC Addition on the central portion of the main campus. The ACC Addition would be bounded by Clay Street to the north, the ACC to the east, Sacramento Street to the south, and the Pacific Professional Building (2100 Webster Street) to the west. The ACC Addition would be built above the proposed Webster Street/Sacramento Street Underground Parking Garage, on the site of the current Stanford Building and 2324 Sacramento Street Clinic, which would be demolished.

The proposed ACC Addition would be located immediately west of the proposed ACC building (which would be a conversion from the existing 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital). The proposed ACC and ACC Addition buildings would both be nine stories and would be connected at the three lower floors, with no connection on the upper floors. Access from the Webster Street/Sacramento Street Underground Parking Garage to the ACC Addition would be available along the northern portion of proposed Campus Drive. As described above, Campus Drive would provide a loading entry/exit area and a secondary vehicular exit to Sacramento Street. The ACC Addition would include loading space, a lobby, and various medical spaces.<sup>5</sup>

### **North of Clay Street**

CPMC proposes to retain the three-story, 51-foot-tall Stern Building (2330 Clay Street), which has been determined to be a historically significant building, and would continue to be useful for office and medical support uses.<sup>6</sup> CPMC would demolish the existing Annex MOB and Gerbode Research Building, both located north of Clay Street between Buchanan Street and Webster Street, as well as the Clay Street Tunnel.<sup>7</sup> CPMC proposes to begin construction of the approximately 169,800-sq.-ft. (including approximately 500-sq.-ft. lobby) North-of-Clay Aboveground Parking Garage above the northern portion of the proposed Webster Street/Sacramento Street Underground Parking Garage around 2018, on the area currently occupied by these two above-mentioned buildings and part of the Buchanan Street surface parking lot (2315 Buchanan Street). The open

---

<sup>5</sup> These may include education and conference space, outpatient space, support space, diagnostic and treatment space, medical offices and outpatient care, and mechanical space.

<sup>6</sup> The historical significance of the Stern Building is described in Section 4.4, "Cultural Resources."

<sup>7</sup> The Clay Street Tunnel, located under the former Clay Street right-of-way, serves as a utility connection between the Stanford Building and the Annex MOB.

space north of the parking structure would be retained. The Buchanan Street parking lot, east of the Stern Building, would be partially retained; this lot would be reconfigured to allow access to the North-of-Clay Aboveground Parking Garage from Buchanan Street, north of the Stern Building. This parking garage would be six stories (plus top deck) with a height of 85 feet, based on the Planning Code methodology for building height. A total of 715 new structured and surface parking spaces (Webster Street/Sacramento Street Underground Parking Garage and North-of-Clay Aboveground Parking Garage combined, 688 spaces; Buchanan Street surface parking lot, 27 spaces)<sup>8</sup> would be provided at the Pacific Campus by the year 2020. This would bring the parking total at the Pacific Campus to 1,587 spaces by 2020, 648 parking more spaces than under existing conditions.

## **OTHER BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES ON THE PACIFIC CAMPUS**

Other buildings and structures on the Pacific Campus are described below by section of campus, from north to south.

### **2400 Clay Street MOB**

No changes are proposed for the 2400 Clay Street MOB under the CPMC LRDP. This building would be across Webster Street from the North-of-Clay Aboveground Parking Garage.

### **South of Sacramento Street**

No changes are proposed for the Health Sciences Library (2395 Sacramento Street), 2329 Sacramento Street Residential Building, or Mental Health Center (2323 Sacramento Street) under the CPMC LRDP. The Mental Health Center would continue to operate as an inpatient and outpatient facility with 18 inpatient beds.

### **Webster Street, California Street, and Other Parking**

The vacant building at 2018 Webster Street (formerly in retail use) would be converted to administrative offices (approximately 5,300 sq. ft.) for the Institute for Health and Healing (IHH) by 2017.<sup>9</sup> No changes are proposed for the Pacific Professional Building (2100 Webster Street), the Clay Street/Webster Street Parking Garage (2405 Clay Street), or the 2300 California Street MOB under the CPMC LRDP.

---

<sup>8</sup> The existing Clay Street/Webster Street Parking Garage and the other surface parking spaces that would be retained at 2300 California Street (41 spaces) would not change.

<sup>9</sup> Founded in 1994, the Pacific Campus's IHH was the first integrative medical clinic certified by the State of California. The IHH is one of the largest integrative medical facilities in the nation, staffed with more than 40 practitioners and doctors practicing more than 35 holistic therapies.

## **S.2.3 CALIFORNIA CAMPUS**

### **EXISTING CAMPUS CONDITIONS**

The 4.9-acre California Campus, in the Presidio Heights neighborhood, encompasses one entire block and portions of two other blocks (Assessor's Blocks 1015, 1016, and 1017). The California Campus is bounded by Sacramento Street to the north, Spruce Street to the east, California Street to the south, and roughly Cherry Street to the west (with five buildings west of Cherry Street).

Existing zoning on the California Campus is residential, primarily RM-2; the exception is the northwest portion of the campus, which is zoned RH-2 (House, Two-Family). The California Campus is located mainly within the 80-E Height and Bulk District; the northwest portion of the campus is located in the 40-X Height and Bulk District. The base allowable FAR for the California Campus is 1.8:1.

The California Campus consists of nine existing buildings. The most prominent building on the campus is the 3700 California Street Hospital (Assessor's Block 1016, Lots 002–009). The hospital site is zoned RM-2 on Lots 002 and 003 and RH-2 on Lots 004–009 and is located within the 80-E Height and Bulk District. The primary uses of this six-story, 91-foot-tall, approximately 360,200-sq.-ft. hospital are diagnostic and treatment space (78,400 sq. ft.), medical support (94,400 sq. ft.), inpatient-care space (77,500 sq. ft.), and outpatient-care space (33,100 sq. ft.). The hospital is licensed for 299 beds, of which 186 are in use.

### **CAMPUS PROPOSAL**

No substantial changes are proposed at the California Campus in the near term. No demolition or alteration of existing structures is proposed. All project components described below are long term. After the proposed Cathedral Hill Hospital opens in 2015, all inpatient functions in the California Campus's 3700 California Street Hospital would be transferred to the Cathedral Hill Campus. CPMC plans to sell the California Campus shortly after relocating inpatient functions. A small amount of CPMC-operated space at the 3838 California Street MOB (primarily outpatient imaging and blood drawing) would be leased from the owner of the California Campus property. The remaining CPMC uses and programs would continue at the California Campus until completion of the proposed ACC and ACC Addition at the Pacific Campus (expected in 2016 and 2020, respectively), at which time the Pacific Campus would absorb almost all remaining CPMC-related uses from the California Campus. Thus, it is expected that by 2020 almost all CPMC-related use of the California Campus would cease.

## **S.2.4 DAVIES CAMPUS**

### **EXISTING CAMPUS CONDITIONS**

The 7.2-acre Davies Campus, in the Duboce Triangle neighborhood, is located on one lot (Assessor's Block 3539, Lot 001) that occupies an entire city block. The campus is bounded by Duboce Avenue to the north, Noe Street to the east, 14th Street to the south, and Castro Street to the west.

Existing zoning on the Davies Campus is residential; the entire campus is zoned RH-3 (Residential, House, Three-Family) and is within the 130-E and 65-D Height and Bulk Districts. The base allowable FAR for the Davies Campus is 1.8:1. The Davies Campus consists of four existing buildings: the Davies Hospital North Tower, the Davies Hospital South Tower, the 45 Castro MOB, and the Castro Street/14th Street Parking Garage.

The Davies Campus is recognizable by the Davies Hospital North and South Towers. There are currently 201 licensed beds in the Davies Hospital, North Tower and South Tower combined. The approximately 187,800-sq.-ft., five-story, 66-foot-tall North Tower is used primarily for inpatient care, diagnostic and treatment space, education and conference space, and support; it also has an Emergency Department. The approximately 136,700-sq.-ft., four-story, 66-foot-tall South Tower contains skilled nursing, outpatient-care, and diagnostic and treatment space. The South Tower also contains some inpatient-care facilities.

The approximately 62,900-sq.-ft., four-story, 67-foot-tall 45 Castro Street MOB is currently used for physicians' offices. The building's four aboveground levels and one belowground level are measured from Duboce Avenue. The belowground story of this building, which contains mechanical and electrical uses, extends approximately 13 feet below grade as measured from Duboce Avenue.

The three-story, 30-foot-tall, approximately 112,600-sq.-ft., 290-space Castro Street/14th Street Parking Garage is located west of the North and South Towers at the intersection of 14th and Castro Streets. Surface parking lots on the Davies Campus are located to the east and south of the North and South Towers. The surface parking lots contain a total of 206 parking spaces at the corner of Noe Street and Duboce Avenue. The surface parking lots are accessible from 14th Street and Duboce Avenue.

### **CAMPUS PROPOSAL**

Existing uses in the North and South Towers would continue under the proposed LRDP. The existing Emergency Department would remain in the North Tower, along with inpatient care through 2029, with a focus on neuroscience-related treatment, microsurgery, and postsurgery rehabilitation. The existing South Tower would continue to be used for skilled nursing, outpatient care, and diagnostic and treatment space.

The approximately four-story, 40-foot-tall, 50,100-sq.-ft. Neuroscience Institute building is proposed for construction on the portion of the Davies Campus currently occupied by the 206-space surface parking lot at the corner of Noe Street and Duboce Avenue. Completion of the Neuroscience Institute in the near term would allow CPMC to consolidate complementary neuroscience departments (including neuroscience/neurosurgery, microsurgery, and acute rehabilitation) at the Davies Campus.

As proposed, the four-story Neuroscience Institute building would be 40 feet in height to the top of the third-floor parapet, as measured from the building's midpoint along Noe Street based on the Planning Code's methodology for measuring building height. The building would be 56 feet tall to the top of the fifth-floor parapet, measured from Noe Street. An elevator penthouse would rise an additional 5 feet above the fourth-floor parapet and would be visible along the Duboce Avenue frontage.

The proposed Neuroscience Institute building is in the 65-D Height and Bulk District, allowing for a maximum of 65 feet in height for buildings. The bulk designation requires additional setbacks for portions of buildings 40 feet in height. The various levels of the proposed Neuroscience Institute would contain the following uses:

- ▶ *Level 1* (i.e., the ground floor) would be the Neuroscience Institute's main access floor, with a pedestrian entrance from the surface parking lot on 14th Street, and would contain the lobby, diagnostic and treatment uses, medical offices, and hospital-oriented retail. Level 1 would also contain medical offices (approximately 4,250 sq. ft.) and a retail pharmacy (1,000 sq. ft.). The south lobby would be the primary lobby for the main entrance. The secondary, north lobby would be within a glass pavilion at the northeast corner of the building on the corner of Duboce Avenue and Noe Street, allowing for views of Duboce Park. Level 1 would also provide pedestrian access to the outdoor courtyard.
- ▶ *Level 2* would contain medical offices (approximately 13,600 sq. ft.).
- ▶ *Level 3* would house the Neuromuscular Clinic (approximately 13,500 sq. ft.). This clinic would be used for the treatment of various neuromuscular diseases, such as amyotrophic lateral sclerosis (ALS, also known as Lou Gehrig's disease), multiple sclerosis, and muscular dystrophy. Level 3 would also provide vehicle access patient drop-off from the service drive.
- ▶ *Level 4* would contain outpatient care and would connect to the Davies Hospital North Tower above the service drive. Level 4 would also house the registration area (approximately 8,500 sq. ft.) for outpatient ambulatory surgery that takes place in the hospital's North Tower.

Under the long-term project, the existing 290-space garage at 14th and Castro Streets would be demolished and a second MOB (the proposed Castro Street/14th Street MOB) would be constructed on the parking garage site by



2020 to meet the future need for medical office space at this campus. The proposed approximately 264,900-sq.-ft., 45-foot-tall, three-story Castro Street/14th Street MOB would contain medical offices, building infrastructure, lobby space, and mechanical and electrical spaces, and would include four levels of parking totaling 184,000 sq. ft. and providing 490 parking spaces.

## **S.2.5 ST. LUKE'S CAMPUS**

### **EXISTING CAMPUS CONDITIONS**

Located in the Mission District, the 4.4-acre St. Luke's Campus occupies one block (Assessor's Block 6575, Lots 001 and 002) and a portion of a second block (Assessor's Block 6576, Lot 021). Block 6575 is bounded by Cesar Chavez Street to the north, Valencia Street to the east, Duncan Street to the south, and San Jose Avenue to the west. The campus also contains a surface parking lot west of San Jose Avenue that occupies a portion of Assessor's Block 6576, Lot 021. This block is generally bounded by Cesar Chavez Street to the north, San Jose Avenue to the east, 27th Street to the south, and Guerrero Street to the west.

The St. Luke's Campus consists of eight structures. The entire campus is zoned RH-2. The existing hospital and seven other buildings on this campus are located in the 105-E Height and Bulk District. The surface parking lot at the northwest portion of this campus is located in the 65-A Height and Bulk District. The base allowable FAR for the St. Luke's Campus is 1.8:1.

Built in 1970 and located near the northeast corner of the campus at 3555 Cesar Chavez Street, the most prominent building on the St. Luke's Campus is the existing St. Luke's Hospital tower. This 12-story, 158-foot-tall (plus mechanical screen) hospital tower occupies 197,983 sq. ft. and includes inpatient space (approximately 52,100 sq. ft.), skilled nursing space (25,600 sq. ft.), and administrative support space (51,500 sq. ft.). The hospital is licensed for 229 beds, of which 139 are in use.

The four-story, 53-foot-tall 1957 Building occupies approximately 31,800 sq. ft. The building includes the campus's Emergency Department (approximately 7,100 sq. ft.), diagnostic and treatment space (14,200 sq. ft.), and support space (3,600 sq. ft.).

The four-story, 53-foot-tall 1912 Building occupies approximately 26,300 sq. ft., and includes hospital administration (4,100 sq. ft.), outpatient care (i.e., Diabetes Center [4,200 sq. ft.]), diagnostic and treatment space (7,100 sq. ft.), hospital support (9,400 sq. ft.), and the chapel.

The eight-story, 102-foot-tall Monteaagle Medical Center occupies the southeastern corner of the St. Luke's Campus at the intersection of Valencia and Duncan Streets (1580 Valencia Street). This medical center occupies approximately 90,000 sq. ft. and includes medical office space (approximately 49,700 sq. ft.), outpatient space

(1,500 sq. ft.), diagnostic and treatment space (15,800 sq. ft.), and support space (5,800 sq. ft.). The Redwood Administration Building is a portable building. This one-story, 12-foot-tall building contains 2,400 sq. ft. of space dedicated entirely to hospital administration.

CPMC leases the two-story, 34-foot-tall Hartzell Building (555 San Jose Avenue) to the Samuel Merritt School of Nursing, which is not part of CPMC. This building accommodates approximately 18,500 sq. ft. of office and educational uses related to the nursing school. The one-story, 12-foot-tall MRI Trailer provides 1,600 sq. ft. of space for diagnostics and treatment.

The St. Luke's Campus provides a total of 329 parking spaces, which are located in one parking structure and two surface parking lots. Located in the southwestern corner of the campus, the approximately 83,370-sq.-ft., two-story, 28-foot-tall Duncan Street Parking Garage contains 215 parking spaces. The 31,000-sq.-ft. 3615 Cesar Chavez Street Surface Parking Lot, located on the west side of San Jose Avenue (i.e., across San Jose Avenue from the rest of the St. Luke's Campus) between Cesar Chavez Street and 27th Street, contains 74 parking spaces. A smaller surface parking lot at the northeast corner of Cesar Chavez and Valencia Streets, plus scattered surface parking on the campus together contain 40 parking spaces. The service and loading area for the St. Luke's Hospital tower is located on the west side of the hospital building and is accessed from San Jose Avenue.

## **CAMPUS PROPOSAL**

### **St. Luke's Replacement Hospital**

The CPMC LRDP would result in the construction of the five-story, 99-foot-tall, approximately 145,000-sq.-ft., seismically compliant St. Luke's Replacement Hospital, adjacent to and west of the existing St. Luke's Hospital tower. Specifically, the replacement hospital would occupy the site of the existing 3615 Cesar Chavez Street Surface Parking Lot. A portion of the new replacement hospital would also be constructed across a section of San Jose Avenue, between the 1957 Building and the existing 3615 Cesar Chavez Street Surface Parking Lot. The proposed project would also require the demolition of the portable Redwood Administration Building prior to construction of the replacement hospital.<sup>10</sup> The proposed St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would replace the acute-care hospital uses in the existing St. Luke's Hospital tower by 2015. The St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would include 80 licensed beds.

The replacement hospital would be a state-of-the-art medical facility providing more efficient delivery of ancillary and support services, along with improved coordination of and access to patient care. After completion of the replacement hospital, the existing hospital tower would be decommissioned and demolished due to seismic concerns. The new, five-story St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would be 99 feet in height, based on the Planning

---

<sup>10</sup> The project, as proposed, would require the City to vacate this section of San Jose Avenue.

Code's methodology for measurement of building height. The various levels of the proposed St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would contain the following uses:

- ▶ *Level 1* would contain off-street loading, mechanical and electrical, cafeteria, and lobby uses. The off-street loading area would be enclosed and located on the north side of the building, and would include three truck loading docks, three service van spaces, and two spaces for dumpsters. The main building entrance would be located on the north side of Level 1, providing covered access from the white zone drop-off area on Cesar Chavez Street through a lower level plaza, adjacent to the hospital cafeteria.
- ▶ *Level 2* would contain the main lobby, admitting, hospital administration, diagnostic and treatment space, and the Emergency Department. A two-vehicle ambulance bay would be located adjacent to the Emergency Department on the south side of the hospital.
- ▶ *Level 3* would contain primarily diagnostic and treatment facilities, as well as 16 inpatient beds.
- ▶ *Levels 4–5* would contain mainly inpatient care facilities, with 29 beds on Level 4 and 35 beds on Level 5.
- ▶ *The roof level* would contain the emergency generators, air handling, and other mechanical and electrical equipment.

Once completed, the approximately 145,000-sq.-ft. replacement hospital would contain a total of 80 licensed beds and would provide acute-care (approximately 76,800 sq. ft.), diagnostic and treatment facilities (17,500 sq. ft.), and an Emergency Department (12,000 sq. ft.), including two critical-care bays, 6 standard bays, and 4 fast-track bays, including a triage room. Other uses would include hospital administration (approximately 2,000 sq. ft.), cafeteria (1,800 sq. ft.), support facilities (14,000 sq. ft.), lobby (2,500 sq. ft.), and loading area (1,000 sq. ft.). In addition, the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would have about 3,000 sq. ft. of utility plant space and about 14,400 sq. ft. of building infrastructure (e.g., shafts, elevators, and stairways), distributed among all the building levels.

After construction of the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital, the existing St. Luke's Hospital tower would be decommissioned and demolished.

### **St. Luke's MOB/Expansion Building**

After the existing 12-story, 158-foot-tall St. Luke's Hospital tower is demolished, a new, approximately 201,000-sq.-ft., five-story, 100-foot-tall MOB/Expansion Building would be constructed at the site of the existing hospital tower. The MOB/Expansion Building would include medical offices (approximately 31,900 sq. ft.), diagnostic and treatment space (22,500 sq. ft.), lobby space and building infrastructure (15,700 sq. ft.), outpatient care (8,700

sq. ft.), and four belowground parking levels that would provide approximately 220 parking spaces (approximately 111,000 sq. ft.). The new, five-story MOB/Expansion Building would be 100 feet in height, based on the Planning Code's methodology for measurement of building height. The various levels of the proposed MOB/Expansion Building would contain the following uses:

- ▶ *Level 1* would provide pedestrian and vehicular access to the MOB/Expansion Building as well as the main lobby, a retail outlet, a community room (with connection to the replacement hospital), and parking.
- ▶ *Level 2* would contain additional lobby space, a laboratory, imaging room, and cafeteria.
- ▶ *Levels 3–5* would contain medical offices.
- ▶ *Levels P1–P4* (belowground levels of parking) would contain 220 parking spaces and be accessible from Level 1.

Parking demand for the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would be accommodated at the existing Duncan Street Parking Garage, which has 215 parking spaces, and the proposed parking garage located at the proposed MOB/Expansion Building. These two parking garages plus 15 surface parking spaces (scattered throughout the campus) would provide a total of 450 parking spaces at the St. Luke's Campus. Loading for the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would be located at the northern end of the hospital on Cesar Chavez Street between Guerrero and Valencia Streets.

### **San Jose Avenue Utilities Relocation**

As described above, a portion of the new St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would be located on the portion of San Jose Avenue between 27th Street and Cesar Chavez Street that is currently used by CPMC under a permit from the City as the 3615 Cesar Chavez Street Surface Parking Lot. This portion of San Jose Avenue is currently gated at its northern end where it meets Cesar Chavez Street, is not open to through traffic, and is used for parking. It has been closed to public use under an encroachment permit since 1968. For the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital to be constructed, the City would be required to approve a street vacation for this portion of San Jose Avenue, and existing utilities located within the San Jose Avenue right-of-way would need to be relocated. The removal of the existing 114 parking spaces, associated with the 3615 Cesar Chavez Street Surface Parking Lot, and scattered throughout the campus, would be accommodated by the parking garage in the proposed MOB/Expansion Building. The proposed realignment of the storm sewer, water main, and electrical utilities from San Jose Avenue would be west onto 27th Street, then north along Guerrero Street, east along Cesar Chavez Street, north on Valencia Street, and west on 26th Street to a substation at the corner of San Jose Avenue and 26th Street.

## **PROJECT VARIANTS FOR THE ST. LUKE'S CAMPUS**

### **Alternate Emergency Department Location**

Under this variant, the Emergency Department and ambulance bay for the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would be relocated from the south side of the building near the intersection of San Jose and 27th Street, where it is proposed to be located under the LRDP, to the north side of the replacement hospital on Cesar Chavez Street (i.e., where the loading dock would be located under the proposed LRDP). A walk-in entrance to the Emergency Department would be located at the northeast corner of the replacement hospital on the first floor. The loading dock would be relocated to the southwest corner of the second floor, as opposed to the north side of the replacement hospital on Cesar Chavez Street (under the LRDP). Service vehicles would enter the loading dock from 27th Street.

### **Cesar Chavez Street Utility Line Alignment**

As described above, existing utilities located within the San Jose Avenue right-of-way would need to be relocated. Under this project variant, most of the existing utilities would be relocated to different alignments than under the proposed LRDP. Instead of following the realignment proposed under the LRDP (which would begin along San Jose Avenue west onto 27th Street, then north along Guerrero Street, and then east along Cesar Chavez Street before connecting to Valencia Street), the electrical lines would be rerouted south on San Jose Avenue, east on Duncan Street, north on Valencia Street, and west on 26th Street to a substation at the corner of San Jose Avenue and 26th Street. An additional electrical line would connect from the intersection of San Jose Avenue and Cesar Chavez Street and continue east on Cesar Chavez Street (connecting to the line described above).

The utility relocation for the sewer would follow a similar route as the electrical lines, as described above, and would be coordinated with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), to be included in SFPUC's currently proposed Cesar Chavez Street Sewer System Improvement Project (Planning Department Case Number 2009.0276E). The proposed realignment of the storm sewer would be rerouted from San Jose Avenue to Duncan Street, then continue east on Duncan Street to Valencia Street, where it would connect with the Cesar Chavez Street Sewer System Improvement Project and continue north on Valencia Street.

The water line utilities under this variant would take the same route as under the proposed LRDP, as described above.

## S.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

CPMC's various objectives for the LRDP are listed below.

### OVERARCHING OBJECTIVES

- ▶ Construct modern, seismically safe hospital facilities that will remain operational in the event of a major disaster—both to serve CPMC's patients and to play an important role in San Francisco's disaster response and preparedness system—through the development of a new CPMC campus and the redevelopment of existing campuses in a manner that is fully compliant with the Alfred E. Alquist Hospital Seismic Safety Act and SB 1953, as mandated by the State of California.
- ▶ Optimize the use of CPMC's resources (medical, facilities, human, financial, and land) to provide an integrated health-care system affording the highest quality of patient care to CPMC's patient population in the most cost-effective and operationally efficient manner.

### SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives listed below support and implement CPMC's overarching objectives for the LRDP.

#### Core Medical Services Objectives

- ▶ Ensure ongoing medical services and an uninterrupted continuum of care at CPMC during construction through a carefully planned, appropriately phased project to minimize disruption.
- ▶ Meet the existing and future projected acute-care and outpatient needs of CPMC's patients, with appropriate physician specialties, including specialized services that are provided by only a limited number of other service providers in the Bay Area, and in some cases Northern California.
- ▶ Efficiently consolidate CPMC campuses and consolidate specialized services and Women's and Children's Center services in one centralized acute-care hospital.
- ▶ Distribute inpatient capacity among CPMC campuses to create a rational overall system of care, including an optimal number of smaller, community-based hospitals, ambulatory-care facilities, and medical offices, sized and located to meet existing and projected future service demands for primary- and secondary-care services.
- ▶ Ensure that this consolidation and distribution minimizes redundancies, particularly with respect to staffing, equipment, support spaces, central processing, and other facilities, to avoid inefficiency and unnecessary costs to the health care system and patients.

- ▶ Optimize patient safety and clinical outcomes by (1) strategically grouping service lines and specialized services (for example, acute medical/surgical services, oncology, cardiology, and respiratory with Women's and Children's Center services); (2) providing multidisciplinary concentration of care for multisystem diseases, chronic-disease management, and other higher-level intervention treatments; (3) limiting patient transfers; and (4) providing critical-care beds where patients can be appropriately and expeditiously supported by necessary physicians, services, and equipment.
- ▶ Provide a modern, efficient, and clinically safe patient care environment in facilities based on contemporary best practices in hospital design and national hospital space and facility guidelines, including all private single-patient rooms, individual bathrooms, adequate common spaces for families and staff, floor plans that allow staff to work efficiently and safely with patients, appropriate department adjacencies, and the ability to accommodate current-day medical technologies.
- ▶ Rebuild and revitalize the St. Luke's Campus as a community hospital that is an integral part of CPMC's larger health care system, and that provides services such as (1) medical/surgical care, (2) critical care, (3) emergency/urgent care, and (4) gynecologic and low-intervention obstetric care.
- ▶ Provide for the development of an appropriately sized new medical office building or outpatient space at the St. Luke's Campus as the logical outgrowth of the increased utilization of the campus, to increase the availability of outpatient services meeting community needs and to better recruit and retain physicians by increasing convenience for physicians admitting patients to the hospital at the campus.
- ▶ Maintain CPMC's prominent role as an education, training, and research institution for medical professionals in San Francisco and the greater Bay Area.
- ▶ Retain and enhance CPMC's role as a provider of high-quality medical and administrative jobs, and contributor of community benefits in San Francisco, by implementing an economically viable development plan that includes consolidating, maintaining, and allowing modest growth opportunity for CPMC's existing inpatient capacity and providing ample facilities to accommodate a broad range of outpatient services.

### **Site Selection and Site Planning Objectives**

- ▶ Locate medical-care facilities on sites that are owned by or practically can be acquired by CPMC in a cost-effective and timely manner, consistent with the mandates of SB 1953 and CPMC's financial and operational needs.
- ▶ Ensure that the new centralized acute-care hospital is appropriately located, taking into account CPMC's patient base and utilization patterns and San Francisco's population concentration, on a site that (1) can

accommodate a building of the necessary size to serve the required program of integrated services, including adequate parking; and (2) is easily accessible by multiple transportation and transit modes.

- ▶ Design contemporary, architecturally integrated medical facilities that are compatible with neighborhood aesthetics in the areas surrounding CPMC facilities to the extent feasible.
- ▶ Integrate sustainability principles into the siting and design of the new centralized acute-care hospital, such as following LEED® [Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design] and other environmentally sustainable design, construction, and operational practices where feasible.
- ▶ Ensure that all hospital facilities are located so that they have the capacity to be supported with medical office space, parking facilities, and other supportive functions.

## S.4 REQUIRED PROJECT APPROVALS

Implementation of the proposed project would require multiple approvals from City and state agencies. Table S-1, “Required Project Approvals,” on page S-23 presents the major approval requirements.

## S.5 UNRESOLVED ISSUES AND AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

This EIR is a full-scope EIR. Environmental issues raised during the EIR public scoping meeting and responses to the notice of preparation (NOP) for this EIR are addressed in Chapter 4, “Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation,” in the applicable resource areas, as well as summarized in Table S-2, “Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures” (page S-37). On the basis of the public comments received on the NOP, potential areas of controversy and unresolved issues for the proposed project include:

- ▶ **Health Concerns**—secondary impacts on physical and mental health caused by noise and pollution;
- ▶ **Community Character**—a request that the vision of the CPMC LRDP, especially uses proposed at the Cathedral Hill Campus, be one that embraces community needs;
- ▶ **Economics**—external costs to other properties due to the construction of the proposed project; and
- ▶ **Merits of the Project**—comments received either advocating support of or opposition to the CPMC LRDP.



**Table S-1  
Required Project Approvals**

Project Element	Relevant Entitlement Code Sections	Current Code Restriction/ Requirement	Approval(s) Required (Approval Body in <i>Italics</i> )	
<b>Cathedral Hill Campus</b>				
Cathedral Hill Campus (all)	General Plan Amendment for <i>Van Ness Avenue Area Plan</i>	General Plan VNAP, Map 1 (Generalized Land Use and Density Plan)	7:1 FAR.	
		General Plan VNAP, Map 2 (Height and Bulk Districts)	130-V Height/Bulk District.	
		General Plan VNAP, Map 4 (Urban Design Element), Height Map	Permitted height is 161–240 feet.	
	General Plan Referral	Finding of General Plan consistency, as modified		Encroachment permits for the subsurface right-of-way for the proposed Van Ness Avenue pedestrian tunnel, subsurface facilities in street right-of-way, sidewalk widening and lane reconfiguration. ( <i>Planning Commission, Department of Public Works, Board of Supervisors, and Caltrans District 4</i> )
	Planning Code Text/ Map Change	Planning Code Sections: - Section 243: Van Ness SUD - Section 204.5: Non-Accessory Parking - Section 154(b): Off-street loading space requirement for MOB	Allows hospital, medical center, or other medical institution with inpatient care and office uses. 64 spaces are required for the Cathedral Hill Hospital with a maximum of 96 spaces allowed as accessory parking (under the 150% maximum accessory parking per Planning Code and minimum MOB off-street loading space dimensions.	Creation of the Van Ness Medical Use Subdistrict: proposed Planning Code Section 243(d), in which a medical center is a conditional use that would have specific building form bulk, off-street parking and loading, street frontage and parking setback requirements and signs based upon Planning Commission conditions of approval rather the code standards. The proposed subdistrict (or the CU authorization described below) may modify residential requirements applicable to nonresidential development, increase the allowable FAR for the hospital, and provide exceptions to otherwise applicable requirements related to signs, off-street parking and loading street frontage, and parking setback requirements. ( <i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors</i> )

**Table S-1  
Required Project Approvals**

Project Element	Relevant Entitlement Code Sections		Current Code Restriction/ Requirement	Approval(s) Required (Approval Body in <i>Italics</i> )
Cathedral Hill Campus (all) (continued)	Planning Code Text/ Map Change	Zoning Map No. SU02; Planning Code Section 302	Van Ness SUD and RC-4 District apply.	Revision to Zoning Map SU02 for the creation of the Van Ness Medical Use Subdistrict. ( <i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors</i> )
	Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections: - Section 243 amended: CU - Section 303: CU - Section 204.5: Non-Accessory Parking - Section 253.2: Over 40 feet in Van Ness SUD - Section 253: Over 40 feet in a residential district - Sections 243(c)(8)(H) and 154(b): Off-street loading space requirement - Section 243 (c)(9); Ground-level wind currents - Section 270: Bulk limits: measurement	Finding of compliance of Cathedral Hill MOB with above text/code changes. 130-foot building in Van Ness SUD, 130-foot buildings in RC-4 Districts. Bulk limits for length and diagonal dimensions of 110 and 140 feet, respectively, apply to the hospital and MOB sites.	- CU authorization under Planning Code Section 304, for the proposed hospital and MOB as a conditional use medical center in an RC-4 zoning district and amended Van Ness Avenue SUD. - CU authorization under Planning Code Section 157 to allow for parking in addition to what is allowed under accessory parking. 513 parking spaces are proposed under the hospital and 542 parking spaces under the MOB. (1,055 independently accessible parking spaces for the medical center). - CU authorization to allow buildings over 40 feet in the Van Ness SUD and a residential district. - CU authorization to allow modification of the bulk limits for length and diagonal dimensions to approximately 385 and 405 feet, respectively, for the hospital and 265 and 295 feet, respectively, for the MOB. - Possible CU authorization to modify application of the 3:1 ratio of residential to non-residential development requirement within the Van Ness SUD. - CU authorization to allow for exception to ground-level wind current comfort level exceedance. ( <i>Planning Commission</i> )
	Subdivision Code	Division 1, Article 7, map	Merging of multiple lots pursuant to the Subdivision Code.	Lot mergers on hospital and MOB sites. ( <i>Department of Public Works</i> )
Cathedral Hill Hospital Only	Planning Code Text/ Map Change	Height/Bulk Map No. HT02; Planning Code Section 302	130-V Height/Bulk District apply.	Revision to Height/Bulk Map HT02 for height and bulk reclassification to 265-V for the hospital block bounded by Post Street, Van Ness Avenue, Geary Boulevard, and Franklin Street. ( <i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors</i> )
Cathedral Hill MOB Only	Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections 321 and 322: Office Allocation; Planning Code Section 317: Loss of dwelling units through merger, loss, and conversion	Specific authorization required for office buildings 25,000 sq. ft. or more.	Proposition M—office allocation findings. ( <i>Planning Commission</i> ); The CU authorization would allow demolition of five residential dwelling units. ( <i>Planning Commission</i> )

**Table S-1  
Required Project Approvals**

Project Element	Relevant Entitlement Code Sections		Current Code Restriction/ Requirement	Approval(s) Required (Approval Body in <i>Italics</i> )
Cathedral Hill MOB Only (continued)	Administrative Code	Residential Hotel Unit Conversion and Demolition Ordinance Chapter 41		Permit to convert and demolish the 20 residential hotel units at the proposed MOB site. ( <i>Department of Building Inspection</i> )
				Approval for the conversion of Cedar Street from a one-way to a two-way street west of the Cathedral Hill MOB garage entrance. ( <i>San Francisco Municipal Transportation Authority, Department of Public Works, and Board of Supervisors</i> )
Van Ness Avenue Pedestrian Tunnel				Encroachment permits (construction) and long-term lease or other agreement (long-term occupancy) for subsurface right-of-way for Van Ness Avenue pedestrian tunnel. ( <i>Department of Public Works, Caltrans District 4, and Board of Supervisors</i> )
1375 Sutter Street MOB	Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections: - Section 303: CU - Section 150: Off-street parking requirement - Section 159(c): required off-street parking not on same lot	Under Planning Code Section 150, off-street parking requirement is 279 parking spaces.	CU authorization required for excess parking at hospital to accommodate required parking at 1375 Sutter MOB. ( <i>Planning Commission</i> )
<b>Pacific Campus</b>				
Pacific Campus (all)	Planning Code Text Amendment/ Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections: - Section 209.3(a), Medical Institutions in Residential Use Districts - Section 303: CU	Hospital, medical center, or other medical institution is permitted as a CU in a residential district if inpatient care is primary use.	Text amendment to Planning Code Section 209.3(a) to continue previously approved medical center use without inpatient care. ( <i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors</i> )
<b>California Campus</b>				
California Campus (all)	Planning Code Text Amendment/ Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections: - Section 209.3(a): Medical Institutions in Residential Use Districts - Section 303: CU	Hospital, medical center, or other medical institution is permitted as a CU in a residential district if inpatient care is primary use.	Text amendment to Planning Code Section 209.3(a) to continue previously approved medical center use without inpatient care. ( <i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors</i> )

Case No. 2005-0555E

S-25

California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC)  
Long Range Development Plan EIR)

**Table S-1  
Required Project Approvals**

Project Element	Relevant Entitlement Code Sections	Current Code Restriction/ Requirement	Approval(s) Required (Approval Body in <i>Italics</i> )
<b>Davies Campus<sup>11</sup></b>			
Neuroscience Institute	Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections: - Section 303: CU - Section 304: PUD	PUD required for addition of new medical building to previously approved PUD.  CU authorization to modify existing PUD and to allow for rear-yard exception and exception from independently accessible off-street parking requirements to allow for valet parking. ( <i>Planning Commission</i> )
<b>St. Luke's Campus</b>			
St. Luke's Replacement Hospital and MOB/ Expansion Building	General Plan Amendment	General Plan Urban Design Element, Map 4 (Height)	88 feet maximum height.  General Plan amendment to allow height to exceed 88 feet to 105 feet for the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital site (the area bounded by Cesar Chavez Street, the portion of San Jose Avenue proposed to be vacated between 27th Street and Cesar Chavez Street, 27th Street, and residential properties to the west) and 105 feet for the area bounded by Cesar Chavez Street, Valencia Street, and the portion of San Jose Avenue proposed to be vacated between 27th Street and Cesar Chavez Street. The proposed St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would be approximately 99 feet in height and the proposed MOB/Expansion Building would be approximately 100 feet in height. ( <i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors</i> )
	Street Vacation Transfer Agreement and General Plan Referral	California Streets and Highways Code Sections 8300-8363. Finding of General Plan consistency, as modified.	Vacation and acquisition of a portion of San Jose Avenue between 27th Street and Cesar Chavez Street. ( <i>Department of Public Works, Planning Commission, Department of Public Works, Board of Supervisors</i> )
	Planning Code Map Change	Height and Bulk Map HT07	65-A and 105-E Height/Bulk District.  Height and bulk reclassification to 105-E for the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital site (the area bounded by Cesar Chavez Street, the portion of San Jose Avenue proposed to be vacated between 27th Street and Cesar Chavez Street, 27th Street, and residential properties to the west). ( <i>Planning Commission and Board of Supervisors</i> )

<sup>11</sup> Future renovations and new construction part of the long-term LRDP program will require additional approvals at a later time and are not included in the description of near-term project approvals.

**Table S-1  
Required Project Approvals**

Project Element	Relevant Entitlement Code Sections		Current Code Restriction/ Requirement	Approval(s) Required (Approval Body in <i>Italics</i> )
St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/ Expansion Building (continued)	Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections: - Section 303: CU - Section 304: PUD - Sections 209.3(a), 123, 134, 136, 253, 270	- 1.8:1 FAR - 25% rear-yard requirement - 65-A and 105-E Height/Bulk Districts	CU authorization to modify existing PUD to allow for medical uses in RH-2 District, exceptions to FAR, rear-yard requirements, restriction on projections extending over a street or alley, and height and bulk restrictions for buildings over 40 feet in RH-2 District. The CU authorization would allow an exception to off-site parking requirements, as the proposed St. Luke’s Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building would provide a total of 450 spaces, where 559 spaces are required by the Planning Code. An exemption from on-site independently accessible off-street parking would be sought to allow valet and off-site parking to serve the St. Luke’s Campus. ( <i>Planning Commission</i> )
	Subdivision Code	Division 1, Article 7, Section 1356—Final Map	Merging of multiple lots pursuant to the Subdivision Code.	Lot merger for existing surface parking lot, part of San Jose Avenue, and existing campus. ( <i>Department of Public Works</i> ) <sup>12</sup>
St. Luke’s MOB/ Expansion Building Only	Planning Code Authorizations	Planning Code Sections 321 and 322: Office Allocation	Specific authorization required for office buildings 25,000 sq. ft. or more.	Proposition M—office allocation findings. ( <i>Planning Commission</i> )
<p>Notes: Caltrans = California Department of Transportation; CU = conditional use; FAR = floor area ratio; General Plan = <i>San Francisco General Plan</i>; MOB = Medical Office Building; PUD = planned unit development; sq. ft. = square feet; SUD = Special Use District; VNAP = <i>Van Ness Avenue Area Plan</i> Source: Data compiled by AECOM in 2009</p>				

Case No. 2005.0555E

S-27

California Pacific Medical Center (CPMC)  
Long Range Development Plan (LRDP)

<sup>12</sup> Lot merger requires only priority policies application.

Environmental impacts as they relate to noise and air quality such as from demolition, construction, and operations are evaluated in the respective “Impact Evaluations” sections within Section 4.6, “Noise,” and Section 4.7, “Air Quality.” Environmental impacts related to land use compatibility and impacts on the existing character of the vicinity of the project sites are evaluated in Section 4.1, “Land Use and Planning.” Issues that were raised during the public scoping process rather than physical environmental issues, such as economic impacts, merits of the project, cost of construction and distribution and provision of health care services are not environmental issues and will be considered by decision-makers during the project approval process. Accordingly, these issues are not addressed in the EIR.

## S.6 ALTERNATIVES

Three alternatives to the proposed LRDP have been evaluated, including the No Project Alternative, as required by CEQA. The alternatives considered include the following:

- ▶ **Alternative 1: No Project**—Consistent with Section 15126.6(e)(1) of the State CEQA Guidelines, this alternative assumes the continuation of existing conditions, taking into account what would reasonably be expected to occur on the existing CPMC medical campuses if the CPMC LRDP were not to proceed. This alternative assumes that buildings on the existing campuses could not be used for acute-care facilities after the SB 1953 deadline of January 1, 2013, except for the Davies Hospital North Tower which would provide acute care until 2030.<sup>13</sup> Similar to facilities at the other campuses, acute inpatient care at the existing St. Luke’s Hospital must also cease before January 1, 2013, pursuant to SB 1953.

Under the No Project Alternative, two scenarios are reasonably foreseeable at the St. Luke’s Campus: Alternative 1A and Alternative 1B:

- ▶ *Alternative 1A* would involve decommissioning acute-care inpatient services; no existing buildings would be demolished or new buildings constructed at the St. Luke’s Campus.
  - ▶ *Alternative 1B* would involve demolishing the existing St. Luke’s Hospital and constructing a new outpatient facility in its place.
- ▶ **Alternative 2: Four-Campus Rebuilding/Retrofit/Redevelopment Alternative**—Under this alternative, CPMC would rebuild, renovate, retrofit, or develop new buildings on its four existing medical campuses (Pacific, California, Davies, and St. Luke’s) to meet the seismic safety requirements of SB 1953 and SB 1661. The proposed Cathedral Hill Campus would not be built under this alternative. Program uses would be shifted/relocated within the existing four campuses. Uses at the site of the proposed Cathedral Hill Campus

---

<sup>13</sup> The Davies Hospital North Tower has already been retrofitted to comply with SB 1953 and would continue to provide acute-care services until 2030.

would continue unchanged; the existing Cathedral Hill Hotel, 1255 Post Street Office Building, and Pacific Plaza Office Building would undergo interior abatement work and renovation. A larger amount of development would occur at the Pacific Campus than under the proposed LRDP, to accommodate a new ACC (north and south towers) and a new Clay Street/Webster Street MOB and parking garage. The California Campus would be redeveloped with a new acute-care hospital, a new Women's and Children's Hospital, and a new Cherry Street MOB. No new construction would occur at the Davies Campus, and acute-care uses would continue to be provided to the Davies Hospital North Tower until 2030. Under Alternative 2, the St. Luke's Campus would be identical to the campus under the proposed LRDP, with construction of a new replacement hospital and MOB/Expansion Building.

- ▶ **Alternative 3: Reduced Development at the Cathedral Hill Campus Alternative**—This alternative would reduce the size of the Cathedral Hill Hospital, compared to the proposed LRDP, allowing the hospital to comply with the basic height requirements under the existing applicable height district (130-V Height and Bulk District). As a result of the reduced development under this alternative, beds from the Women and Children's service lines and relocated services would be shifted from the Cathedral Hill Hospital to either the St. Luke's Campus or the California Campus:
  - ▶ *Alternative 3A* would shift 160 beds from the Women's and Children's service lines that are currently at the Pacific and California Campuses to a new Women's and Children's facility at the St. Luke's Campus. The 160-bed St. Luke's Women's and Children's facility would be constructed as a second-phase addition to the replacement hospital. The St. Luke's Replacement Hospital would be similar to that under the proposed LRDP but would be slightly larger under Alternative 3A to accommodate additional diagnostic and treatment services to support the Women's and Children's facility. Alternative 3A would also include construction of a new MOB and parking structure on the southeast portion of St. Luke's Campus. The Pacific, California, and Davies Campuses would have the same development as under the proposed LRDP.
  - ▶ *Alternative 3B* would shift 160 beds from the Women's and Children's service lines that are currently at the Pacific and California Campuses to a new Women's and Children's hospital located in the eastern portion of the California Campus, which would remain in operation. The 3700 California Street Hospital would be demolished and the parcels on which it is located would be sold. The Pacific and Davies Campuses development would remain the same as under the proposed LRDP. The St. Luke's Campus development would remain the same as under the proposed LRDP, except that the MOB/Expansion Building would be reduced by two stories and would no longer include approximately 31,800 sq. ft. of patient-care clinic uses.

The alternatives identified above consider a range of different types, sizes, uses, and/or locations for development at the CPMC campuses that could result in physical effects on the environment. The analysis of potential impacts assumes that all feasible mitigation measures would be implemented under each alternative.

The following other alternatives were also considered or analyzed, but were eliminated from further analysis in this EIR:

- ▶ Inpatient services outside of San Francisco
- ▶ U.S. Public Health Service Hospital (Presidio)
- ▶ Muni Bus Yard at Euclid and Presidio Avenues
- ▶ Mervyn's Shopping Center (Geary Boulevard and Masonic Street)
- ▶ Aggregation of Sites on the East Side of Masonic Avenue, between O'Farrell Street and Turk Boulevard
- ▶ Aggregation of Sites on the South Side of Geary Boulevard, between Scott and Pierce Streets
- ▶ Presidio Three-Site Study
- ▶ Initial Three-Campus Project with New Acute-Care Hospital at the Davies Campus
- ▶ Three-Campus Project with Integrated Acute-Care Facility at the California Campus from Prior Application
- ▶ Larger Four-Campus Plan
- ▶ Four-Campus Renovation/Retrofit of Existing Acute-Care Facilities
- ▶ Code-Complying Alternative

## **COMPARISON OF IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVES**

### **No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B**

In general, the impacts of No Project Alternative 1A and 1B on the Cathedral Hill Campus area would be similar, because the No Project Alternative would not involve any redevelopment of the proposed Cathedral Hill Campus (other than anticipated future interior renovations of existing on-campus buildings). Therefore, in contrast with the proposed LRDP, there would be no new impacts at the proposed Cathedral Hill Campus properties or in the immediate vicinity related to the No Project Alternative, including with respect to construction, traffic, transit, noise, groundborne vibration, and air quality.

Similarly, under the No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B, there would be no direct development or redevelopment of the California Campus, Davies Campus or Pacific Campus. Therefore, no significant impacts would occur at these campuses or in their immediate vicinity. The No Project Alternatives would, however, result in changes in



the long term medical uses at these campuses. This is because existing hospitals on CPMC campuses would be required to close by 2013 under SB 1953, with the exception of Davies Campus where acute care would continue to be provided at the Davies Hospital North Tower until 2030.

Under the No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B, the existing 2333 Buchanan Street Hospital at the Pacific Campus would be converted from acute care to an ambulatory care center (ACC) use. However, unlike under the LRDP, no new ACC Addition or North of Clay Parking Garage would be constructed. Therefore, the overall level of activity at Pacific Campus would be somewhat less than under the proposed LRDP. Impacts related to the No Project Alternative at Pacific Campus and its immediate vicinity would be less than the impacts at this campus under the proposed LRDP.

The activity at California Campus would be expected to cease and the property sold under the No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B, similar to under the LRDP. Similar to the proposed LRDP, there would be no impacts at California Campus or its immediate vicinity, related to the No Project Alternative.

At the Davies Campus under the No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B, there would be no new development, unlike under the LRDP. The conversion of acute care uses in the South Tower to non-acute care uses and closure of the emergency department would result in less acute-care beds and less overall activity at Davies Campus. In contrast to the proposed LRDP, which would result in new impacts at this campus, there would be no new impacts at Davies Campus or its immediate vicinity under the No Project Alternative.

Under Alternative 1A, the existing St. Luke's 1970 Hospital Tower would be closed, pursuant to SB 1953, and neither the 1970 Hospital Tower nor the 1957 Building would be reused. Overall, medical activity at St. Luke's Campus would diminish under Alternative 1A. Accordingly, there would be an overall reduction of impacts at St. Luke's Campus and its immediate vicinity under Alternative 1A, compared to the LRDP.

Under Alternative 1B, the existing St. Luke's 1970 Hospital Tower would be demolished and a new non-acute care outpatient facility would be constructed in its place. Emergency department services would no longer be provided at this campus. The amount of medical activity at St. Luke's Campus under Alternative 1B would be greater than under No Project Alternative 1A, but somewhat less than under existing conditions and less than under the proposed LRDP. Overall impacts of Alternative 1B at St. Luke's Campus, including construction impacts, would be greater than under Alternative 1A, but less than under the LRDP.

Alternative 1 (No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B) would have reduced overall citywide full buildout impacts, as compared to the proposed LRDP. This is particularly with respect to population, employment and housing, transportation and circulation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, public services, and utilities and service systems. The No Project Alternative 1B would have slightly increased citywide full buildout impacts,

compared to No Project Alternative 1A, although substantially reduced citywide full buildout impacts compared to the proposed LRDP. This is due to the proposed construction of a new outpatient facility at St. Luke's Campus under No Project Alternative 1B, unlike under No Project Alternative 1A where no new development is proposed.

### **Alternative 2: The Four Campus Re-Building/Retrofit/Redevelopment Alternative**

Alternative 2 would include rebuilding or retrofitting buildings on the four existing campuses (Pacific, California, Davies and St. Luke's Campuses). The Cathedral Hill Campus would remain in its existing condition (except for interior renovations of existing on-campus buildings). Impacts of Alternative 2 at Cathedral Hill Campus and its vicinity would be similar to the No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B impacts at the same campus. Overall, there would be no new impacts at the proposed Cathedral Hill Campus properties or in the immediate vicinity, compared to the LRDP, including with respect to construction, traffic, transit, noise, groundborne vibration, and air quality.

As under the LRDP, the Pacific Campus would be converted to outpatient/ambulatory care uses under Alternative 2, but there would be more development at this campus than under the LRDP. The level of medical activity at Pacific Campus would therefore be somewhat increased compared to the LRDP, and would also increase over existing conditions after a multi-phase redevelopment and construction period. Overall, there would be increased impacts at Pacific Campus under Alternative 2, compared to the LRDP. Generally, these impacts have either not been determined to be significant or would also be significant and unavoidable under the proposed LRDP. However, a new significant and unavoidable cultural resources impact would occur at the Pacific campus under Alternative 2 due to the demolition of an historic resource, the Stern Building, which would not occur under the proposed LRDP.

In contrast to the LRDP, where medical activity at this campus would largely cease, the California Campus would continue to operate as a medical campus under Alternative 2. It would include a new acute care hospital, a new Women's and Children's Hospital and a new MOB/parking garage under Alternative 2. There would be substantially more demolition and construction activity at California Campus than under the LRDP, and substantially more medical activity, relative to existing conditions and the LRDP. The impacts at this campus and its vicinity would therefore be considerably increased under Alternative 2, compared to the LRDP. Alternative 2 would result in a significant and unavoidable cultural resources impact due to the demolition of a historic resource, the 3698 California Street building, project-specific and/or cumulative significant and unavoidable impacts at five intersections, and significant and unavoidable construction-related traffic, groundborne, and air quality impacts at the California Campus, which would not occur under the proposed LRDP.

Development at Davies Campus under Alternative 2 would be the same as under either of the No Project Alternatives 1A and 1B. Therefore, in contrast to the proposed LRDP and similar to the No Project Alternative, there would be no new impacts at Davies Campus or its immediate vicinity related to Alternative 2.

Development and uses at St. Luke's Campus under Alternative 2 would be the same as under the proposed LRDP. Therefore, impacts at St. Luke's Campus under Alternative 2 would be identical to the proposed LRDP.

Alternative 2 would have similar overall citywide full buildout impacts, as compared to the proposed LRDP. This is particularly with respect to population, employment and housing, transportation and circulation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, public services, and utilities and service systems, with the exception that Alternative 2 would result in a significant and unavoidable combined traffic impact at the intersection of Octavia/Market/U.S. 101, which would be less than significant under the proposed LRDP.

### **Alternative 3: Reduced Development at Cathedral Hill Alternative**

Alternatives 3A would result in somewhat reduced of total buildout for CPMC systemwide than under the proposed LRDP. However, Alternative 3B would result in more overall development than under either Alternative 3A or the proposed LRDP, because of the increased development and continued operation of existing buildings required at California Campus to support the new Women's and Children's Center at this campus under this sub-alternative.

The reduced development at Cathedral Hill Campus, relative to the LRDP, resulting from relocation of the Women's and Children's Center (proposed at Cathedral Hill under the LRDP) to either St. Luke's Campus (Alternative 3A) or California Campus (Alternative 3B), would result in less intensive development and uses at Cathedral Hill Campus. Overall, there would be fewer impacts at Cathedral Hill Campus and its immediate vicinity, including with respect to construction, traffic and transit, compared to the LRDP.

Under Alternative 3A, California Campus development would be the same as under the LRDP, which proposes no development at this campus. Overall, there would be no impacts at California Campus or its vicinity under Alternative 3A, identical to the LRDP.

The development of a Women's and Children's Center and accompanying medical offices and other facilities and services at California Campus to support the Women's and Children's Center under Alternative 3B would result in continuation of medical services at California Campus that are not anticipated under the LRDP. Service levels at California Campus would overall be greater than under the LRDP, but similar to the level that exists under current conditions. Impacts at California Campus and its vicinity would be greater than under the LRDP. Therefore, overall impacts at California Campus and its vicinity, after the period of construction and redevelopment, are not expected to be significant, with the exception of a significant and unavoidable cultural resources impact due to the

demolition of a historic resource, the 3698 California Street building, and significant and unavoidable construction-related groundborne vibration and air quality impacts which would not occur under the proposed LRDP.

Under Alternative 3A, the development program at St. Luke's Campus would be similar to that proposed under the LRDP, except with the addition of the Women's and Children's Center. The new Women's and Children's Center is proposed to be located next to the new St. Luke's Replacement Hospital and at the site of the existing (to be demolished) St. Luke's 1970 Hospital, under Alternative 3A. Compared to the LRDP, where the MOB/Expansion building is proposed at the site of the existing St. Luke's 1970 Hospital Tower, the proposed MOB and parking garage under Alternative 3A would be located in the southeast portion of the campus. Under this Alternative, there would be more construction and an increased level of medical activity at St. Luke's Campus. Therefore, somewhat more impacts at St. Luke's Campus and its immediate vicinity would occur under Alternative 3A, compared to the LRDP.

Under Alternative 3B, development at St. Luke's Campus would be the same as under the LRDP, except that the proposed MOB/Expansion building would be reduced in size. Therefore, this alternative would somewhat reduce the level of activity at St. Luke's Campus and impacts at St. Luke's Campus and its immediate vicinity, compared to the LRDP.

Development at the Pacific Campus and the Davies Campus under Alternative 3A and 3B would be the same as under the proposed LRDP; therefore impacts at these campuses under Alternative 3A and 3B would be the same as under the proposed LRDP.

Alternative 3 would have similar overall citywide full buildout impacts, as compared to the proposed LRDP. This is particularly with respect to population, employment and housing, transportation and circulation, air quality, and greenhouse gas emissions, recreation, public services, and utilities and service systems.

### **Environmentally Superior Alternative**

Pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, Alternative 3A would be the environmentally superior alternative other than the No Project Alternative (Alternative 1A or 1B). Alternative 3A would reduce some of the significant and unavoidable impacts on transportation and circulation identified for the Cathedral Hill Campus under the proposed LRDP, but would still result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to transportation, groundborne vibration, and air quality. Alternative 3A would meet some core project objectives, but not all of the project objectives and its development program at the CPMC campuses would be similar to that of the LRDP. However, Alternative 3A would reduce significant and unavoidable transportation and circulation impacts compared to the proposed LRDP, and would not result in additional impacts at the California Campus. The St.

Luke's Campus would have a larger development program under Alternative 3A than under the proposed LRDP, and would result in greater impacts related to land use and aesthetics (although not to a significant and unavoidable level) because of the additional MOB building and added height of the St. Luke's Replacement Hospital building, and the loss of the pedestrian through connection at the campus. However, the overall development program at the CPMC campuses under this alternative would be less than under the proposed LRDP and would result in fewer significant and unavoidable impacts.

## **S.7 SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

This EIR provides information on the potential impacts of the project related to land use and planning; aesthetics; population, employment, and housing; cultural and paleontological resources; transportation and circulation; noise; air quality; greenhouse gas emissions; wind and shadow; recreation; public services; utilities and service systems; biological resources; geology and soils; hydrology and water quality; hazards and hazardous materials; mineral and energy resources; and agricultural and forest resources. All impacts of the project and associated mitigation measures identified in this draft EIR are summarized in Table S-2, "Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures," beginning on page S-37.

This page is intentionally left blank

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>4.1: Land Use and Planning</b>																	
<b>Impact LU-1:</b> The project would not physically divide an established community.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact LU-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact LU-2:</b> The project would not conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact LU-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact LU-3:</b> The project would not have a substantial impact on the existing character of the vicinity.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact LU-3.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.2: Aesthetics</b>																	
<b>Impact AE-1:</b> The project would not have a substantial effect on a scenic highway or scenic vista					LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AE-1.					LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
▶ <b>Cathedral Hill Campus:</b> Cathedral Hill Hospital and MOB	LTS	LTS								LTS	LTS						
▶ <b>Cathedral Hill Campus:</b> 1375 Sutter Street MOB	NI	NI								NI	NI						
▶ <b>Pacific Campus:</b> ACC and 2018 Webster Street			NI									NI					
▶ <b>Pacific Campus:</b> ACC Addition and North-of-Clay Aboveground Parking Garage			LTS									LTS					
<b>Impact AE-2:</b> The project would not substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings, and other features of the built or natural environment that contribute to a scenic public setting.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AE-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact AE-3:</b> The project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and surroundings at the existing and proposed CPMC campus sites.			LTS		LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AE-3.			LTS		LTS	LTS		
▶ <b>Cathedral Hill Campus:</b> Cathedral Hill Hospital and MOB	LTS	LTS								LTS	LTS						
▶ <b>Cathedral Hill Campus:</b> 1375 Sutter Street MOB	NI	NI								NI	NI						
▶ <b>St. Luke's Campus:</b> St. Luke's Replacement Hospital and MOB/Expansion Building						LTS	LTS									LTS	LTS
▶ <b>St. Luke's Campus:</b> 1957 Building and 1912 Building						NI	NI									NI	NI
<b>Impact AE-4:</b> The project would not create a new source of light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area or that would substantially affect other people or properties.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AE-4.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.3: Population, Employment, and Housing</b>																	
<b>Impact PH-1:</b> The project would not induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure) (year-2030 operations).	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact PH-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

<sup>14</sup> Campuses: CH = Cathedral Hill; Pac = Pacific; Cal = California; Dav = Davies; StL = St. Luke's. Levels of Significance: LTS = Less than Significant; LTSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation; PS = Potentially Significant; PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable; PSU/M = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable after Mitigation; SU = Significant and Unavoidable Impact; NI = No Impact; SI = Significant Impact; SU/M = Significant and Unavoidable Impact after Mitigation. Please note that the grey area indicates that section is not applicable.

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																		
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)								
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► <b>Pacific Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>California Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></li> </ul>			NI								NI							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► <b>Pacific Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>California Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></li> </ul>				NI							NI							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► <b>Pacific Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>California Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></li> </ul>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS			LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<p><b>Impact PH-2:</b> The project would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing units or create demand for additional housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing (year-2030 operations).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► <b>Pacific Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>California Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></li> </ul>	LTS	LTS	LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact PH-2.			LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► <b>Pacific Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>California Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></li> </ul>			NI								NI							
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► <b>Pacific Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>California Campus:</b> near term</li> <li>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></li> </ul>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS			LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<p><b>Impact PH-3:</b> The project would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.</p>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact PH-3.			LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<b>4.4: Cultural and Paleontological Resources</b>																		
<p><b>Impact CP-1:</b> Project construction would not result in the removal of existing structures that are eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, and thus would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.</p>	NI	NI	LTS		NI	NI	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact CP-1.			LTS		NI	NI	LTS	LTS	
<p><b>Impact CP-2:</b> Construction under the proposed LRDP could potentially adversely affect the significance of subsurface archaeological resources pursuant to Section 15064.5 of the State CEQA Guidelines.</p>	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-CP-N2 (Cathedral Hill with or without Variants):</b> Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within the project site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effects from the proposed project on buried or submerged historical resources. CPMC shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall undertake an archaeological testing program as specified herein. In addition, the consultant shall be available to conduct an archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery program if required pursuant to this measure. The archaeological consultant's work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and with the requirements of the project archaeological research design and treatment plan completed for this CPMC campus site <sup>15</sup> at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirement of the project archaeological research design and treatment plan and of this archaeological mitigation measure, the requirements of this archaeological mitigation measure shall prevail. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the proposed LRDP for up to a maximum of 4 weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond 4 weeks only if such a suspension is the			LTS M	LTS M		LTS M	LTS M	LTS M	LTS M

<sup>15</sup> This refers to individual archaeological research design/treatment plans prepared by Archeo-Tec and AECOM for the CPMC LRDP in January 2010 and June 2010. Separate plans were prepared for the Cathedral Hill Campus, Pacific Campus, Davies Campus, and St. Luke's Campus. Each of these plans is on file with the Planning Department, 1650 Mission Street, Suite 400, San Francisco, CA 94103 in Case No. 2005.0555E.



Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									<p>only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant archaeological resource, as defined in the State CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5(a)(c).</p> <p><i>Archaeological Testing Program.</i> The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that could be adversely affected by the proposed LRDP, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine, to the extent possible, the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes a historical resource under CEQA.</p> <p>At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If, based on the archaeological testing program, the consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the consultant shall determine whether additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed LRDP, at the discretion of CPMC either (a) the proposed LRDP shall be redesigned so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or (b) a data recovery program shall be implemented unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.</p> <p><i>Archaeological Monitoring Program.</i> If the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant determines that an archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented, the archaeological monitoring program shall, at a minimum, include the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The archaeological consultant, CPMC, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to commencement of any project-related soil-disturbing activities. The ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soil-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context.</li> <li>▶ The archaeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the</li> </ul>								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									<p>expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits.</li> <li>▶ The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/ecofactual material as warranted for analysis.</li> <li>▶ If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soil-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile-driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If, in the case of pile-driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile driving may affect an archaeological resource, the pile-driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the encountered archaeological deposit, and to present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.</li> </ul> <p>Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.</p> <p><i>Archaeological Data Recovery Program.</i> The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accordance with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, CPMC, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information that the archaeological resource is expected to contain (i.e., the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions). Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed LRDP. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if nondestructive methods are practical.</p> <p>The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements: [</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>Field Methods and Procedures.</i> Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.</li> <li>▶ <i>Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis.</i> Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis <i>procedures.</i></li> </ul>								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>Discard and Deaccession Policy.</i> Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and deaccession policies.</li> <li>▶ <i>Interpretive Program.</i> Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program.</li> <li>▶ <i>Security Measures.</i> Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and unintentionally damaging activities.</li> <li>▶ <i>Final Report.</i> Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.</li> <li>▶ <i>Curation.</i> Description of the procedures and recommendations for the curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.</li> </ul> <p><i>Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects.</i> The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soil-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable federal and state laws. This shall include immediate notification of the county coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and, in the event of the coroner's determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the NAHC, which shall appoint an MLD (PRC Section 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, CPMC, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (State CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5[d]). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.</p> <p><i>Final Archaeological Resources Report.</i> The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft final archaeological resources report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put any archaeological resource at risk shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.</p> <p>Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one copy, and the ERO shall receive one copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis Division (MEA) of the Planning Department shall receive two copies (bound and unbound) of the FARR and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a compact disk. MEA shall receive a copy of any formal site recordation forms (California Department of Parks and Recreation Form 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to NRHP/CRHR. In instances of high public interest in or high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different</p>								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above. <b>M-CP-N2 (Davies near-term and St. Luke's with or without project variants):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-CP-N2 for the Cathedral Hill Campus. <b>M-CP-L2 (Pacific and Davies long-term):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-CP-N2, above.								
<b>Impact CP-3:</b> Construction-related earthmoving activities would take place in several paleontologically sensitive rock formations; therefore, earthmoving activities could damage or destroy previously unknown, unique paleontological resources at the project site.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-CP-N3 (Cathedral Hill and St. Luke's with or without variants):</b> For each of the CPMC campuses where earthmoving activities would occur in the Colma Formation, slope debris and ravine fill sediments, and older native sediments (as identified in the applicable geotechnical reports for each campus), CPMC shall implement the following measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Before the start of any earthmoving activities, CPMC shall retain a qualified paleontologist or archaeologist to train all construction personnel involved with earthmoving activities, including the site superintendent, regarding the possibility of encountering fossils, the appearance and types of fossils likely to be seen during construction, and proper notification procedures should fossils be encountered.</li><li>If paleontological resources are discovered during earthmoving activities, the construction crew shall immediately cease work near the find and notify CPMC and the San Francisco Planning Department. CPMC shall retain a qualified paleontologist to evaluate the resource and prepare a recovery plan in accordance with SVP guidelines.<sup>16</sup> The recovery plan may include a field survey, construction monitoring, sampling and data recovery procedures, museum storage coordination for any specimen recovered, and a report of findings. Recommendations in the recovery plan that are determined by the City to be necessary and feasible shall be implemented before construction activities can resume at the site where the paleontological resources were discovered.</li></ul> <b>M-CP-L3 (Pacific and Davies long-term):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-CP-N3, above	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
<b>Impact CP-4:</b> Project-related construction activities could disturb as-yet-undiscovered human remains.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-CP-N4 (Cathedral Hill, Davies (near-term) and St. Luke's):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-CP-N2, above. <b>M-CP-L4 (Pacific and Davies [long-term]):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-CP-N2, above.	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
<b>4.5: Transportation and Circulation</b>																	
<b>Impact TR-1:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.	SU								No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-1.	SU							

<sup>16</sup> Society of Vertebrate Paleontology. 1996. Conditions of Receivership for Paleontologic Salvage Collections (final draft). *Society of Vertebrate Paleontology News Bulletin* 166:31-32.

**Table S-2**

**Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures**

Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact TR-2:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Polk/Geary.	SU								No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-2.	SU							
<b>Impact TR-3:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would have a less-than-significant impact at six study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2015 Modified Baseline No Project conditions and 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-3.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-4:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would have less-than-significant impacts at 18 study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-4.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-5:</b> Operation of the Cathedral Hill Campus parking garages would have a less-than-significant impact on traffic operations because inbound peak period queues would not spill back into adjacent travel lanes.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-5.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-6:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-6.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-7:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Polk/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-7.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-8:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Franklin/Bush.		SU (Two-Way Post only)							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-8.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-9:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would have a less than-significant impact at five study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2015 Modified Baseline No Project conditions and 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-9.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-10:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would have less-than-significant impacts at 18 study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-10.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-11:</b> With implementation of the Two-Way Post Street Variant, the operation of the hospital parking garage at the Cathedral Hill campus would have less-than-significant impacts on traffic operations since inbound peak period queues would not spill back into adjacent travel lanes.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-11.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-12:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-12.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-13:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in a significant impact at the intersection of Polk/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-13.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-14:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would have a less than-		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-14		LTS						

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
significant impact at six study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2015 Modified Baseline No Project conditions and Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.																	
<b>Impact TR-15:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would have less-than-significant impacts at 18 study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-15.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-16:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus parking garages with the MOB Access Variant would have a less-than-significant impact on traffic operations because inbound peak period queues would not spill back into adjacent travel lanes.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-16.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-17:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in a traffic hazard impact at the proposed MOB's driveway on Geary Street.		SU (MOB Access Variant)							<b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-17</b> During peak periods of MOB garage activity (generally mid-morning to mid-afternoon), CPMC shall staff the garage exit with a traffic control attendant or provide equivalent measures to facilitate vehicular egress from the Geary Street driveway. CPMC shall incorporate signage into the garage that directs exiting drivers to use Cedar Street during peak periods of congestion on Geary Street, and shall incorporate traffic control mechanisms within the garage with the capacity to close the Geary Street exit and intermittently to use Cedar Street (as determined by a traffic control attendant or equivalent measure). CPMC shall install and operate pedestrian warning devices, a stop sign, and a notice for drivers to yield the right-of-way to pedestrians at the Geary Street driveway. The pedestrian warning device shall have a flashing yellow light and an intermittent audible signal that will be activated when vehicles exit the garage and drive over the sidewalk.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-18:</b> If the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at five of the BRT study intersections would be less than significant.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-18.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-19:</b> If the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects would be significant at the intersection of Polk/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-19.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-20:</b> If the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects would be significant at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-20.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-21:</b> For the Two-Way Post Street Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at five of the BRT study intersections would be less than significant.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-21.		LTS						

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact TR-22:</b> For the Two-Way Post Street Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects would be significant at the intersection of Polk/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-22.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-23:</b> For the Two-Way Post Street Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects would be significant at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-23.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-24:</b> For the MOB Access Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at five of the BRT study intersections would be less than significant.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-24.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-25:</b> For the MOB Access Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects would be significant at the intersection of Polk/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-25.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-26:</b> For the MOB Access Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue BRT and Geary Corridor BRT projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined impact of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects would be significant at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-26.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-27:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity.	LTS	LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-27.	LTS	LTS						
<b>Impact TR-28:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project's shuttle operation would be accommodated within the proposed shuttle loading zone and would not impact adjacent transit service.	LTS	LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-28.	LTS	LTS						
<b>Impact TR-29:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion and ridership along Van Ness Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 49-Van Ness-Mission bus route.		SU							<b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-29</b> CPMC shall ensure that the transit delay impact related to the Cathedral Hill Campus project on the 49-Van Ness-Mission is reduced to a less-than-significant level by financially compensating the SFMTA for the cost of providing the service needed to accommodate the project at proposed levels of service. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied in a manner that is consistent with the SFMTA cost/scheduling model. The amount and schedule for payment and commitment to application of service needs shall be set forth in a Transit Mitigation Agreement between CPMC and SFMTA.		SU/M						

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																		
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)								
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants	
<b>Impact TR-30:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion and ridership along Geary Street, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 38/38L-Geary bus routes.	SU								<b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-30</b> CPMC shall ensure that the transit delay impact related to the Cathedral Hill Campus project on the 38/38L-Geary bus routes is reduced to a less-than-significant level by financially compensating the SFMTA for the cost of providing the service needed to accommodate the project at proposed levels of service. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied in a manner that is consistent with the SFMTA cost/scheduling model. The amount and schedule for payment and commitment to application of service needs shall be set forth in a Transit Mitigation Agreement between CPMC and SFMTA.	SU/M								
<b>Impact TR-31:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion and ridership along Polk Street, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 19-Polk bus route.	SU								<b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-31</b> CPMC shall ensure that the transit delay impact related to the Cathedral Hill Campus project on the 19-Polk is reduced to a less-than-significant level by financially compensating the SFMTA for the cost of providing the service needed to accommodate the project at proposed levels of service. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied in a manner that is consistent with the SFMTA cost/scheduling model. The amount and schedule for payment and commitment to application of service needs shall be set forth in a Transit Mitigation Agreement between CPMC and SFMTA.	SU/M								
<b>Impact TR-32:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion and ridership along Van Ness Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 49-Van Ness-Mission bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-29</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-33:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion and ridership along Geary Street, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 38/38L-Geary bus routes.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-30</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-34:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion and ridership along Polk Street, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 19-Polk bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-31</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-35:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would increase congestion and ridership along Van Ness Avenue, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 49-Van Ness-Mission bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-32</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-36:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would increase congestion and ridership along Geary Street, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 38/38L-Geary bus routes.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-33</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-37:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-37.		LTS							



Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact TR-38:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-38.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-39:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-39.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-40:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-40.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-41:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-41.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-42:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in a pedestrian hazard impact at the proposed MOB's driveway on Geary Street.	SU								Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-17</b> , as described above.	SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-43:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply, or within on-street loading zones.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-43.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-44:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project and subsequent operation of the Cathedral Hill Hospital off-street loading facility could result in potentially hazardous conditions on Franklin Street.	SI								<b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-44 Loading Dock Restrictions and Attendant</b> To minimize the potential disruptions to intersections operations and safety, CPMC shall schedule delivery trucks longer than 46 feet in length to only arrive and depart between 10 p.m. and 5 a.m., when traffic volumes on Franklin Street are lower and when there would be a less likely chance that queues would form behind the truck and extend into adjacent intersections. Because some disruption may still occur between 10 p.m. and midnight, CPMC shall monitor and document truck deliveries occurring between 10 p.m. and midnight for a period of 6 months following full building occupancy/program implementation, recording truck size, number of lanes blocked by delivery trucks and for how long, and whether operations at the intersection of Franklin/Geary are temporarily affected and for how long. CPMC shall submit the truck loading report to the Planning Department and SFMTA. Based on the truck loading report and review, the deliveries by trucks longer than 46 feet in length may be modified. An attendant at the loading dock shall also be present to stop on-coming traffic while delivery trucks maneuver into the service loading area.	LTS M							

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact TR-45:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply, or within on-street loading zones.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-45.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-46:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project and Two-Way Post Street Variant and subsequent operation of the Cathedral Hill Hospital off-street loading facility could result in potentially hazardous conditions on Franklin Street.	SI								Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-44</b> , as described above.	LTSM							
<b>Impact TR-47:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply, or within on-street loading zones.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-47.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-48:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant and subsequent operation of the Cathedral Hill Hospital off-street loading facility could result in potentially hazardous conditions on Franklin Street.	SI								Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-44</b> , as described above.	LTSM							
<b>Impact TR-49:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project relevant to the passenger loading/unloading demand would be accommodated within the proposed passenger loading/unloading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-49.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-50:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant relevant to passenger loading/unloading demands would be accommodated within the proposed passenger loading/unloading zones and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-50.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-51:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant relevant to passenger loading/unloading demands would be accommodated within the proposed passenger loading/unloading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-51.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-52:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would not result in a significant emergency vehicle access impact.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-52.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-53:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would not result in a significant emergency vehicle access impact.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-53.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-54:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would not result in a significant emergency vehicle access impact.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-54.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-55:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would result in a transportation impact in the project vicinity resulting from construction vehicle traffic and construction activities that would affect the transportation network.	SU								<b>Mitigation Measure TR-55</b> CPMC shall develop and implement a Construction Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to anticipate and minimize impacts of various construction activities associated with the Proposed Project. The Plan would disseminate appropriate information to contractors and affected agencies with respect to coordinating construction activities to minimize overall disruptions and ensure that overall	SU/M							

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									<p>circulation is maintained to the extent possible, with particular focus on ensuring pedestrian, transit, and bicycle connectivity. The program would supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede, any manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by Caltrans, SFMTA, DPW, or other City departments and agencies.</p> <p>Specifically, the plan should:</p> <p>Identify construction traffic management best practices in San Francisco, as well as others that, although not being implemented in the City, could provide valuable information for the project. Management practices include, but are not limited to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifying ways to reduce construction worker vehicle trips through transportation demand management programs and methods to manage construction work parking demands.</li> <li>Identifying best practices for accommodating pedestrians, such as temporary pedestrian wayfinding signage or temporary walkways.</li> <li>Identifying ways to accommodate transit stops located at sidewalks slated for closure during construction. This may include identifying locations for temporary bus stops, as well as signage directing riders to those temporary stops.</li> <li>Identifying ways to consolidate truck delivery trips, including a plan to consolidate deliveries from a centralized construction material and equipment storage facility.</li> <li>Identifying best practices for managing traffic flows on Van Ness Avenue during the nighttime hours for the period when tunnel construction would involve surface construction activities. This may include coordination with Caltrans on appropriate traffic management practices and lane closure procedures.</li> </ul> <p>Describe procedures required by different departments and/or agencies in the city for implementation of a Construction TMP, such as reviewing agencies, approval processes, and estimated timelines. For example,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CPMC shall coordinate temporary and permanent changes to the transportation network within the City of San Francisco, including traffic, street and parking changes and lane closures, with the SFMTA. Any permanent changes may require meeting with the SFMTA Board of Directors or one of its sub-Committees. This may require a public hearing. Temporary traffic and transportation changes must be coordinated through the SFMTA's Interdepartmental Staff Committee on Traffic and Transportation (ISCOTT) and would require a public meeting. As part of this process, the Construction Plan may be reviewed by SFMTA's Transportation Advisory Committee (TASC) to resolve internal differences between different transportation modes.</li> <li>Caltrans Deputy Directive 60 (DD-60) requires TMP and contingency plans for all state highway activities. These plans should be part of the normal project development process and must be considered during the planning stage to allow for the proper cost, scope and scheduling of the TMP activities on</li> </ul>								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																		
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)								
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants	
									<p>Caltrans right-of-way. These plans should adhere to Caltrans standards and guidelines for stage construction, construction signage, traffic handling, lane and ramp closures and TMP documentation for all work within Caltrans right-of-way.</p> <p>Require consultation with other Agencies, including Muni/SFMTA and property owners on Cedar Street, to assist coordination of construction traffic management strategies as they relate to bus-only lanes and service delivery on Cedar Street. CPMC should proactively coordinate with these groups prior to developing their Plan to ensure the needs of the other users on the Islands addressed within the construction TMP for the project.</p> <p>Identify construction traffic management strategies and other elements for the project, and present a cohesive program of operational and demand management strategies designed to maintain acceptable levels of traffic flow during periods of construction activities. These include, but are not limited to, construction strategies, demand management activities, alternative route strategies, and public information strategies.</p> <p>Develop a public information plan to provide adjacent residents and businesses with regularly-updated information regarding project construction, including construction activities, peak construction vehicle activities (e.g., concrete pours), travel lane closures, and other lane closures.</p> <p>The Construction Transportation Management Plan shall be submitted to SFMTA, SFDPW, and the Planning Department for review and approval.</p>									
<b>Impact TR-56:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in a significant transportation impact in the project vicinity resulting from construction vehicle traffic and construction activities.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-55</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-57:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in a significant transportation impact in the project vicinity from construction vehicle traffic and construction activities.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-55</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-58:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project No Van Ness Avenue Pedestrian Tunnel Variant would result in a significant transportation impact in the project vicinity resulting from construction vehicle traffic and construction activities.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-55</b> , as described above.		SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-59:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not cause an increase in traffic at the study intersections that would cause the LOS to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or LOS F, or from LOS E to LOS F.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-59.			LTS						
<b>Impact TR-60:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-60.			LTS						
<b>Impact TR-61:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-61.			LTS						

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas.																	
<b>Impact TR-62:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-62.			LTS					
<b>Impact TR-63:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply or within on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-63.			LTS					
<b>Impact TR-64:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not result in a passenger loading/unloading demand that could not be accommodated within the existing and proposed passenger loading/unloading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-64.			LTS					
<b>Impact TR-65:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not result in a significant emergency vehicle access impact.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-65.			LTS					
<b>Impact TR-66:</b> Implementation of Pacific Campus project construction-related activities would not cause an impact that would be considered significant because of their temporary and limited duration.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-66.			LTS					
<b>Impact TR-67:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP would not cause the level of service at California Campus study intersections to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or LOS F, or from LOS E to LOS F, and therefore, the project would not cause major traffic hazards.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-67.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-68:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP relevant to the California Campus would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-68.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-69:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP relevant to the California Campus would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially impact bicycle accessibility on the campus and adjoining areas.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-69.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-70:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP relevant to the California Campus would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the campus or adjoining areas.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-70.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-71:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP relevant to the California Campus would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply, or within on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-71.				LTS				

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact TR-72:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP relevant to the California Campus would not result in a significant emergency access impact.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-72.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-73:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP relevant to the California Campus would not result in construction-related impacts.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-73.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-74:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would have less than-significant impact at five study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2020 Modified Baseline No Project conditions.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-74.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-75:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would have a significant impact at the intersection of Church/Market/14th Street that would operate at LOS F under 2020 Modified Baseline No Project conditions.					SU	SU			No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-75.					SU	SU		
<b>Impact TR-76:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would have a less-than-significant impact at seven study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2020 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-76.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-77:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-77.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-78:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-78.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-79:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise impact pedestrian accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-79.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-80:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply, or within on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-80.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-81:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would not result in a passenger loading/unloading demand that could not be accommodated within the existing and proposed passenger loading/unloading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-81.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-82:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would not result in a significant emergency vehicle access impact.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-82.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-83:</b> Implementation of construction-related activities on the Davies Campus would not cause a significant impact because of their temporary and limited duration.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-83.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-84:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would have less than-significant impact at six study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-84.							LTS	LTS

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
2015 Modified Baseline No Project conditions and 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.																	
<b>Impact TR-85:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would have less than significant impacts at nine study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2015 Modified Baseline plus Project conditions.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-85.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-86:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would not cause a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity, resulting in unacceptable levels of transit service.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-86.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-87:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would not create potentially hazardous conditions for bicyclists or otherwise substantially interfere with bicycle accessibility to the project site and adjoining areas.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-87.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-88:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would not result in substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, create hazardous conditions for pedestrians, or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility to the project site or adjoining areas.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-88.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-89:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply, or within on-street loading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-89.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-90:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus Alternate Emergency Department Location Variant would not result in a loading demand during the peak hours of loading activities that could not be accommodated within the proposed loading supply or within on-street loading zones and the variant would not create potentially hazardous conditions.								LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-90.								LTS
<b>Impact TR-91:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would not result in a passenger loading/unloading demand that could not be accommodated within the existing and proposed passenger loading/unloading zones, and would not create potentially hazardous conditions.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-91.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-92:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would not result in a significant emergency vehicle access impact.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-92.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-93:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project Alternate Emergency Department Location Variant would not result in a significant emergency vehicle access impact.								LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-93.								LTS
<b>Impact TR-94:</b> Implementation of construction-related activities on the St. Luke's Campus would not cause a significant impact because of their temporary and limited duration.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-94.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-95:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus, Pacific Campus and Davies Campus projects would have less than-significant combined impacts at the study intersection of Octavia/Market/US 101.	LTS	LTS	LTS				LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-95.	LTS	LTS	LTS				LTS	LTS

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact TR-96:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP combined project transit demand would not exceed the proposed transit system capacity at the study area corridors.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-96.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-97:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP would impact the ridership demand for CPMC shuttles, which would be accommodated within the proposed shuttle service.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-97.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-98:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP with overlapping construction activities at the five campuses would not result in a significant construction impact.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-98.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-99:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.	SU								No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-99.	SU							
<b>Impact TR-100:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Van Ness/Pine.	SU								No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-100.	SU							
<b>Impact TR-101:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Polk/Geary.	SU								No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-101.	SU							
<b>Impact TR-102:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would have less than-significant impacts at eight study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-102.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-103:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would have less than significant impacts at 17 study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-103.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-104:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Gough/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-104.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-105:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-105.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-106:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Franklin/Bush.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-106.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-107:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Van Ness/Pine.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-107.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-108:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Polk/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-108.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-109:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would have less than-significant project impacts at five study intersections that		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-109.		LTS						



Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions.																	
<b>Impact TR-110:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would have less than significant impacts at 16 study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-110.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-111:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Van Ness/Market.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-111.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-112:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Van Ness/Pine.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-112.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-113:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would result in significant project and cumulative impacts at the intersection of Polk/Geary.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-113.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-114:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would have less than-significant project impacts at eight study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-114.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-115:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would have less than significant impacts at 15 study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-115.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-116:</b> If the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at five intersections would be less than significant.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-116.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-117:</b> If the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at the intersection of Polk/Geary would be significant.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-117.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-118:</b> If the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at the intersection of Van Ness/Market would be significant.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-118.		SU	SU					
<b>Impact TR-119:</b> For the Two-Way Post Street Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at five		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-119.		LTS						

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
intersections would be less than significant.																	
<b>Impact TR-120:</b> For the Two-Way Post Street Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at the intersection of Polk/Geary would be significant.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-120.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-121:</b> For the Two-Way Post Street Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus and BRT projects at the intersection of Van Ness/Market would be significant.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-121.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-122:</b> For the MOB Access Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant and BRT projects at five intersections would be less than significant.		LTS							No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-122.		LTS						
<b>Impact TR-123:</b> For the MOB Access Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant and BRT projects at the intersection of Polk/Geary would be significant.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-123.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-124:</b> For the MOB Access Variant, if the proposed Van Ness Avenue and Geary Corridor Bus Rapid Transit projects are implemented, the Cathedral Hill Campus project's contribution to the combined cumulative impacts of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant and BRT projects at the intersection of Van Ness/Market would be significant.		SU							No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-124.		SU						
<b>Impact TR-125:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would have less-than-significant impacts at the intersection of Market/Octavia/U.S. 101, which would operate at LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-125.			LTS					
<b>Impact TR-126:</b> The California Campus project transit demand would not exceed the proposed transit system capacity at the study area corridors under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-126.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-127:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would have significant impacts at the intersection of Church/Market/14th Street which would operate at LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions and 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.					SU	SU			No feasible mitigation measures are available for Impact TR-127.					SU	SU		
<b>Impact TR-128:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would have less-than-significant project impacts at six study intersections that would operate at LOS E or LOS F					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-128.					LTS	LTS		

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions and 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.																	
<b>Impact TR-129:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would have less than significant impacts at six study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-129.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-130:</b> The St. Luke's Campus project would have less-than-significant cumulative impacts at six study intersections that would operate at LOS F under 2030 Cumulative No Project conditions.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-130.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-131:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would have less than significant impacts at nine study intersections that would operate at LOS D or better under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-131.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-132:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would not cause transit demand to exceed the proposed transit system capacity at the study area corridors under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.	LTS								No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-132.	LTS							
<b>Impact TR-133:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion along Van Ness Avenue under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 49-Van Ness-Mission bus route.	SU								Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-29</b> , as described above.	SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-134:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion along Van Ness Avenue under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 47-Van Ness bus route.	SU								<b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-134</b> CPMC shall ensure that the transit delay impact related to the Cathedral Hill Campus project on the 47-Van Ness is reduced to a less-than-significant level by financially compensating the SFMTA for the cost of providing the additional service needed to accommodate the project at existing levels of service. The financial contribution shall be calculated and applied in a manner that is consistent with the SFMTA cost/scheduling model. The amount and schedule for payment and commitment to application of service needs shall be set forth in a Transit Mitigation Agreement between CPMC and SFMTA.	SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-135:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion along Geary Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 38/38L-Geary bus routes.	SU								Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-30</b> , as described above.	SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-136:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion along Polk Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 19-Polk bus route.	SU								Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-31</b> , as described above.	SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-137</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project would increase congestion along Post Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 3-Jackson bus route.	SU								<b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-137</b> CPMC shall ensure that the transit delay impact related to the Cathedral Hill Campus project on the 3-Jackson is reduced to a less-than-significant level by financially compensating the SFMTA for the cost of providing the service needed to accommodate the project at proposed levels of service. The financial contribution	SU/M							

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									shall be calculated and applied in a manner that is consistent with the SFMTA cost/scheduling model. The amount and schedule for payment and commitment to application of service needs shall be set forth in a Transit Mitigation Agreement between CPMC and SFMTA.								
<b>Impact TR-138:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion along Van Ness Avenue under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 49-Van Ness-Mission bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-29</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-139:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion along Van Ness Avenue under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 47-Van Ness bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-134</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-140:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion along Geary Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 38/38L-Geary bus routes.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-30</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-141:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion along Polk Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 19-Polk bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-31</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-142:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project Two-Way Post Street Variant would increase congestion along Post Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 3-Jackson bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-137</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-143:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would increase congestion along Van Ness Avenue under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 49-Van Ness-Mission bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-29</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-144:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would increase congestion along Van Ness Avenue under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 47-Van Ness bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-134</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-145:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would increase congestion along Geary Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 38/38L-Geary bus routes.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-30</b> , as described above.		SU/M						
<b>Impact TR-146:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would increase congestion and ridership along Polk Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 19-Polk bus route.		SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-31</b> , as described above.		SU/M						

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact TR-147:</b> Implementation of the Cathedral Hill Campus project MOB Access Variant would increase congestion along Post Street under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions, which would increase travel times and impact operations of the 3-Jackson bus route.	SU								Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-137</b> as described above.	SU/M							
<b>Impact TR-148:</b> Implementation of the Pacific Campus project would not cause transit demand to exceed the transit system capacity at the study area corridors under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.			LTS						No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-148.			LTS					
<b>Impact TR-149:</b> Implementation of the CPMC LRDP would not cause transit demand at the California Campus to exceed the transit system capacity at the study area corridors under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.				LTS					No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-149.				LTS				
<b>Impact TR-150:</b> Implementation of the Davies Campus project would not cause transit demand to exceed the transit system capacity at the study area corridors under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.					LTS	LTS			No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-150.					LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact TR-151:</b> Implementation of the St. Luke's Campus project would not cause transit demand to exceed the transit system capacity at the study area corridors under 2030 Cumulative plus Project conditions.							LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for Impact TR-151.							LTS	LTS
<b>Impact TR-152:</b> Construction of the Cathedral Hill Campus (including all Cathedral Hill Variants) would contribute to cumulative construction impacts in the project vicinity.	SU	SU							Same as <b>Mitigation Measure MM-TR-55</b> , as described above.	SU/M	SU/M						
<b>4.6: Noise</b>																	
<b>Impact NO-1:</b> Short-term noise generated by project-related construction and/or demolition activities could temporarily expose existing nearby noise-sensitive receptors to substantial increases in ambient noise levels.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-NO-N1a (Cathedral Hill and St. Luke's; Davies and Pacific [long-term]):</b> CPMC shall minimize the impacts of construction noise where feasible by implementing the measures listed below in accordance with the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance. These measures shall be required in each contract agreed to between CPMC and a contractor under the LRDP and shall be applied to all projects and programs covered by this EIR.  Construction equipment shall be properly maintained in accordance with manufacturers' specifications and shall be fitted with the best available noise suppression devices (e.g., mufflers, silencers, wraps). All impact tools shall be shrouded or shielded, and all intake and exhaust ports on power equipment shall be muffled or shielded.  Construction equipment shall not idle for extended periods of time near noise-sensitive receptors.  Stationary equipment (compressors, generators, and cement mixers) shall be located as far from sensitive receptors as feasible. Sound enclosures shall be used during noisy operations on-site.  Temporary barriers (noise blankets or wood paneling) shall be placed around the construction site parcels and, to the extent feasible, they should break the line of sight from noise sensitive receptors to construction activities. For temporary sound blankets, the material shall be weather and abuse resistant, and shall exhibit superior hanging and tear strength with a surface weight of at least 1 pound per square foot. Placement, orientation, size, and density of	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									acoustical barriers shall be reviewed and approved by a qualified acoustical consultant. When temporary barrier units are joined together, the mating surfaces shall be flush with each other. Gaps between barrier units, and between the bottom edge of the barrier panels and the ground, shall be closed with material that would completely close the gaps, and would be dense enough to attenuate noise. <b>M-NO-N1b</b> A community liaison shall be designated by CPMC. The community liaison shall be available to manage and respond to noise complaints from nearby sensitive receptors. Contact information for the community liaison shall be posted in a conspicuous location so that it is clearly visible to the nearby receptors most likely to be disturbed. The community liaison shall be responsible for ensuring that reoccurring noise complaints are evaluated by a qualified acoustical consultant to determine appropriate noise control measures to meet applicable standards. The community liaison shall contact nearby noise-sensitive receptors and shall advise them of the construction schedule. <b>M-NO-N1c:</b> A construction noise management plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant. The noise management plan shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following tasks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prepare a detailed evaluation of nighttime construction at noise sensitive receptors. The evaluation would include calculations of construction noise levels based on detailed information regarding construction methods and duration. If it is determined that construction noise levels would exceed City noise ordinance standards, a qualified acoustical consultant shall review and approve additional mitigation measures to minimize prolonged sleep disturbance (e.g., acoustical treatments to existing buildings such as upgraded weather-stripping or the feasibility of constructing a cantilevered overhang along temporary barriers around the construction area to reduce construction noise levels at elevated receptors).</li> <li>• Long- and short-term noise measurements shall be conducted at ground level and elevated locations to represent the noise exposure of noise sensitive receptors adjacent to the construction area. The measurements shall be conducted for at least one week during the onset of each major phase of construction. Measurements shall be conducted during both daytime and nighttime hours of construction, with observations and recordings to document combined noise sources and maximum noise levels of individual pieces of equipment.</li> <li>• Identify additional noise mitigation measures that shall be provided if construction activity noise levels are found to exceed City standards and result in complaints that are lodged with the community liaison. These measures may include erecting additional temporary noise barriers at either the source or the receptor; building large temporary enclosures to shield receptors from the continuous engine noise of delivery trucks during offloads (e.g., concrete pump trucks during foundation</li> </ul>								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									work); or lining temporary noise barriers with sound absorbing materials. <b>M-NO-N1 (Davies [near-term]):</b> This mitigation measure is similar to Mitigation Measure M-NO-N1a, b and c for the Cathedral Hill Campus and differs in that the on-site receptors would require evaluation of interior construction noise levels by a qualified acoustical consultant if the number of complaints to the community liaison becomes excessive and warrants further action								
<b>Impact NO-2:</b> Project operation could cause a substantial permanent increase in traffic noise levels at noise-sensitive residential receptors and/or expose noise-sensitive receptors to a substantial increase in noise levels.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required for <b>Impact NO-2.</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact NO-3:</b> Operation of stationary noise sources associated with the CPMC LRDP could expose on-site and off-site noise-sensitive receptors to noise levels that would exceed applicable standards, and/or result in a substantial increase in ambient noise levels.	SI	SI	SI		LTS	SI	SI	SI	<b>M-NO-N3a (Cathedral Hill, St. Luke's, and Pacific Campuses, Davies [long-term]):</b> CPMC shall retain the services of a qualified acoustical consultant to measure the sound levels of operating exterior equipment within 30 days after installation. If exterior equipment meets sound level standards, no further action is required. If exterior equipment does not meet sound level standards, CPMC shall replace and/or redesign the exterior equipment to meet the City's noise standards. Results of the measurements shall be provided to the Hospital MEP and the City to show compliance with standards. <b>M-NO-N3b (Cathedral Hill):</b> Bay doors shall be closed during Aduomed operations. <b>M-NO-N3c (Cathedral Hill):</b> If bay doors are open during Aduomed operation, a noise-absorptive material shall be applied to the entire ceiling structure of the loading dock area to reduce noise levels from Aduomed operations. The material shall have a minimum Noise Reduction Coefficient of 0.75. <b>M-NO-N3d (Cathedral Hill):</b> Noise attenuators shall be included on kitchen exhaust fans located on Level 5 of the Cathedral Hill Hospital adjacent to patient rooms, or the sound power levels of the exhaust fans shall be limited. <b>M-NO-N3e (Cathedral Hill):</b> Delivery of oxygen to the proposed Cathedral Hill Campus shall not be scheduled during hours when church activities are typically taking place. Communication shall be established between the Hamilton Square Baptist Church and CPMC and a mutually acceptable time for delivery of oxygen shall be determined. <b>M-NO-N3a (Davies [near-term]):</b> CPMC shall retain the services of a qualified acoustical consultant to conduct an additional site-specific noise study to evaluate and establish the appropriate ambient noise levels at the Davies Campus for purposes of a detailed HVAC and emergency generator noise reduction analysis. The recommendations of the acoustical consultant shall include specific equipment design and operations measures to reduce HVAC and emergency generator noise to acceptable levels for exterior and interior noise levels as specified in the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance. <b>M-NO-N3a (St. Luke's Campus):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-NO-N3a for the Davies Campus	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																			
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)									
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		
									and Mitigation Measure M-NO-N3a for the Cathedral Hill Campus. <b>M-NO-L3a (Pacific Campus [long-term])</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-NO-N3a for the Davies Campus. <b>M-NO-L3b (Pacific Campus [long-term])</b> CPMC shall retain the services of a qualified acoustical consultant to conduct a site-specific acoustical analysis of the North-of-Clay Aboveground Parking Garage once detailed construction plans are available. The analysis shall address the impacts associated with the parking garage at the adjacent on-site and off-site noise-sensitive receptors. Based on the conclusions of the site-specific acoustical analysis, additional recommended noise reduction measures shall be incorporated into the design of the parking garage structure if impacts are anticipated. <b>M-NO-L3 (Davies [long-term])</b> : This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-NO-N3a for the Cathedral Hill Campus.										
<b>Impact NO-4:</b> Future traffic-related interior noise levels could exceed applicable land use compatibility standards.	SI	SI	PS		SI	SI	SI	SI	<b>M-NO-N4 (Cathedral Hill Campus)</b> CPMC shall obtain the services of a qualified acoustical consultant to perform a detailed interior-noise analysis and develop noise-insulating features for the interior spaces of the Cathedral Hill Hospital associated with the proposed projects that would reduce the ambient noise level inside the hospital to a level that complies with the 45-dB CNEL standard of the San Francisco Noise Control Ordinance. Interior spaces of the hospital shall be designed to include insulating features (e.g., laminated glass, acoustical insulation, and/or acoustical sealant) that would reduce interior noise levels to 45 dB L <sub>dn</sub> or lower.	LTS M	LTSM	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS		
<b>Impact NO-5:</b> Groundborne vibration levels attributable to construction activities could exceed the threshold of significance for exposing noise- and vibration-sensitive land uses to vibration levels that exceed applicable thresholds.	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU	<b>M-NO-N5 (Cathedral Hill, Davies [near-term], St. Luke's Campuses):</b> CPMC shall minimize the impacts of construction noise and vibration where feasible by implementing the measures listed below. These measures shall be required in each contract agreed to between CPMC and a contractor under the LRDP and shall apply to all projects and programs covered by this EIR. Construction equipment generating the highest noise and vibration levels (vibratory rollers) shall operate at the maximum distance feasible from sensitive receptors. Vibratory rollers shall operate during the daytime hours only to ensure that sleep is not disrupted at sensitive receptors near the construction area. A community liaison shall be available to respond to vibration complaints from nearby sensitive receptors. A community liaison shall be designated. Contact information for the community liaison shall be posted in a conspicuous location so that it is clearly visible to the nearby receptors most likely to be disturbed. The community liaison shall manage complaints resulting from construction vibration. Reoccurring disturbances shall be evaluated by a qualified acoustical consultant to ensure compliance with applicable standards. The community liaison shall contact nearby noise-sensitive receptors and shall advise them of the construction	SU/M	SU/M	SU/M		SU/M	SU/M	SU/M	SU/M		



Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									schedule. To further address the nuisance impact of project construction, a construction vibration management plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant retained by CPMC. The vibration management plan shall include but shall not be limited to the following tasks: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A community liaison shall be designated. This person's contact information shall be posted in a location near the project site that it is clearly visible to the nearby receptors most likely to be disturbed. The community liaison shall manage complaints and concerns resulting from activities that cause vibration. The severity of the vibration concern shall be assessed by the community liaison and, if necessary, evaluated by a qualified noise and vibration control consultant.</li> <li>▶ The preexisting condition of all buildings within a 50-foot radius and historical buildings within the immediate vicinity of proposed construction activities shall be recorded in the form of a preconstruction survey. The preconstruction survey shall determine conditions that exist before construction begins and shall be used to evaluate damage caused by construction activities. Fixtures and finishes within a 50-foot radius of construction activities susceptible to damage shall be documented (photographically and in writing) before construction. All buildings damaged shall be repaired to their preexisting conditions.</li> </ul> <b>M-NO-L5 (Davies and Pacific [long-term]):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-NO-N5 for the Cathedral Hill Campus.								
<b>4.7: Air Quality</b>																	
<b>Impact AQ-1:</b> Construction activities associated with the LRDP would not result in short-term increases in fugitive dust that exceed BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-AQ-N1a (Cathedral Hill, Davies [near-term], St. Luke's)</b> Implement BAAQMD Basic and Optional Control Measures and Additional Construction Mitigation Measures during Construction The following mitigation measures shall be implemented during construction activities to avoid short-term significant impacts on air quality: <b>BAAQMD Basic Control Measures</b> Water all active construction areas at least twice daily. Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least 2 feet of freeboard. Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (nontoxic) soil stabilizer on all unpaved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas, and staging areas at construction sites. Sweep street daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried into adjacent public streets. <b>Optional Control Measures</b> Install wheel washers for all exiting trucks, or wash off the tires or tracks of all trucks and equipment leaving the site.	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									Install wind breaks, or plant trees/vegetative wind breaks at windward sides of construction areas. Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 20 mph. Limit the area subject to excavation, grading, and other construction activities at any one time. <b>Additional Construction Mitigation Measures</b> All exposed surfaces (e.g., parking areas, staging areas, soil piles, graded areas, and unpaved access roads) shall be watered twice daily. All haul trucks transporting soil, sand, or other loose material off-site shall be covered. All visible mud or dirt trackout 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. All vehicle speeds on unpaved roads shall be limited to 15 mph. 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. 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 measures, Title 13, Section 2485 of California Code of Regulations). Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined to be running in proper condition prior to operation. Post a publicly visible sign with the telephone number and person to contact at the lead agency regarding dust complaints. This person shall respond and take corrective action within 48 hours. The air district's phone number shall also be visible to ensure compliance with applicable regulations. <b>M-AQ-N1b (Cathedral Hill, Davies [near-term], St. Luke's)</b> Implement Equipment Exhaust Control Measures during Construction To reduce exhaust emissions of ROG, NO <sub>x</sub> , PM <sub>10</sub> , and PM <sub>2.5</sub> by construction equipment at the CPMC campuses, CPMC and its construction contractor shall implement the following BAAQMD-recommended control measures during construction in both the near term and the long term: Idling times shall be minimized, either by shutting equipment off when not in use or by reducing the maximum idling time to 2 minutes, to the extent feasible. Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. All construction equipment shall be maintained and properly tuned in accordance with the manufacturers' specifications. All equipment shall be checked by a certified mechanic and determined								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																		
Impact(s) <sup>14</sup>	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)								
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants	
									to be running in proper condition before operation. <b>M-AQ-L1a (Pacific and Davies Campuses [long-term])</b> Implement BAAQMD Basic and Optional Control Measures and Additional Construction Mitigation Measures during Construction This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N1a, above. <b>M-AQ-L1b (Pacific and Davies Campuses [long-term])</b> Implement Equipment Exhaust Control Measures during Construction This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N1b, above.									
<b>Impact AQ-2:</b> Construction activities associated with the LRDP would expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).	SU	SU	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	<b>M-AQ-N2 (Cathedral Hill Campus):</b> Install Accelerated Emission Control Device on Construction Equipment.  To reduce risk associated with exhaust emissions of DPM by construction equipment during construction of the LRDP sites, CPMC and its construction contractor shall implement the following BAAQMD-recommended control measures during construction:  Implement Accelerated Emission Control Device Installation on Construction Equipment. In order to minimize the potential impacts on residents living near the CPMC campuses from the construction activities in that area, CPMC shall make reasonable efforts to ensure that all construction equipment used at these campuses would use equipment that meets the EPA Tier 4 engine standards for particulate matter and NO <sub>x</sub> control (or equivalent) throughout the entire duration of construction activities, to the extent that equipment meeting the EPA Tier 4 engine standards is available to the contractor at the time construction activities requiring the use of such equipment occur.	SU/M	SU/M	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<b>Impact AQ-3:</b> Operation of the LRDP would exceed BAAQMD CEQA significance thresholds for mass emissions of criteria pollutants and would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation at full buildout (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU	No mitigation measures are proposed at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-3.	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU	
<b>Impact AQ-4:</b> Operation of the LRDP would not cause local concentrations of CO from motor vehicle exhaust to exceed state and federal ambient air quality standards (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-4.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<b>Impact AQ-5:</b> Operations at the LRDP would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-5.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<b>Impact AQ-6:</b> Construction and operation of the LRDP would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-6.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<p><b>Impact AQ-7:</b> The LRDP's short-term construction emissions would not contribute to cumulatively considerable toxic air contaminant, criteria air pollutant or precursor emissions in the region. The LRDP's long-term operation criteria air pollutant emissions would contribute to a cumulative considerable impact, but its toxic air contaminant emissions would not be cumulatively considerable (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <b>Criteria Air Pollutants (operational)</b></li> <li>▶ <b>Criteria Air Pollutants (construction)</b></li> <li>▶ <b>Toxic Air Contaminants (operational)</b></li> <li>▶ <b>Toxic Air Contaminants (construction)</b></li> </ul>									<p>No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-7.</p>								
	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU
	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Impact AQ-8:</b> Construction activities associated with the LRDP would not result in short-term increases in fugitive dust that exceed the recently adopted (6/2/10) BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria.</p>	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<p><b>M-AQ-N8a (Cathedral Hill, Davies[near-term], St. Luke's)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N1a for Impact AQ-1.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-N8b (Cathedral Hill, Davies[near-term], St. Luke's)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N1b for Impact AQ-1.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-L8a (Pacific and Davies [long-term])</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N1a for Impact AQ-1.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-L8b (Pacific and Davies [long-term])</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N1b for Impact AQ-1.</p>	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
<p><b>Impact AQ-9:</b> Near-term and long-term construction activities associated with the LRDP would exceed the recently adopted (6/2/10) BAAQMD CEQA significance thresholds for mass criteria pollutant emissions and would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation.</p>	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU	<p><b>M-AQ-N9 (Cathedral Hill, Davies[near-term], St. Luke's)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N1a for Impact AQ-1 and M-AQ-N2 for Impact AQ-2.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-L9 (Pacific and Davies [long-term])</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N9.</p>	SU/M	SU/M	SU/M		SU/M	SU/M	SU/M	SU/M
<p><b>Impact AQ-10:</b> Construction activities associated with the LRDP would result in short-term increases in emissions of diesel particulate matter that exceed the recently adopted (6/2/10) BAAQMD CEQA significance criteria and expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants and PM2.5.</p>	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU	<p><b>M-AQ-N10a (Cathedral Hill Campus)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N2 for Impact AQ-2.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-N10b (Davies Campus [near-term])</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N2 for Impact AQ-2.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-N10c (St. Luke's Campus)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N2 for Impact AQ-2.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-L10 (Pacific Campus)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N2 for Impact AQ-2.</p> <p><b>M-AQ-L10 (Davies Campus [long-term])</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N2 for Impact AQ-2.</p>	SU/M	SU/M	SU/M		SU/M	SU/M	SU/M	SU/M

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact AQ-11:</b> Operation of the LRDP would exceed the recently adopted (6/2/10) BAAQMD CEQA significance thresholds for mass criteria pollutant emissions and would contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation at full buildout.	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU	No mitigation measures are proposed at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-11.	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU
<b>Impact AQ-12:</b> Operation of CPMC campuses under the LRDP would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial concentrations of toxic air contaminants (Recently adopted BAAQMD Guidelines).	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-12.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact AQ-13:</b> Construction and operation under the LRDP would not expose a substantial number of people to objectionable odors (Recently adopted BAAQMD Guidelines).	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AQ-13.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact AQ-14:</b> The proposed LRDP's operational emissions of toxic air contaminants would not contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on sensitive receptors. The proposed LRDP's construction emissions of toxic air contaminants would potentially contribute to a cumulatively considerable impact on sensitive receptors (Recently adopted BAAQMD Guidelines).									This mitigation measure is identical to <b>Mitigation Measure M-AQ-N2</b> for Impact AQ-2.								
▶ <b>During Construction of LRDP</b>	PSU	PSU	PSU		PSU	PSU	PSU	PSU		PSU/M	PSU/M	PSU/M		PSU/M	PSU/M	PSU/M	PSU/M
▶ <b>During Operations of LRDP</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.8: Greenhouse Gas Emissions</b>																	
<b>Impact GH-1:</b> Direct and indirect LRDP-generated GHG emissions would not have a significant impact on the environment, nor would they conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (1999 BAAQMD Guidelines).	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GH-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GH-2:</b> Construction-related GHG emissions would not have a significant impact on the environment, nor conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (Recently adopted BAAQMD Guidelines).	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GH-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GH-3:</b> Direct and indirect LRDP-generated GHG emissions would have a significant impact on the environment or conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions (Recently adopted BAAQMD Guidelines).	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU	No mitigation measures are proposed at any CPMC campuses for Impact GH-3.	SU	SU	SU		SU	SU	SU	SU
<b>4.9: Wind and Shadow</b>																	
<b>Impact WS-1:</b> The project would not alter wind in a manner that substantially affects public areas.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact WS-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact WS-2:</b> The project would not create net new shadow in a manner that would substantially affect the use of any park or open space under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, publicly accessible open space, outdoor recreation facility, or other public area or change the climate in either the community or the region.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact WS-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.10: Recreation</b>																	

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<p><b>Impact RE-1:</b> The project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated. The project also would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered park or recreational facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, or other performance objectives.</p> <p>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact RE-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Impact RE-2:</b> The project would not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities, which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.</p> <p>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact RE-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Impact RE-3:</b> The project would not adversely affect existing recreational opportunities.</p> <p>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact RE-3.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.11: Public Services</b>																	
<p><b>Impact PS-1:</b> The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered fire and emergency services facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.</p> <p>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact PS-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Impact PS-2:</b> The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered police protection facilities to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.</p> <p>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></p>	PS	PS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	<b>M-PS-N2 (Cathedral Hill Campus):</b> CPMC shall implement Mitigation Measure M-TR-43 as described above.	LTS	LTSM	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Impact PS-3:</b> The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered schools to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives.</p> <p>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></p>	LTS	LTS	NI		LTS	NI	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact PS-3.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<p><b>Impact PS-4:</b> The project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of, or the need for, new or physically altered libraries to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives.</p> <p>► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b></p>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact PS-4.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.12: Utilities and Service Systems</b>																	
<p><b>Impact UT-1:</b> The project would not exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable regional water quality control board.</p>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact UT-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact UT-2:</b> The project would not require or result in the construction of new water treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact UT-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact UT-3:</b> The project would not require or result in the construction of new wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact UT-3.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact UT-4:</b> The project would not require or result in the construction of new stormwater drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact UT-4.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact UT-5:</b> SFPUC would have sufficient water supplies to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources. No new or expanded entitlements would be needed.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact UT-5.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact UT-6:</b> The project would be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact UT-6.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact UT-7:</b> The project would comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact UT-7.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
► <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout (all utilities and service systems)</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses.	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.13: Biological Resources</b>																	
<b>Impact BI-1:</b> Tree and shrub removal and vegetation clearing required at most of the CPMC campus sites during project construction may potentially disturb nesting birds and could result in destruction of bird nests, a potential violation of the California Fish and Game Code or the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-BI-N1 (Cathedral Hill, Davies, St. Luke's [near-term]):</b> Before any demolition or construction activities occurring during the nesting season (January 15 through August 15) that involve removal of trees or shrubs, CPMC shall conduct a preconstruction survey for nesting birds at each of its medical campuses. The surveys shall be conducted by a qualified wildlife biologist no sooner than 14 days before the start of removal of trees and shrubs. The survey results shall remain valid for 21 days after the survey; therefore, if vegetation removal is not started within 21 days of the survey, another survey shall be required. The area surveyed shall include the construction site and the staging area for the tree or shrub removal. If no nests are present, tree removal and construction may commence. If active nests are located during the preconstruction bird nesting survey, CPMC shall contact DFG for guidance on obtaining and complying with the Section 1081 agreement, which may include setting up and maintaining a line-of-sight buffer area around the active nest and prohibiting construction activities within the buffer; modifying construction activities; and/or removing or relocating active nests. <b>M-BI-L1 (Pacific and Davies [long-term]):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-BI-N1, above.	LTS M	LTS M	LTS M		LTS M	LTS M	LTS M	LTS M
<b>Impact BI-2:</b> The project would require removal of protected trees at most of the CPMC campus sites during construction. However, protected trees would be removed in compliance with the City's Urban Forestry Ordinance and Section 143 of the San Francisco Planning Code, and thus the project would not conflict with any local policies.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact BI-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>4.14: Geology and Soils</b>																	
<b>Impact GE-1:</b> The project would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault or strong seismic ground shaking.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GE-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GE-2:</b> The project would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving ground failure, including liquefaction, or be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in liquefaction or lateral spreading.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GE-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GE-3:</b> The project would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides or be located on geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslides.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GE-3.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GE-4:</b> The project would not result in substantial erosion or loss of topsoil.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-GE-N4 (Cathedral Hill, Davies [near-term], St. Luke's):</b> CPMC shall implement Mitigation Measure <b>M-HY-N3</b> , as described below. <b>M-GE-L4 (Pacific, Davies [long-term]):</b> CPMC shall implement Mitigation Measure <b>M-HY-N3</b> , as described below.	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
<b>Impact GE-5:</b> The project would not expose people or structures to the risk of loss, injury, or death involving ground failure, including densification or seismic settlement.	LTS	LTS	PS		LTS	PS	LTS	LTS	<b>M-GE-L5 (Pacific and Davies Campuses [Long-term])</b> Additional geotechnical studies shall be conducted following development of detailed design-level plans for the long-term projects at the Pacific and Davies Campuses. All recommendations in the studies shall be implemented by CPMC.	LTS	LTS	LTS M		LTS	LTSM	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GE-6:</b> The project would not be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project, resulting in subsidence or collapse.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	PS	PS	<b>M-GE-N6 (St. Luke's):</b> The design level geotechnical report for the MOB/Expansion Building, the proposed utility route, and the sewer variant at the St. Luke's Campus shall include an excavation and dewatering program. The program shall include measures to monitor the improvements adjacent to construction for vertical movement. The monitoring shall include an optical survey and installation of inclinometers and groundwater observation wells. Groundwater levels outside the excavation shall be monitored through wells while dewatering is in progress. Should the magnitude of settlement or groundwater drawdown be deemed potentially damaging to surrounding improvements by a licensed engineer, the groundwater outside the excavation shall be recharged through wells or the dewatering program altered to reduce drawdown to an acceptable level.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTSM	LTSM
<b>Impact GE-7:</b> The project would not be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, nor would it be substantially affected by corrosive soils, and therefore would not create substantial risks to life or property	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GE-7.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GE-8:</b> The CPMC campus sites do not have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GE-8.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact GE-9:</b> The project would not change substantially the topography or any unique geologic or physical features of the	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact GE-9.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS



Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
sites.																	
<b>4.15: Hydrology and Water Quality</b>																	
<b>Impact HY-1:</b> Dewatering activities during project construction could temporarily lower the local groundwater table, but the project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere with recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a substantial lowering of the local groundwater table.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HY-1.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HY-2:</b> The proposed construction activities would result in net increases in impervious surfaces in areas that drain to the City's combined sewer system, and an increase in total or peak runoff volume from the site could contribute to the frequency or severity of combined sewer overflow events or flooding on- or off-site.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<p><b>M-HY-N2 (Cathedral Hill, Davies [near-term], St. Luke's):</b> To manage peak flow and discharge volume, CPMC shall prepare and implement a stormwater control plan for each of the near-term projects under the LRDP, focusing on LID strategies and BMPs. In implementing the LRDP, CPMC shall comply with all policies and regulations adopted by the City, including SFPUC's Stormwater Design Guidelines, which require a 25% decrease in the rate and volume of stormwater runoff from the 2-year, 24-hour design storm. Therefore, the design-level drainage plans shall demonstrate that, at a minimum, there will be a 25% decrease in the rate and volume of stormwater runoff to the combined sewer for the 2-year, 24-hour storm as compared to existing conditions. This will be achieved by using LID stormwater BMPs which may include, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ green roofs,</li> <li>▶ cisterns,</li> <li>▶ bioswales,</li> <li>▶ bioretention basins,</li> <li>▶ planter boxes,</li> <li>▶ blue roofs,<sup>17</sup></li> <li>▶ dry wells, and</li> <li>▶ other detention/storage facilities.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the final design team for the development project shall review and incorporate as many concepts as practicable from <i>Start at the Source: Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection</i>.<sup>18</sup> SFPUC shall conduct project design review before the City's project approval occurs, to ensure that the impacts of the LRDP on the combined sewer system have been fully mitigated.</p> <p><b>M-HY-L2 (Pacific, Davies [long-term]):</b> To manage peak discharge volumes, CPMC shall prepare and implement stormwater control plans that are consistent with guidelines in place during the time of construction for each of the long-term projects under the LRDP.</p>	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM
<b>▶ CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HY-3:</b> Excavation and other construction-related activities have the potential to degrade the quality of stormwater runoff from the CPMC campuses, but CPMC	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-HY-N3 (Cathedral Hill, Davies [near-term], St. Luke's):</b> In compliance with Article 4.1 of the San Francisco Public Works Code and the City's Construction Site Water Pollution Prevention	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM

<sup>17</sup> Rooftops that use flow controls atop downspouts to regulate the flow of runoff from the roof, thereby retaining and slowly releasing stormwater.

<sup>18</sup> Bay Area Stormwater Management Agencies Association. 1999. *Start at the Source, Design Guidance Manual for Stormwater Quality Protection*. Available: <http://www.basmaa.org>. Accessed October 2009.

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
would implement a SWPPP to reduce pollution of surface water during construction.									<p>Program, CPMC shall submit a site-specific SWPPP to SFPUC for approval before initiating construction activities in areas draining to the combined sewer system. SFPUC requires implementation of appropriate BMPs from the <i>California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater BMP Handbook—Construction</i>.<sup>19</sup> In accordance with SFPUC’s requirements, the SWPPP shall include the following elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>An erosion and sediment control plan.</i> The plan shall present a site map illustrating the BMPs that will be used to minimize on-site erosion and the sediment discharge into the combined sewer system, and shall provide a narrative description of those BMPs. Appropriate BMPs for the erosion and sediment control plan may include the following practices:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>Scheduling</i>—Develop a schedule that includes sequencing of construction activities with the implementation of appropriate BMPs. Perform construction activities and control practices in accordance with the planned schedule. Schedule work to minimize soil-disturbing activities during the rainy season. Schedule major grading operations for the dry season when practical. Monitor the weather forecast for rainfall and adjust the schedule as appropriate.</li> <li>▶ <i>Erosion control</i>—Preserve existing vegetation where feasible; apply mulch or hydroseed areas until permanent stabilization is established; and use soil binders, geotextiles and mats, earth dikes and drainage swales, velocity dissipation devices, slope drains, or polyacrylamide to protect soil from erosion.</li> <li>▶ <i>Wind erosion</i>—Apply water or other dust palliatives to prevent dust nuisance; prevent overwatering that can cause erosion. Alternatively, cover small stockpiles or areas that remain inactive for 7 or more days.</li> <li>▶ <i>Sediment control</i>—Install silt fences, sediment basins, sediment traps, check dams, fiber rolls, sand or gravel bag barriers, straw bale barriers, vegetated swales, approved chemical treatment, storm drain inlet protection, or other LID measures to minimize the discharge of sediment. Employ street sweeping to remove sediment from streets. Utilize treatment trains where feasible.</li> <li>▶ <i>Tracking controls</i>—Stabilize the construction site entrance to prevent tracking of sediment onto public roads by construction vehicles. Stabilize on-site vehicle transportation routes immediately after grading to prevent erosion and control dust. Install a tire wash area to remove sediment from tires and under carriages.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ <i>Nonstormwater-management BMPs.</i> These BMPs may include water conservation practices, dewatering practices that minimize sediment discharges, and BMPs for all of the following:</li> </ul>								

<sup>19</sup> California Stormwater Quality Association, 2003 (January), *Stormwater BMP Handbook—Construction*, January 2003 with revisions through 2004. Menlo Park, CA.

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ paving and grinding activities;</li> <li>▶ identification of illicit connections and illegal dumping;</li> <li>▶ irrigation and other planned or unplanned discharges of potable water;</li> <li>▶ vehicle and equipment cleaning, fueling, and maintenance;</li> <li>▶ concrete curing and finishing;</li> <li>▶ temporary batch plants;</li> <li>▶ implementation of shoreline improvements; and</li> <li>▶ work over water.</li> </ul> <p>Discharges from dewatering activities shall comply with the requirements of SFPUC's Batch Wastewater Discharge Permit that regulate influent concentrations for various constituents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ <i>Waste management BMPs.</i> These BMPs shall be implemented for:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ material delivery, use, and storage;</li> <li>▶ stockpile management;</li> <li>▶ spill prevention and control; and</li> <li>▶ management of solid and liquid waste, hazardous waste, contaminated soil, concrete waste, and septic/sanitary waste.</li> </ul> </li> <li>▶ <i>BMP inspection, maintenance, and repair requirements.</i> All BMPs shall be inspected on a regular basis to confirm proper installation and function. BMPs shall be inspected daily during storms, and BMPs that have failed shall be immediately repaired or replaced. Sufficient devices and materials (e.g., silt fence, coir rolls, erosion blankets) shall be provided throughout project construction to enable immediate corrective action for failed BMPs. Required BMP maintenance related to a storm event shall be completed within 48 hours of the storm event. The SWPPP shall include checklists that document when the inspections occurred, the results of the inspection, required corrective measures, and when corrective measures were implemented.</li> </ul> <p>The SWPPP shall demonstrate how treatment control measures (e.g., silt fences, sediment basins, sediment traps, check dams, vegetated swales, infiltration trenches) targeting the project-specific contaminants including sediment, metals, oil and grease, trash and debris, and oxygen-demanding substances would be incorporated into the project. In addition, the SWPPP shall demonstrate that the project has the land area available to support the proposed BMP facilities sized for the required water quality design storm.</p> <p>Construction personnel shall receive training on the SWPPP and implementation of BMPs.</p> <p><b>M-HY-L3 (Pacific and Davies [long-term]):</b> This mitigation measure is identical to Mitigation Measure M-HY-N3, above.</p>								
▶ <b>CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS				LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact HY-4:</b> Changes in the intensity of land use and increases in impervious surfaces at the CPMC campuses could result in degradation of the quality of stormwater discharged to the combined sewer. <b>► CPMC LRDP projects at full buildout</b>	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HY-4.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HY-5:</b> Project construction would not place any buildings or structures within a designated 100-year flood hazard area.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HY-5.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HY-6:</b> Project construction would not expose people or structures to risks from inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HY-6.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.16: Hazards and Hazardous Materials</b>																	
<b>Impact HZ-1:</b> Project construction would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials or create a significant hazard through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>M-HZ-N1a (Cathedral Hill, Davies [near-term], St. Luke's):</b> <b>Step 1: Preparation of a Site Mitigation Plan</b> Before the issuance of site, building, or other permits from the City for development activities involving subsurface disturbance, CPMC shall submit the previously prepared environmental contingency plans to SFDPH for review and approval as site mitigation plans (SMPs) for the Cathedral Hill, Davies, and St. Luke's Campuses. The SMPs shall include the following measures and procedures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>► All soil shall be sampled for a suite of common chemicals required by landfills and redevelopment sites accepting imported fill from other sites to provide a chemical profile and identify the soil worker safety and disposal classification. Sample analytical results shall be submitted to SFDPH for review.</li> <li>► Fill shall be sampled and analyzed before excavation to allow excavation, loading, and transportation off-site without stockpiling, which would minimize soil handling.</li> <li>► If soil encountered during excavation exhibits the presence of liquid hydrocarbons (such as oil), strong odors, or staining suggesting the presence of hazardous materials, work shall be halted, the area shall be covered in plastic sheeting, stockpiles shall be segregated and covered, and samples shall be collected from the base and walls of the excavation. Once sampling results have returned, the soil shall be treated in accordance with the above outlined procedures.</li> <li>► If groundwater is present and in a volume requiring dewatering, a dewatering contractor shall be retained to design and install a dewatering system to remove and discharge the water to the sanitary sewer system during excavation and construction. The dewatering contractor shall obtain a batch groundwater discharge permit from SFPUC. A groundwater sample shall be collected and analyzed for parameters established by SFPUC before any discharge of groundwater into the sewer system. If required by SFPUC, additional groundwater samples shall be collected monthly from the discharged water for parameters stipulated by SFPUC. If analytes in the groundwater exceed the established SFPUC discharge limits, the groundwater shall be stored in containers</li> </ul>	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									<p>and properly treated before discharge. The treatment system, if needed, shall be designed based on the chemicals present in the groundwater.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ A licensed tank removal contractor shall be retained to properly remove and dispose of known tanks in accordance with all current regulations and the site-specific and tank-specific procedures outlined in the ECPs for each campus. All the necessary permits from SFFD and SFDPH shall be obtained, and all notifications to BAAQMD shall be made before the tank is removed. The health and safety plan shall be followed, and air monitoring shall be performed during all tank removal activities. If soil staining, odor, and/or elevated organic vapor analyzer readings are observed during tank removal, the affected soil shall be placed on and covered with plastic tarpaulins, separate from any unaffected soil removed from above the tank. All soil sampling and analysis for tank closure shall be performed in accordance with the <i>Tri-Regional Board Staff Recommendations for Preliminary Evaluation and Investigation of Underground Tank Sites</i>, dated August 10, 1990, and any additional SFFD and SFDPH requirements.</li> </ul> <p>Any additional measures that the SFDPH determines are required beyond those already identified in the ECPs shall also be incorporated into the SPMs and implemented by CPMC. A copy of the SMPs shall be submitted to the Planning Department to become part of the case file.</p> <p><b>Step 2: Handling, Hauling, and Disposal of Contaminated Soils</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <u>Specific work practices</u>: If, based on the results of the soil tests conducted, the SFDPH determines that the soils on the campuses are contaminated at or above potentially hazardous levels, the construction contractor shall be alert for the presence of such soils during excavation and other construction activities on the campuses (detected through soil odor, color, and texture) and shall be prepared to handle, profile (i.e., characterize), and dispose of such soils appropriately (i.e., as dictated by federal, state, and local regulations) when such soils are encountered on the campuses. If excavated materials contain over one percent friable asbestos, they shall be treated as hazardous waste, and shall be transported and disposed of in accordance with applicable federal and state regulations.</li> <li>(b) <u>Dust suppression</u>: Soils exposed during excavation for site preparation and project construction activities shall be kept moist throughout the time they are exposed, both during and after construction work hours.</li> <li>(c) <u>Surface water runoff control</u>: Where soils are stockpiled, plastic sheeting shall be used to create an impermeable liner, both beneath and on top of the soils, with a berm to contain any potential surface water runoff from the soil stockpiles during inclement weather and from air.</li> <li>(d) <u>Soils replacement</u>: If necessary, clean fill or other suitable material(s) shall be used to bring portions of the project site, where contaminated soils have been excavated and removed,</li> </ul>								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									up to construction grade. (e) <b>Hauling and disposal:</b> Contaminated soils shall be hauled off the project site by waste hauling trucks appropriately certified with the State of California and adequately covered to prevent dispersion of the soils during transit, and shall be disposed of at a permitted hazardous waste disposal facility registered with the State of California. Nonhazardous soil shall be sent to other sites to be used as import fill where accepted or shall be transported and disposed of at a licensed Class II or Class III landfill, as appropriate. Soil classified as California hazardous waste shall be transported either out of state to an appropriate licensed facility or to a Class I facility in California. Soil classified as RCRA hazardous waste shall be transported to a Class I landfill facility in California.  <b>Step 3: Preparation of Closure/Certification Report</b> After construction activities are completed, the project sponsor shall prepare and submit a closure/certification report to the SFDPH for review and approval. The closure/certification report shall include the mitigation measures in the SMPs for handling and removing contaminated soils from the project site, whether the construction contractor modified any of these mitigation measures, and how and why the construction contractor modified those mitigation measures.  <b>M-HZ-N1b: Preparation of Unknown Contingency Plan</b> Before the issuance of site, building, or other permit from the city for development activities involving subsurface disturbance, CPMC shall prepare and submit to SFDPH for approval a contingency plan to address unknown contaminants encountered during development activities. This plan, the conditions of which shall be incorporated into the first permit and any applicable permit thereafter, shall establish and describe procedures for implementing a contingency plan, including appropriate notification and site control procedures, in the event unanticipated subsurface hazards or hazardous material releases are discovered during construction. Control procedures shall include, but shall not be limited to, further investigation and, if necessary, remediation of such hazards or releases, including off-campus removal and disposal, containment, or treatment. In accordance with the procedures outlined in the ECPs, measures following the discovery of previously unidentified USTs or other subsurface facilities shall include, but shall not be limited to, the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work at the location of the discovered tank shall be halted, the exposed portion of the tank shall be covered with plastic sheeting, and the area shall be secured while the tank and surrounding soil (if unvaulted) are evaluated. The site superintendent shall be notified, and an appropriate environmental professional shall be brought on-site to evaluate the nature, use, and extent of the tank. The contractor's health and safety plan shall be reviewed and revised, if necessary, and appropriately trained personnel (e.g., HAZWOPER trained) shall be mobilized to address the tank. If the tank is ruptured</li> </ul>								

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																								
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)														
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants							
									<p>during discovery, the contractor, at the direction of the environmental professional, shall attempt to contain any contents that have been released to the soil. The top of the tank shall be uncovered to locate an access port, and the tank shall be opened to evaluate the contents. The tank shall be sounded to evaluate its size and the presence and amount of tank contents remaining (if any). A sample of the contents shall be collected, if possible. On determining the nature and use of the tank, the environmental professional and/or contractor shall notify BAAQMD, SFDPH, and SFFD. During all work performed in response to the presence of the tank, the air in the working area shall be monitored for volatile organic compounds, and the tank shall remain covered with the tarpaulin whenever access is not necessary. Tanks discovered in vaults in basements shall be removed after the building above has been demolished. All tanks shall be removed in accordance with the procedures described in the ECPs for the campuses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If other subsurface facilities containing or associated with hazardous materials, such as oil pits, sumps associated with clarification or neutralization of liquid waste, piping associated with underground tanks, piping that may be composed of asbestos-containing material, and building drainage systems (e.g., waste lines, sewer laterals) are encountered during demolition and excavation, work in the area shall be halted and the facility be covered in plastic sheeting. If a sump and/or vaults are identified during excavation activities, the facility shall be managed in the same manner as required for underground tanks. If drainage lines or piping are encountered, they shall be observed and evaluated to determine use and composition. If piping contains liquid wastes, these wastes shall be contained as completely as possible, transferred to secure containers, sampled, and subsequently disposed of off-site. If piping is composed of asbestos-containing materials, the material shall be removed, bagged, and disposed of appropriately. If piping is not composed of asbestos-containing materials, it shall be removed and subsequently sent off-site as scrap. Soil adjacent to and in the vicinity of the discovered facilities shall be examined, evaluated, and managed as described for other soils at the campuses.</li> </ul> <p>In the event unanticipated subsurface hazards or hazardous material releases are discovered during construction, the requirements of this unknown contingency plan shall be followed. The contingency plan shall be amended, as necessary, in the event new information becomes available that could affect the implementation of the plan.</p> <p><b>M-HZ-L1a (Pacific and Davies long-term)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1 for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of site mitigation plan (SMPs) for the long-term projects at the Pacific and Davies Campuses.</p> <p><b>M-HZ-L1b (Pacific and Davies long-term)</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1b for near-term</p>															

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																		
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)								
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants	
									impacts and requires the preparation of unknown contingency plans for the long-term projects at the Pacific and Davies Campuses. <b>M-HZ-L1c (Pacific and Davies long-term)</b> Before the issuance of site, building, or other permits from the City for development activities involving subsurface disturbance, the project sponsor shall update the environmental site assessments (ESAs) for the Pacific and Davies Campuses. The updated ESAs shall include the results of a current environmental database search conducted pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. The results shall be incorporated into the SMPs for the campuses.									
<b>Impact HZ-2:</b> Project operations would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment during project operation.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HZ-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<b>Impact HZ-3:</b> The project would not emit hazardous emissions or involve handling of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or wastes within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school during construction or operation.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HZ-3.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	
<b>Impact HZ-4:</b> The project would not be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled in accordance with Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment; in the long term, however, project construction could occur on such a site, and thus could create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.	PS	PS	PS		PS	PS	PS	PS	<b>Cathedral Hill Campus</b> <b>M-HZ-N4a</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1a for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of site mitigation plan (SMPs) for the near-term projects at the Cathedral Hill Campus. <b>M-HZ-N4b</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1b for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of unknown contingency plans for the near-term projects at the Cathedral Hill Campus.  <b>Davies Campus (near-term)</b> <b>M-HZ-N4c</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1a for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of site mitigation plan (SMPs) for the near-term projects at the Davies Campus. <b>M-HZ-N4d</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1b for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of unknown contingency plans for the near-term projects at the Davies Campus.  <b>St. Luke's Campus</b> <b>M-HZ-N4e</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1a for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of site mitigation plan (SMPs) for the near-term projects at the Cathedral Hill Campus. <b>M-HZ-N4f</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1b for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of unknown contingency plans	LTS M	LTSM	LTS M		LTS M	LTSM	LTSM	LTSM	



Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
									for the near-term projects at the Cathedral Hill Campus.  <b>Pacific Campus (long-term)</b> <b>M-HZ-L4a</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1a for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of site mitigation plan (SMPs) for the long-term projects at the Pacific Campus. <b>M-HZ-L4b</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1b for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of unknown contingency plans for the long-term projects at the Pacific Campus. <b>M-HZ-L4c</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-L1c and requires an update to the site-specific environmental database search conducted pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 for the Pacific Campus.  <b>Davies Campus (long-term)</b> <b>M-HZ-L4d</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1a for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of site mitigation plan (SMPs) for the long-term projects at the Davies Campus. <b>M-HZ-L4e</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-N1b for near-term impacts and requires the preparation of unknown contingency plans for the long-term projects at the Davies Campus. <b>M-HZ-L4f</b> This mitigation measure is identical to M-HZ-L1c and requires an update to the site-specific environmental database search conducted pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 for the Davies Campus.								
<b>Impact HZ-5:</b> The project would not be located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or private airstrip, and as a result, would not create a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HZ-5.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HZ-6:</b> The project would not conflict with emergency response or evacuation plans during the project's construction and operational periods.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HZ-6.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>Impact HZ-7:</b> The project would not expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving fires.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact HZ-7.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.17: Minerals and Energy Resources</b>																	
<b>Impact ME-1:</b> The project would not result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the state, nor would it result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact ME-1.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI

Table S-2 Summary of CPMC LRDP Impacts and Mitigation Measures																	
Impact(s)	Proposed LRDP Level of Significance								Mitigation Measure(s)	Level of Significance after Mitigation Measure(s)							
	CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants		CH	CH w/ variants	Pac (long-term)	Cal	Dav	Dav (long-term)	StL	StL w/ variants
<b>Impact ME-2:</b> The project would encourage activities that would result in the use of large amounts of fuel, water, and energy, but these resources would not be used in a wasteful manner.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact ME-2.	LTS	LTS	LTS		LTS	LTS	LTS	LTS
<b>4.18: Agricultural and Forest Resources</b>																	
<b>Impact AG-1:</b> The project would not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance; would not conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract; and would not involve other changes in the existing environment that, because of their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland of Statewide Importance to nonagricultural use.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AG-1.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Impact AG-2:</b> The project would not result in conflicts with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land or timberland.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AG-2.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI
<b>Impact AG-3:</b> The project would not result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to nonforest use.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI	No mitigation measures are required at any CPMC campuses for Impact AG-3.	NI	NI	NI		NI	NI	NI	NI

Notes: *Campuses:* CH = Cathedral Hill; Pac = Pacific; Cal = California; Dav = Davies; StL = St. Luke's. *Levels of Significance:* LTS = Less than Significant; LTSM = Less than Significant with Mitigation; PS = Potentially Significant; PSU = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable; PSU/M = Potentially Significant and Unavoidable after Mitigation; SU = Significant and Unavoidable Impact; NI = No Impact; SI = Significant Impact; SU/M = Significant and Unavoidable Impact after Mitigation.

PLACE  
POSTAGE  
HERE

San Francisco Planning Department  
Major Environmental Analysis  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, California 94103

Attn: Environmental Review Coordinator  
2005.0555E: California Pacific Medical Center LRDP

PLEASE CUT ALONG DOTTED LINE

RETURN REQUEST REQUIRED FOR FINAL  
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

REQUEST FOR FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

TO: San Francisco Planning Department  
Major Environmental Analysis

*Check one box:*  Please send me a copy of the Final EIR on CD.  
 Please send me a paper copy of the Final EIR.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

Print Your Name and Address Below