

SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

Addendum to Environmental Impact Report

Addendum Date:	January 2, 2014
Case No.:	2007.0603E
Project Title:	San Francisco General Hospital Seismic Compliance Hospital
	Replacement Program
EIR:	2007.0603E, certified June 19, 2008
Project Sponsors:	Diane Kay, UCSF Campus Planning (415) 502-5311
	Mark Primeau, SF Department of Public Health, (415) 554-2789
Lead Agency:	San Francisco Planning Department
Staff Contact:	Jeanie Poling – (415) 575-9072
	jeanie.poling@sfgov.org

1650 Mission St. Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103-2479

Reception: 415.558.6378

Fax: 415.558.6409

Planning Information: 415.558.6377

REMARKS

Background

The San Francisco General Hospital Seismic Compliance Hospital Replacement Program Environment Impact Report (SFGH EIR) was certified by the Planning Commission on June 19, 2008.¹ The project analyzed in the EIR is the construction of a new approximately 422,144 gross-square-foot, seven-story acute care hospital to comply with seismic safety requirements of Senate Bill 1953; the relocation of acute care services from the existing Main Hospital to the new hospital; the phasing out of certain non-acute care services on the SFGH campus; and landscape improvements bordering the new hospital.

The project received Conditional Use Authorization for a Planned Unit Development addressing height measurement modification, bulk, and parking, among other approvals.² The new acute care hospital is currently being constructed on the former west lawn area of the SFGH campus, located along Potrero Avenue, between Buildings 20 and 30 (see Figure 1). Acute care services currently located in the existing Main Hospital (Building 5) will be relocated to the new hospital, and the vacated space in the existing Main Hospital will be reused for non-acute care medical and administrative uses. The SFGH campus is in a P (Public) Use District and a 105-E Height and Bulk District.

Construction of the new acute care hospital is anticipated to be completed in 2015. The San Francisco Department of Public Health (SFDPH) and the University of California San Francisco (UCSF)³ are also in the early planning stages of a project that would build a new research building on an existing parking lot on the southeast portion of the SFGH campus (the B/C Lot), and expand the City-owned parking

¹ Planning Commission Motion No. 17623, June 19, 2008. Project files are available for review at 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, as part of Case No. 2007.0603E.

² Planning Commission Motion No. 17766, November 20, 2008. Project files available for review at 1650 Mission Street, 4th Floor, as part of Case No. 2007.0603C.

³ UCSF and SFDPH staff work together at the SFGH campus to provide trauma, psychiatric and emergency care, outpatient treatment and other medical services.

structure across 23rd Street from the campus to accommodate parking that would be displaced by the development of the new research building. The proposed research building/parking structure expansion project will undergo its own environmental review and is not the subject of this EIR Addendum. Figure 1 provides a site plan of the SFGH campus.

Project Description

The revised project entails the following elements:

- Construction of a 10-foot "fall-zone" around the perimeter of Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40 and 100 using fencing and landscaping, including:
 - Three new fences and gates on the south and north facades of Building 100;
 - New vegetation and paving (measuring approximately 10 feet in width) along the west façade of Building 10;
 - New vegetation and paving near the northwest corner of Building 20 on either side of the non-historic exit stairway;
 - New vegetation and paving at the southwest corner of Building 30 on either side of the non-historic exit stairway;
 - New vegetation and paving (measuring approximately 10 feet in width) along the west façade of Building 40.
- Construction of one new self-supporting steel canopy facing an inner courtyard currently occupied by mechanical equipment along the north façade of Building 40; and,
- Re-anchoring/repairing historic clay tile roof on Building 30.

These landscape alterations and steel canopy are anticipated to be in place for approximately five to seven years.

The Final SFGH EIR noted that the seismic retrofit of Buildings 1, 10/20, 30/40, 80/90, and 100 would occur after the completion and operation of the new acute care hospital. The landscaping, fencing, canopy and tire repair that are currently proposed are interim measures until those permanent repairs/stabilizations can occur. Thus, the revised project is a minor technical change or addition to the SFGH project analyzed in the SFGH EIR.

Approvals Required

The project requires approval by the San Francisco Health Commission and a building permit from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection.



Figure 1 – San Francisco General Hospital Campus

Source: San Francisco General Hospital Seismic Compliance Hospital Replacement Program EIR, Case No. 2007.0603E, Figure III-2.

Note: The replacement acute care hospital that is currently under construction is within the dotted lines. The proposed research building that is currently in the early planning stages would be located on the existing parking lot south of Building 5 and east of West Drive.

Analysis of Potential Environmental Effects

Section 31.19(c)(1) of the San Francisco Administrative Code states that a modified project must be reevaluated and that, "If, on the basis of such reevaluation, the Environmental Review Officer determines, based on the requirements of CEQA, that no additional environmental review is necessary, this determination and the reasons therefor shall be noted in writing in the case record, and no further evaluation shall be required by this Chapter."

CEQA Guidelines Section 15164 provides for the use of an addendum to document the basis of a lead agency's decision not to require a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR for a project that is already adequately covered in an existing certified EIR. The lead agency's decision to use an addendum must be supported by substantial evidence that the conditions that would trigger the preparation of a Subsequent EIR, as provided in CEQA Guidelines Section 15162, are not present.

The SFGH EIR determined that implementation of the project would not result in any significant and unavoidable physical environmental impacts related to plans and policies; land use and planning; population, housing and employment; aesthetics (visual quality and urban design); shadow and wind; utilities, service systems, and energy; public services; biological, agricultural, and mineral resources; and growth inducement.

The EIR furthermore determined that the project would result in potentially significant impacts that could be reduced to less-than-significant levels with implementation of mitigation measures for impacts related to noise; air quality; geology, soils and seismicity; hydrology and water quality; and hazards and hazardous materials.

The EIR concluded that the project would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to the historical integrity of the eligible SFGH District, a historical resource under CEQA. Mitigation measures were identified in the EIR to reduce this significant impact, but would not be sufficient to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. The EIR also found that the project would result in significant and unavoidable transportation impacts in that it would contribute considerably to adverse cumulative traffic conditions on southbound US Highway 101 off-ramp to Potrero Avenue and Cesar Chavez Boulevard under future (2021) cumulative conditions. Mitigation measures were identified in the EIR to reduce this significant to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Historical Resources

Preservation Planning staff reviewed the revised project.⁴ The SFGH campus comprises an eligible historic district (the SFGH District), and the SFGH EIR identifies character-defining landscape features of the District:

⁴ Rich Sucre, Preservation Planner, San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) Seismic Compliance Hospital Replacement Program, Case No. 2007.0603E, EIR Addendum: Interim Seismic Measures, Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40 and 100. This memo is attached.

The SFGH District is bounded by brick and steel perimeter fencing, constructed of brick posts with terra cotta capitals and medallions, interspersed with vertical metal railings. The primary entries are characterized by double-arched decorative metal gates. Brick gatehouses, located at each primary entry to the south campus (one each on Potrero Avenue and 23rd Street, as well as one at the entry to the north campus on 22nd Street), feature gable and parapet Mission tile roofs, Craftsman brackets, doors, and windows with metal grilles. The brick bus shelter, with Mission tile gable roof, arched bays, and Palladian windows, is also an important feature. The wide concrete stairway from Potrero Avenue, flanked by brick windowpane casings with terra cotta details and formal gardens, is an important element of the 1915 design and appears to retain its integrity of design. Lighted by period metal electroliers, the stairway and gardens provide a human scale entry and a sense of arrival. Although not all dating to the 1915 period, concrete pathways, lawns, and ornamental plantings provide open spaces and contrasting greenery in the midst of the red and terra cotta colors.

The SFGH EIR identified significant adverse and unavoidable impacts of the project to historic architectural resources, specifically caused by the construction of a new acute care hospital on the SFGH campus. The EIR stated that while the project would not alter any historic fabric of adjacent Buildings 10/20 and 30/40, project construction would result in direct impacts to the SFGH District by removing the concrete entry stairway to the main campus along Potrero Avenue and the formal rectangular gardens and lawns. Most of these landscape elements are from the period of significance for the SFGH District. The EIR determined that these landscape features contributed to the eligibility of the SFGH District.

Planning Department preservation technical specialist staff reviewed the revised project and found that there would be no substantial change in the scope of work and that the revised project would cause no greater impact to historic resources on the SFGH campus than originally reviewed in the SFGH EIR. The revised project would be consistent with the *Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation,* and would not cause a substantial adverse impact to Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40, and 100. Specifically, the revised project is additive in nature, and does not damage or remove any historic features. Further, the self-supporting steel canopy designed for Building 40 would be located in a discrete location, would be minimally visible from public rights-of-way, and would not be attached to the historic building, thus would not impact any existing historic fabric on the SFGH campus. Finally, the new landscaping and fencing around the perimeter of Building 100 would not detract from the overall historic character of the surrounding eligible historic district. These new landscape elements would be designed to be consistent with the district's historic landscaping and would feature a mix of vegetation and hardscape.

The revised project would not significantly impact the landscape elements that are character-defining features of the eligible historic district and would be designed in a manner that would be compatible with the existing historic landscape features of the SFGH District — for example, the decorative metal rails and planting palette would be consistent with existing historic features. The revised project would not result in a greater impact to the setting of the eligible historic district compared to what was analyzed in the SFGH EIR, since the new interim work would be designed to be compatible with the district's overall historic character.

As the revised project would not cause additional significant impacts to historic resources on the SFGH campus, the EIR mitigation measures for historic architectural resources would remain in place. Relative to Historic Architecture Resources, the EIR identified the following mitigation measures:

- Architectural Resources Mitigation Measure Documentation
- Architectural Resources Mitigation Measure Interpretation
 - Placard
 - Interior Display and Video
 - Brochures
- Architectural Resources Mitigation Measure Historic Integrity
 - Removal of Incompatible Building Modifications
 - Perimeter Fence Improvements
 - Restoration of Landscape Feature
 - Conditions Assessment and Maintenance Program for Historic Structures
 - Design Mitigation

Since the EIR was published, SFGH has undertaken and will continue implementation of these mitigation measures. As per the identified mitigation, UCSF and SFDPH will ensure that future work is restorative in nature and will assist in maintaining the integrity of the SFGH District.

In conclusion, the revised project would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of the previously identified significant impact on historic resources and would not require any new mitigation measures.

Other Impacts

The EIR noted that the project would change the existing visual relationships between buildings on campus and would alter the existing visual quality and character of the campus. The EIR noted that, when viewed from Potrero Avenue, the campus buildings contribute to the unique character of the campus. The revised project would change the project site's visual character via the use of fencing and landscaping around the perimeter of Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40 and 100 and the addition of a canopy along the north façade of Building 40. While these changes would be noticeable, they would be consistent with the architectural style and visual character of the campus and thus would not cause significant adverse impacts to the existing visual character of the site.

The EIR concluded that although the adopted project could alter existing views from public viewpoints, because of the proposed development onsite, it would not have a substantial adverse effect on scenic views or vistas. The revised project is similar to the previously approved project in height, bulk, and building square footage and open space placement, and would result in similar changes to existing views immediately surrounding the project site boundaries. Similar to the adopted project and the project analyzed in the EIR, the revised project would not substantially or adversely degrade public views or

scenic vistas, result in a degradation of the visual quality or character of the site or surroundings or create substantial new sources of light or glare. Project and cumulative aesthetic effects would be less than significant.

Other than historic resources and visual character, all other topics that were addressed in the SFGH EIR⁵ would not be affected by the proposed change, and impacts identified in the EIR, as described above, would remain the same.

Conclusion

Based on the foregoing, it is concluded that the analyses conducted and the conclusions reached in the SFGH EIR certified on June 19, 2008, remain valid. The proposed revisions to the previously approved project would not cause new significant impacts not identified in the SFGH EIR, and no new mitigation measures would be necessary to reduce significant impacts related to the revised project. The proposed new research building on the existing B/C Lot on campus that is in the early stages of planning and is not covered by this SFGH EIR Addendum would not affect or be affected by the proposed interim seismic improvements. No changes have occurred with respect to circumstances surrounding the revised project that would cause significant environmental impacts to which the project would contribute considerably, and no new information has become available that shows that the project would cause significant environmental impacts. Therefore, no supplemental environmental review is required beyond this addendum.

Date of Determination:

January 2nd, 2014

I do hereby certify that the above determination has been made pursuant to State and Local requirements.

Ktomila Wis

Sarah B. Jones Environmental Review Officer

cc: Diane Kay, UCSF Campus Planning Mark Primeau, SF Department of Public Health Rich Sucré, San Francisco Planning Dept. Bulletin Board / Master Decision File Distribution List

⁵ Plans and policies; land use; population, housing, and employment; shadow and wind; archeological and paleontological resources; transportation, circulation, and parking; noise; air quality; utilities, service systems, and energy; public services ; geology, soils, and seismicity ; hydrology and water quality, hazardous materials ; and biological, agricultural, and mineral resources.



SAN FRANCISCO PLANNING DEPARTMENT

MEM

DATE: TO:	December 27, 2013 File	1650 Mission St. Suite 400 San Francisco, CA 94103-2479
FROM:	Richard Sucre, Preservation Technical Specialist/Planner, Southeast (SE) Quadrant	Reception: 415.558.6378
RE:	San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) Seismic Compliance, Hospital Replacement Program Case No. 2007.0603E	Fax: 415.558.6409
	EIR Addendum: Interim Seismic Measures, Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40 and 100	Planning Information:

415.558.6377

The San Francisco General Hospital (SFGH) Seismic Compliance, Hospital Replacement Program Environment Impact Report (EIR) was certified by the Planning Commission on June 19, 2008.

On December 19, 2013, the University of California San Francisco (UCSF), on behalf of the SFGH and the Department of Public Health (DPH), submitted a revised project for interim seismic safety measures for Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40 and 100. In brief, the revised project entails:

- Construction of a 10-ft "fall-zone" around the perimeter of Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40 and 100 using fencing and landscaping;
- Construction of one new self-supporting steel canopy facing an inner courtyard currently occupied by mechanical equipment along the north facade of Building 40; and,
- Re-anchoring/repairing historic clay tile roof on Building 30. •

These landscape alterations are anticipated to be in place for approximately five to seven years.

In detail, the revised project would construct new landscape features and fences consisting of: three new fences and gates on the south and north facades of Building 100; installation of new vegetation and paving (measuring approximately 10-ft) along the west façade of Building 10; installation of new vegetation and paving near the northwest corner of Building 20, on either side of the non-historic exit stairway; installation of new vegetation and paving at the southwest corner of Building 30, on either side of the non-historic exit stairway; and, installation of new vegetation and paving (measuring approximately 10-ft) along the west façade of Building 40.

As noted in the EIR, significant adverse and unavoidable impacts were identified to historic architectural resources, specifically caused by the construction of a new acute care hospital. The EIR stated that while the project would not alter any historic fabric of adjacent Buildings 10/20 and 30/40, project construction would result in direct impacts to the SFGH District by removing the concrete entry stairway, flanking brick windowpane casing walls with terra cotta escutcheons, and formal rectangular gardens and lawns. Most of these landscape elements persist from the period of significance for the SFGH District. The EIR determined that these landscape features contributed to the eligibility of the SFGH District.

Department Preservation staff reviewed the revised project and found that there is no substantial change in the scope of work and that the project would cause no greater impact to historic resources than originally reviewed in the EIR (Case No. 2007.0603E). The revised project would be consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation, and would not cause a substantial adverse impact to Buildings 10, 20, 30, 40 and 100. Specifically, the revised project would repair failing elements of the existing terracotta roof, as evidenced by the work at Building 30. The revised project is additive in nature, and does not damage or remove any historic features. Further, the self-supporting steel canopy designed for Building 40 would be located in a discrete location, would be minimally visible from public rights-of-way, and would not be attached to the historic building, thus would not impact any existing historic fabric. Finally, the new landscaping and fencing around the perimeter of the subject buildings would not detract from the overall historic character of the surrounding historic district. These new landscape elements would be designed to be consistent with the district's historic landscaping and would feature a mix of vegetation and hardscape.

As noted in the EIR, the character-defining landscape features of the SFGH Historic District include:

The SFGH District is bounded by brick and steel perimeter fencing, constructed of brick posts with terra cotta capitals and medallions, interspersed with vertical metal railings. The primary entries are characterized by double-arched decorative metal gates. Brick gatehouses, located at each primary entry to the south campus (one each on Potrero Avenue and 23rd Street, as well as one at the entry to the north campus on 22nd Street), feature gable and parapet Mission tile roofs, Craftsman brackets, doors, and windows with metal grilles. The brick bus shelter, with Mission tile gable roof, arched bays, and Palladian windows, is also an important feature. The wide concrete stairway from Potrero Avenue, flanked by brick windowpane casings with terra cotta details and formal gardens, is an important element of the 1915 design and appears to retain its integrity of design. Lighted by period metal electroliers, the stairway and gardens provide a human scale entry and a sense of arrival. Although not all dating to the 1915 period, concrete pathways, lawns, and ornamental plantings provide open spaces and contrasting greenery in the midst of the red and terra cotta colors.

The revised project would not impact these landscape elements, and would be designed in a manner to be compatible with the existing historic landscape features, as evidenced by the decorative metal rails and planting palette. The revised project does not result in a greater impact to the setting to the historic district, since the new work is designed to be compatible with the district's overall historic character.

As the revised project would not cause additional impacts to historic resources, the EIR mitigation measures for historic architectural resources would remain in place. Relative to Historic Architecture Resources, the EIR identified the following mitigation measures:

- Architectural Resources Mitigation Measure Documentation
- Architectural Resources Mitigation Measure Interpretation
 - Placard
 - Interior Display and Video
 - Brochures
- Architectural Resources Mitigation Measure Historic Integrity
 - Removal of Incompatible Building Modifications
 - Perimeter Fence Improvements

- Restoration of Landscape Feature
- Conditions Assessment and Maintenance Program for Historic Structures
- Design Mitigation

Since the EIR was published, SFGH has undertaken and will continue implementation of these mitigation measures. As per the identified mitigation, SFGH/DPH will ensure that future work is restorative in nature and will assist in maintaining the integrity of the historic district.

cc: Devyani Jain, Senior Environmental Planner Tina Tam, Senior Preservation Planner Jeanie Poling, Environmental Planner

 $(RS) \ G: \verb| Documents \verb| Environmental \verb| SFGH Seismic \verb| SFGH EIR Addendum Memo.doc| \\$