

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT
FOR THE
SHARP OCEAN VIEW TOWER PROJECT

EIR 15-0002

SCH NO. 2016021010

CEQA FINDINGS OF FACT

August 23, 2016

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) prepared for the proposed SHARP OCEAN VIEW TOWER PROJECT (project) addresses the potential environmental effects associated with implementation of the project. In addition, the Final EIR evaluates two alternatives to the project. These alternatives include the following: (1) No Project-No Build Alternative; and (2) Reduced Height Alternative.

These findings have been prepared in accordance with requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA; Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., Title 14, § 15000 et seq.).

II.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The project site is located within the City of Chula Vista (City), in southwestern San Diego County approximately one mile east of Interstate 805 (I-805) and one-quarter mile south of Telegraph Canyon Road. The project includes the construction of a new hospital tower, called the Ocean View Tower (OVT) on a 2.47-acre footprint within the existing Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center campus. As shown in Final EIR Figures 3-2 through 3-5, the project would be 197,696 square feet and seven stories in height: to include 138 beds; 6 operating rooms with pre- and post-operational support; sterile processing; dietary services; material management; dock; morgue; and pharmacy; as well as a rooftop ocean view café. Total height of the OVT would be 110 feet 9 inches for the tower itself; reaching a maximum height of 120 feet to the top of the elevator enclosure (see Final EIR Figure 3-7).

Additional component parts of the project include improved circulation and access and parking. The project would construct a new main entrance connecting directly to the OVT providing patient drop-off access along the existing new Loop Road. Following drop-off, drivers would then have continued access to the proposed parking structure and other surface lots. Upon completion of the project, the campus' total parking requirement would be 1,605. The project would require removal of 32 existing spaces; but a 717-stall parking garage was completed in 2014. Thus, upon conclusion of project construction there would be a total of 2,268 spaces provided on the Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center campus. As discussed in the Final EIR, this results in a surplus of 663 parking spaces above the 1,605 spaces required by the City's Municipal Code.

Project phasing is proposed as follows: Phase 1 (January 2016–August 2016) - planning and coordination; Phase 2 (September 2016–February 2017) - preliminary Utility Relocation, Shoring, and Foundations; Phase 3 (March 2017–September 2019) - Constructing the OVT; and Phase 4 (October 2019–February 2020) - finishing touches. Details of the phases are discussed in Section 3.8 of the Final EIR.

The Chula Vista City Council will consider the following discretionary actions required to implement the project:

- Conditional Use Permit (CUP)
- Major Planning Application (Precise Plan)
- Design Review

III.

BACKGROUND

The existing 343-bed Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center has grown over the years to accommodate increased demand and need for services. The East Tower was the first major facility, opening in 1975, and was supplemented by the construction of the Birch Patrick Facility in 1989, which included 100 skilled nursing and long-term care beds. An additional 104 beds were added in 1991 when the West Tower was constructed; then the Douglas and Nancy Barnhart Cancer Center and medical offices opened in 2012. However, the hospital experiences shortages of 25 to 30 beds every day, resulting in diversions of patients to other facilities and the shortage is anticipated to increase as the population in the South Bay continues to expand. In 2012 Sharp began planning for this growth by developing a new Master Plan which provides a comprehensive solution to both the current overcrowding situation and the need to meet the requirements of the Senate Bill (SB) 1953 seismic requirements.

The City approved "Make Ready" work which was completed in late 2015. The "Make Ready" phase included relocations and reorganization of existing utilities, cooling towers, and surface parking; as well as construction of a new 717-stall parking structure and Loop Road.

IV.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

For purposes of CEQA and the findings set forth below, the administrative record of the City Council decision on the environmental analysis of this project shall consist of the following:

- The Notice of Preparation and all other public notices issued by the City in conjunction with the project;
- The Draft and Final EIR for the project (EIR #15-0002; SCH NO. 2016021010), including appendices and technical reports;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the public comment period on the Draft EIR;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by the City, consultants to the City, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the City's compliance with the requirements of CEQA and the City's actions on the project;

- All documents, comments, and correspondence submitted by members of the public and public agencies in connection with this project, in addition to comments on the Draft EIR for the project;
- All documents submitted to the City by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the EIR, up through the close of the public hearing;
- Minutes and verbatim transcripts of all workshops, the scoping meeting, other public meetings, and public hearings held by the City, or videotapes where transcripts are not available or adequate;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted at workshops, public meetings, and public hearings for this project;
- The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP);
- Matters of common knowledge to the City which the members of the City Council considered regarding this project, including federal, state, and local laws and regulations and including, but not limited to the following:
 - City General Plan;
 - Relevant portions of the Municipal Code;
- Any documents expressly cited in these Findings; and
- Any other materials required to be in the record of proceedings by Section 21167.6(e) of CEQA.

The documents and other materials that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the City Council's decision is based are located at the Office of the City Clerk to the City Council, whose office is located at 276 Fourth Avenue, Chula Vista, California 91910. Copies of all these documents, which constitute the record of proceedings, are and at all relevant times have been available upon request at the offices of the City at the above addresses. This information is provided in compliance with Public Resources Code Section 21081.6(a)(2) and 14 California Code of Regulations Section 15091(e).

The City Council has relied on all of the documents listed above in reaching its decision on the project, even if every document was not formally presented to the City Council or City staff as part of the City files generated in connection with the project. Without exception, any documents set forth above but not found in the project files fall into two categories. Many of them reflect prior planning or legislative decisions with which the City Council was aware in approving the project (see *City of Santa Cruz v. Local Agency Formation Commission* (1978) 76

Cal App 3d 381, 391-392 [142 Cal Rptr. 873]; *Dominey v. Department of Personnel Administration* (1988) 205 Cal.App.3d 729, 738, fn. 6 [252 Cal. Rptr. 620]). Other documents influenced the expert advice provided to City staff or consultants, who then provided advice to the City Council. For that reason, such documents form part of the underlying factual basis for the City Council's decisions relating to the adoption of the project (see Pub. Resources Code, Section 21167.6, subd. (e)(10); *Browing-Ferris Industries v. City Council of City of San Jose* (1986) 181 Cal.App.3d 852, 866 [226 Cal.Rptr. 575]; *Stanislaus Audubon Society, Inc. v. County of Stanislaus* (1995) 33 Cal.App.4th 144, 153, 155 [39 Cal.Rptr.2d 54]).

V.

LEGAL EFFECTS OF FINDINGS

To the extent that these findings conclude that proposed mitigation measures outlined in the Final EIR are feasible and have not been modified, superseded, or withdrawn, the City (or "decision makers") hereby binds itself and any other responsible parties, including the applicant and its successors in interest (hereinafter referred to as "Applicant"), to implement those measures. These findings, in other words, are not merely informational or hortatory, but constitute a binding set of obligations that will come into effect when the City adopts the resolution(s) approving the project.

The adopted mitigation measures are express conditions of approval. Other requirements are referenced in the MMRP adopted concurrently with these findings and will be effectuated through the process of implementing the project.

VI.

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

As required by CEQA Section 21081.6(a)(1), the City, in adopting these findings, also concurrently adopts a MMRP as prepared by the environmental consultant under the direction of the City. The program is designed to ensure that during project implementation, the applicant and any other responsible parties comply with the feasible mitigation measures identified below. The MMRP is included as Chapter 11 of the Final EIR.

The City will use the MMRP to track compliance with project mitigation measures. The MMRP will be available for public review during the compliance period. The program includes monitoring team qualifications, specific monitoring activities, a reporting system, and criteria for evaluating the success of the mitigation measures.

VII.

GENERAL FINDINGS

The City Council hereby finds as follows:

- The foregoing statements are true and correct;
- The Final EIR was completed in compliance with CEQA;
- The Final EIR reflects the City Council's independent judgment;
- An MMRP has been prepared for the proposed project, which the City Council has adopted or made a condition of approval of the proposed project. That MMRP is also included in the Final EIR as Chapter 11 and is therefore incorporated herein and is considered part of the record of proceedings for the proposed project;
- The MMRP designates responsibility and anticipated timing for the implementation of mitigation;
- In determining whether the proposed project has a significant impact on the environment, and in adopting these Findings pursuant to CEQA Section 21081, the City Council has complied with CEQA Sections 21081.5 and 21082.2;
- The impacts of the proposed project have been analyzed to the extent feasible at the time of certification of the Final EIR;
- The City Council has made no decisions related to approval of the proposed project prior to certification of the Final EIR, nor has the City Council previously committed to a definite course of action with respect to the proposed project; and
- Copies of all the documents incorporated by reference in the Final EIR are and have been available upon request at all times at the City, custodians of record for such documents or other materials.

VIII

SUMMARY OF IMPACTS

The Final EIR analyzed the environmental impacts that could result from the proposed project. The Final EIR concluded that the following issue areas were determined during preliminary project review not to be significant (see, Final EIR Section 9):

- Cultural Resources (Archaeological and Historic)
- Biological Resources
- Agricultural and Forestry Resource

- Housing and Population
- Mineral Resources
- Public Services (including fire protection, police services, and public facilities)

The Final EIR concluded that impacts associated with the following issue areas would be less than significant, and no mitigation would be required (see, Final EIR Section 5):

- Land Use
- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Greenhouse Gas
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Risk of Upset
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Noise
- Public Utilities

The Final EIR identified a significant direct and cumulative environmental impacts resulting from the project with regard to the following issues:

- Transportation and Circulation (operational direct impacts, cumulative impacts, construction-related impacts)
- Paleontological Resources (direct impacts)

All significant impacts would be fully avoided through the adoption of feasible mitigation measures. No impacts would remain significant and unmitigated.

IX.

FINDINGS OF FACT

CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines require that the environmental impacts of a project be examined before a project is approved. Specifically, regarding findings, CEQA Guidelines Section 15091 provides:

- (a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an Environmental Impact Report has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.
 2. Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the Final EIR.
- (b) The findings required by subdivision (a) shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- (c) The finding in subdivision (a)(2) shall not be made if the agency making the finding has concurrent jurisdiction with another agency to deal with identified feasible mitigation measures or alternatives. The finding in subdivision (a)(3) shall describe the specific reasons for rejecting identified mitigation measures and project alternatives.
- (d) When making the findings required in subdivision (a)(1), the agency shall also adopt a program for reporting on or monitoring the changes which it has either required in the project or made a condition of approval to avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects. These measures must be fully enforceable through permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.
- (e) The public agency shall specify the location and custodian of the documents or other materials which constitute the record of the proceedings upon which its decision is based.
- (f) A statement made pursuant to Section 15093 does not substitute for the findings required by this section.

The "changes or alterations" referred to in CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1) above, that are required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant environmental effects of the project, may include a wide variety of measures or actions as set forth in CEQA Guidelines section 15370, including:

- (a) Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- (b) Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action and its implementation.

- (c) Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the impacted environment.
- (d) Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- (e) Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the Final EIR for the proposed project, as well as all other information in the record of proceedings on this matter, the following Supplemental Findings are hereby adopted by the City Council in its capacity as the CEQA Lead Agency.

With respect to transportation and circulation and paleontological resources, the Final EIR concludes that the proposed project would result in significant environmental impacts requiring mitigation.

A. FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS MITIGATED TO BELOW A LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE (CEQA GUIDELINES 15091 (A)(1))

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

Impact (construction): Due to high construction traffic volumes (greater than 5 percent of traffic entering the intersection) and the need for internal road closures, the project would result in a significant direct traffic impact at the intersection of Medical Center Court and the Main Hospital Driveway during Phase 3 of project construction.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City Council finds that conditions, changes, or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would reduce the significant environmental effect identified in the Final EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: Prior to the issuance of construction-related permits, the project would be required to implement mitigation measure TRAF-1, as stated in Section 5.3.5 of the Final EIR. This mitigation measure would require the preparation and implementation of a traffic control plan. Mitigation measure TRAF-1 specifically states:

TRAF-1 Prior to the issuance of any construction-related permits, such as a demolition or grading permit, the applicant shall prepare and implement a traffic control plan during the construction phase of the project. This plan may include construction personnel directing traffic, construction start/end times which avoid peak periods, and/or other traffic reducing measures. Ultimately, measures shall be included to regulate construction traffic flow to improve intersection operations to level of service (LOS) D or better, to the satisfaction of the City Traffic Engineer.

Implementation of the traffic control plan would improve traffic flow during construction. Implementation of mitigation measure TRAF-1 would reduce the project's significant impacts associated with construction-related traffic impacts to less than significant.

Impact (direct): Project traffic would result in the addition of more than 800 additional average daily traffic (ADT), more than 5 percent of the total traffic, along Medical Center Court east of Medical Center Drive. Pursuant to City threshold standards, this represents a significant direct impact to this street segment.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City Council finds that conditions, changes, or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would reduce the significant environmental effect identified in the Final EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for the OTV, the project would be required to implement mitigation measure TRAF-2, as stated in Section 5.3.5 of the Final EIR. This mitigation measure would require construction of road improvements. Mitigation measure TRAF-2 specifically states:

TRAF-2 Prior to the issuance of occupancy permits for the Ocean View applicant shall provide eastbound left turn lanes at the Veterans Home Driveway and the West Hospital Loop Road and restripe Medical Center Court between the West Hospital Loop Road and the Main Hospital Driveway to provide a two-way left-turn lane. Medical Center Court is currently 38 feet wide, and could accommodate two 14-foot through lanes and a 10-foot two-way left-turn lane. Curbside parking along this segment is currently prohibited.

Implementation of these improvements would relieve the increased flow of traffic along the effected segment to acceptable LOS. Implementation of mitigation measure TRAF-2 would reduce the project's significant direct impact to the street segment of Medical Center Court east of Medical Center Drive to less than significant.

Impact (cumulative): Project traffic combined with the traffic of cumulative projects would result in the following significant cumulative impacts:

- Cumulative Impacts to Intersections
 - Telegraph Canyon Road/I-805 NB Ramps
 - E. Palomar Street/Medical Center Drive
 - E. Palomar Street/Heritage Road
 - Olympic Parkway/I-805 SB Ramps
 - Olympic Parkway/I-805 NB Ramps
 - Olympic Parkway/Oleander Avenue
 - Olympic Parkway/Brandywine Avenue
 - Olympic Parkway/Heritage Road

- Cumulative Impacts to Street Segments
 - Telegraph Canyon Road: Halecrest Drive to Oleander Avenue
 - Telegraph Canyon Road: Oleander Avenue to Medical Center Drive
 - Olympic Parkway: I-805 Ramps to Oleander Avenue
 - Olympic Parkway: Oleander Avenue to Brandywine Avenue
 - Olympic Parkway: Brandywine Avenue to Heritage Road

For a summary of the specific timing of the cumulative impacts (i.e., near-term, long-term), see Final EIR Table 5.3-17.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City Council finds that conditions, changes, or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would reduce the significant environmental effect identified in the Final EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for the OVT, the project would be required to implement mitigation measure TRAF-3, as stated in Section 5.3.5 of the Final EIR. This mitigation measure would require contribution to the City's Capital Project Fund. Mitigation measure TRAF-3 specifically states:

TRAF-3 Prior to issuance of occupancy permits for the Ocean View Tower, the project applicant shall contribute to the City's Capital Project Fund in an amount determined by the City to be sufficient to mitigate the project's cumulative impacts. These funds would be used in conjunction with TDIF program funds to construct system improvements that address cumulative traffic impacts.

Implementation of this measure assures that funds are available to construct road improvements necessary to relieve the cumulative traffic congestion. Mitigation measure TRAF-3 would reduce the project's significant cumulative impacts to intersections and street segments to less than significant.

Reference: Final EIR Section 5.3, Transportation and Circulation

PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Impact: The project site contains geologic formations considered to be of high and moderate sensitivity for fossils. Specifically, the area proposed for the OVT is underlain by the San Diego and Linda vista formations, which are formations of high and moderate paleontological sensitivity, respectively. Therefore, project grading could uncover fossils of paleontological sensitivity resulting in a significant impact to paleontological resources.

Finding: Pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(1), CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), the City Council finds that conditions, changes, or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which would reduce the significant environmental effect identified in the Final EIR.

Facts in Support of Finding: Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the project would be required to implement mitigation measure PALEO-1 as stated in Section 5.10.5 of the Final EIR. This mitigation measure would require paleontological monitoring to be undertaken during ground disturbing activities. Mitigation measure PALEO-1 specifically states:

PALEO-1 Prior to the issuance of grading permits for the proposed project, the Applicant shall confirm to the Development Services Director, or their designee, that a qualified paleontologist (QP) has been retained to carry out an appropriate mitigation program. A QP is defined as an individual with a doctorate or a master's degree in paleontology or geology, who is familiar with paleontological

procedures and techniques. A pre-grade meeting shall be held between the paleontologist and the grading and excavation contractors

A paleontological monitor shall be on-site at all times during the original cutting of previously undisturbed sediments of highly sensitive geologic formations (i.e., San Diego Formation) to inspect cuts for contained fossils. (A paleontological monitor is defined as an individual who has experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials.) The paleontological monitor shall work under the direction of a qualified paleontologist. The monitor shall be on-site on at least a half-time basis during the original cutting of previously undisturbed sediments of moderately sensitive geologic formations (i.e., Lindavista Formation) to inspect cuts for contained fossils.

When fossils are discovered, the paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) shall recover them. In most cases, this fossil salvage can be completed in a short period of time. However, some fossil specimens (such as a complete whale skeleton) may require an extended salvage time. In these instances, the paleontologist (or paleontological monitor) shall be allowed to temporarily direct, divert, or halt grading to allow recovery of fossil remains in a timely manner. Because of the potential for the recovery of small fossil remains such as isolated mammal teeth, it may be necessary in certain instances and at the discretion of the paleontological monitor to set up a screen-washing operation on the site.

Prepared fossils along with copies of all pertinent field notes, photographs, and maps shall be deposited in a scientific institution with paleontological collections such as the San Diego Natural History Museum. A final summary report shall be completed. This report shall include discussions of the methods used, stratigraphy exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils.

Implementation of this mitigation measure requires that should fossils be discovered during grading activities, an on-site monitor would collect, identify, and permanently record such resources to assure that the resources are not lost. Implementation of mitigation measure PALEO-1 would reduce the project's significant direct impact to paleontological resources to less than significant.

Reference: Final EIR Section 5.10, Paleontological Resources

B. FINDING REGARDING MITIGATION THAT IS WITHIN THE RESPONSIBILITY AND JURISDICTION OF ANOTHER PUBLIC AGENCY (CEQA GUIDELINES 15091 (A)(2))

There are no changes or alterations that are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making these Findings.

C. FINDINGS REGARDING SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE IMPACTS (CEQA GUIDELINES 15091 (A)(3))

There are no significant and unavoidable impacts.

X.

FINDINGS REGARDING THE FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a), an EIR must contain a discussion of “a range of reasonable alternatives to a project, or the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” Section 15126.6(f) further states that “the range of alternatives in an EIR is governed by the ‘rule of reason’ that requires the EIR to set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice.”

The objectives of the proposed project are as follows:

1. Provide a state-of-the-art medical center that provides the best place to receive care, practice medicine and to work, in the universe. (Sharp HealthCare’s mission statement.)
2. To construct a medical center compliant with the state’s Office of Statewide Health Planning and Development (OSHPD) seismic safety regulations beyond 2030 and relocate support services to compliant space, right sized for the growth of patient volumes beyond 2030.
3. To construct a seven-story, 197,696-square-foot tower with 138 single occupancy beds, 6 operating rooms with pre- and post-operating recovery spaces, sterile processing, dietary services, materials management, a loading dock, and other support services.
4. Facilitate Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center’s goals of becoming a “High Reliability Organization” or “HRO” by designing and constructing the OVT such that high quality, patient centered care is delivered while hardwiring the highest safety standards in infection and defect prevention.
5. Facilitate the goal of Sharp Chula Vista Medical Center to achieve “Designation with Distinction – Planetree Patient Centered Hospital” - by including inspiring features such as the Ocean View Café, and calming/relaxing features such as natural lighting, family zones in the patient rooms, a chapel, meditation gardens, library and hospitality-like-finishes.
6. Construct the “Ocean View Café” on the seventh floor, providing high-quality fresh food in a naturally lit and inspiring setting.

7. Provide enough acute care and intensive care beds to enable the future conversion of approximately 70 of the existing semi-private (2-bed) acute care patient rooms into single occupancy rooms. This conversion drives the safety goal by reducing the chance of infection between patients.
8. Provide six state-of-the-art operating rooms, with associated support space and systems, such that the patient flow is optimized.
9. Construct acute care beds and operating rooms, in conjunction with the expansion to the Emergency Department (ED) completed in 2012, to eliminate the approximately 30 patients per month which are “overflow” and redirected to other facilities (both Sharp and non-Sharp Medical Centers).
10. Provide optimized space and flow for sterile processing, dietary services, and post-op support to reduce bottlenecks, increase safety, and ensure that patients who need to be admitted, are able to be admitted quickly and to this campus.
11. Reduce or eliminate the current need to divert patients when space at the Chula Vista Medical Center is not available and drastically reduce:
 - o Number of hours per month of ambulance diversion or bypass.
 - o Number of patients leaving without treatment (elopements) and leaving against medical advice.
 - o Number of patients diverted to other facilities or remaining in the ED longer than 4 hours before being admitted.

Where no significant environmental effects remain after application of all feasible mitigation measures identified in the EIR, the decision makers must still evaluate the project alternatives identified in the EIR. Under these circumstances, the City Council must consider the feasibility of any alternatives to the proposed project, evaluating whether these alternatives could avoid or substantially lessen significant environmental effects while achieving most of the objectives of the proposed project.

Alternative: The No Project-No Build Alternative presents the scenario where the project site would remain in the existing condition and no additional hospital facilities would be constructed.

Findings: The No Project-No Build Alternative would not meet any of the basic project objectives as listed above. Specifically, this alternative would not address the need for additional capacity in order to reduce or eliminate the current need to divert patients, would not facilitate Sharp’s goal of working toward High Reliability, and would not provide updated acute care facilities including private patient rooms and updated operating rooms. This alternative would not facilitate the goal of achieving the designation as a “Planetree Patient Centered Hospital

with distinction” because this alternative would eliminate integral features such as the ocean view café, as well as calming/relaxing features such as natural lighting, family zones in the patient rooms, a chapel, meditation gardens, library, and hospitality-like finishes. Under this alternative, the significant SB 1953 compliance issues would not be addressed and some of the central services currently come from a “non-compliant” structure that will need to be corrected by 2030. The seismic upgrades required under this alternative would take approximately six years to complete and would result in a loss of 44 beds. Without the seismic upgrades, this portion of the hospital would be decommissioned in 2030, resulting in a loss of 139 beds.

For these reasons, the City Council concludes that the No Project–No Build Alternative is not feasible.

Alternative: The Reduced Height Alternative would result in construction of a three-story tower (i.e., 45 feet) within the same footprint as the proposed project.

Findings: Due to the reduction in height of the proposed tower and corresponding reduction of available patient facilities, implementation of this alternative would incrementally reduce impacts specifically related to traffic. However, impacts to paleontological resources would remain significant.

As a result of the decreased height under this alternative, the number of patient beds would also be decreased compared to the proposed project. The hospital is currently at capacity and while this alternative would provide an additional 36 patient beds over existing conditions, it would not meet several of the project objectives related to providing sufficient patient care services through the 2030 planning horizon. Due to the reduction in development capacity under this alternative, it would not provide enough acute care facilities for the future conversion of approximately 70 existing semi-private rooms into single occupancy, an improvement which is needed to increase patient safety and reduce infection. The reduction in patient beds would also not provide the additional capacity needed to eliminate the diversion of patients to other medical facilities (both Sharp and non-Sharp).

Under this alternative, the significant SB 1953 compliance issues would not be addressed. Currently, some of the central services come from a “non-compliant” structure that will need to be corrected by 2030 or this portion of the hospital would be decommissioned from acute care use. No upgrades to the existing east tower would occur under the Reduced Height Alternative, resulting in the loss of an additional 139 patient beds. The hospital experiences shortages of beds every day, resulting in diversions of patients to other facilities and the shortage is anticipated to increase as the population in the South Bay continues to expand.

This alternative would meet some of the project objectives related to providing new and upgraded surgical, ICU, dietary, and patient facilities but not to the same degree as the proposed project. Additionally, the overall reduction in patient beds would not address the need

to increase capacity needed to serve existing and projected medical services to the community within the 30-year planning horizon without having to build additional facilities

For these reasons, the City Council concludes that the Reduced Height Alternative is not feasible.

The City Counsel, having reviewed and considered the information contained in the Final EIR, finds pursuant to CEQA Section 21081(a)(3) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(3) that the alternatives presented and considered in the Final EIR constitute a reasonable range of alternatives necessary that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project to permit a reasoned choice among the options available to the City and/or the project proponent.

XI.

FINDINGS REGARDING OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

The City is the "Lead Agency" for the project evaluated in the Final EIR. The City Council finds that the Draft EIR and the Final EIR were prepared in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The City Council finds that it has independently reviewed and analyzed the Draft EIR and Final EIR for the proposed project, that the Draft EIR, which was circulated for public review reflected its independent judgment, and that the Final EIR reflects the independent judgment of the City Council. The Notice of Preparation of the Draft EIR was published on January 27, 2016. It requested that responsible agencies respond to the scope and content of the environmental information germane to that agency's specific responsibilities. The public review period for the Draft EIR began on June 20, 2016, and the Draft EIR was available for public review on that date. A Notice of Availability of Draft EIR was filed with the County Recorder/County Clerk on June 20, 2016 and a Notice of Completion of Draft EIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse on June 17, 2016. The 45-day public review and comment period ended on August 3, 2016.

The City Council finds that the Final EIR provides objective information to assist the decision-makers and the public at large in their consideration of the environmental consequences of the proposed project. The public review period provided all interested jurisdictions, agencies, private organizations, and individuals the opportunity to submit comments regarding the Draft EIR. The Final EIR was prepared after the review period and responds to comments made during the public review period. Comments on environmental issues received from persons, who reviewed the Draft EIR during the public review period are included in the Final EIR. All of the significant environmental impacts of the proposed project were identified in the text and summary of the Final EIR. The mitigation measures, which have been identified for the proposed project, were identified in the text and summary of the Final EIR. The final mitigation measures are described in the MMRP. Each of the mitigation measures identified Final EIR, as contained in the MMRP is incorporated into the proposed project. The City Council finds that the impacts of the proposed project have been mitigated to the extent feasible by the mitigation measures described in the Final EIR as contained in the MMRP.

The City Council is certifying this Final EIR for, and is approving and adopting these Findings for, the entirety of the actions described in these Findings and in the Final EIR as comprising the proposed project.

It is contemplated that there may be a variety of actions undertaken by other state and local agencies (who might be referred to as “responsible agencies” under CEQA). Because the City Council is the lead agency for the proposed project, the Final EIR is intended to be the basis for compliance with CEQA for each of the possible discretionary actions by other state and local agencies to carry out the proposed project.