

# CHAPTER 1 SUMMARY

---

## 1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Focused Tiered Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential environmental impacts of the San Francisco State University (SF State) Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project (Project), which would involve construction of the Creative Arts replacement building; an associated concert hall; and a mixed-use development including student housing, neighborhood-serving retail, student support services. Transportation and parking improvements, utility connections, stormwater improvements, landscaping and lighting improvements are also included in the Project. This chapter highlights the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the Project, as required by Section 15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines. It also provides a brief description of the Campus Master Plan (CMP) background, tiering to the 2007 CMP EIR, Project overview, Project impact summary, alternatives to the Project, areas of controversy known to SF State, and topics not carried forward for detailed analysis in this EIR.

## 1.2 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN BACKGROUND

The CMP, adopted by the Board of Trustees of the California State University (Trustees of the California State University) in 2007, addresses all aspects of future physical development and land use on the campus to accommodate the enrollment ceiling of 25,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students (SF State 2007a). The CMP provides a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the SF State campus through 2020. It addresses the acquisition of property, older facilities, changing student demographics, and the need for additional academic building space and other support space to accommodate the anticipated growth in enrollment. To accommodate the projected growth in enrollment and academic activities, the adopted CMP accommodates a building program that envisions development of 0.9 million gross square feet (GSF) of new and replacement non-residential building space on campus, and development or conversion of approximately 1,198 additional units of housing on campus for faculty, staff, and students. The existing adopted CMP includes a land use map and urban design plan map that locate major uses and buildings to guide the siting of future campus facilities. Most of the growth in facilities would occur through demolition and replacement of existing buildings, as a number of existing buildings are at or beyond their useful life.

## 1.3 TIERING TO THE CMP EIR

As the CEQA lead agency, the Trustees of the California State University certified the SF State CMP EIR (SCH No. 2006102050) in 2007 (SF State 2007b). The Project conforms to the CMP building program and, therefore, the CEQA analysis for the Project is tiered to the 2007 CMP EIR.

SF State prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and issued a Tiered Initial Study (Tiered IS) on July 6, 2016 (Appendix A) that was tiered to the 2007 CMP EIR. The Tiered IS evaluated potential environmental effects of the Project, identified the issues that were adequately addressed in the 2007 CMP EIR, and identified the issues that would require further analysis. Based on the NOP/Tiered IS and the results of comments received during the scoping process, SF State determined that a Focused Tiered EIR is the appropriate CEQA document to evaluate potential impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, historical resources, and transportation.

The 2007 CMP EIR is incorporated by reference and referred to throughout this EIR. The 2007 CMP EIR and related documents (e.g., Board of Trustees Approval, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Findings of Fact, Notice of Determination) are available at <http://cpdc.sfsu.edu/plan>. Additional updated and/or site-specific information is also incorporated throughout this EIR.

## **1.4 PROJECT OVERVIEW**

### **1.4.1 Project Location**

The Project is on the existing 144-acre SF State campus located in the southwestern corner of the City and County of San Francisco, in California. The approximately 3.6-acre Project site is located in the south campus, with one parcel (Block 6) on the south side of Holloway Avenue between Cardenas and Varela Avenues, and one parcel (Block 1), referred to as the Tapia Triangle, bounded by Tapia Drive, Holloway Avenue, and Font Boulevard. The Project site is part of University Park South, which was purchased by SF State between 2000 and 2005 and includes a portion of the original Parkmerced development, which extends beyond the campus boundaries to the south.

### **1.4.2 The Project Objectives**

CEQA indicates that the statement of a project's objectives should be clearly written to define the underlying purpose of a project in order to permit development of a reasonable range of alternatives and aid the lead agency in making findings when considering a project for approval. The Project objectives below are drawn from the CMP (SF State 2007a):

1. Replace significant portions of the existing Creative Arts building, which has various deficiencies and no longer supports the academic program, and construct a new concert hall with recording and broadcast capability to provide hands-on learning for BECA [Broadcast & Electronic Communication Arts] students and support SF State and community programs.
2. Reinforce the academic core and extend it westward to create a contiguous, uninterrupted academic core. The Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall

would occupy a pivotal location at Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard, in proximity to residential mixed-use development and adjacent to College of Liberal and Creative Arts facilities to provide for programmatic collaboration.

3. Position semi-public uses, such as the concert hall, at the corners or edges of campus, creating icons that redefine SF State’s external identity and engage the larger community.
4. Provide for the most efficient and effective use of the West Campus Green and the Tapia Triangle for planned future Creative Arts programs.
5. Provide new on-campus student housing to aid in recruitment and retention of students and to provide close-in housing that enables students to walk to school, thereby reducing commute trips to campus and associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.
6. Begin to integrate and make efficient use of more recently acquired residential properties located along the southern edge of the campus.
7. Locate new student housing, neighborhood retail, and support services in proximity to the existing Muni M line and bus lines and to the future planned underground Muni M line and station and to planned 19th Avenue bicycle and pedestrian facilities. Additionally, locate the above uses in immediate proximity to the academic core of the campus, where pedestrian access to the core is readily available.
8. Locate higher-density student housing with ground-floor neighborhood retail and services along Holloway Avenue to redefine Holloway Avenue as a “college main street.”
9. Ensure that new construction achieves LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) Gold or equivalent performance and energy efficiency beyond California Energy Commission Title 24 requirements. LEED Platinum certification (or an equivalent rating under WELL or another green building rating system) and ZNE (zero net energy) should be targeted, and the Project should meet other CMP and Climate Action Plan (SF State 2010) sustainability objectives.

### **1.4.3 Project Summary**

The Project would include construction of new housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and student support services on the south side of Holloway Avenue, and construction of the Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall on the north side of the Holloway Avenue/Font Boulevard intersection. The Project would also include preparation and implementation of design guidelines, transportation and parking improvements, utility connections, storm drainage improvements, landscaping, lighting, and the implementation of applicable CMP mitigation measures adopted as part of the CMP Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program. A revision to the existing Master Plan map would be required to allow for the proposed uses on the identified sites. All key elements of the Project are summarized in Table I-1.

**Table 1-1  
Project Summary**

<b>Project Element</b>	<b>Existing Project Site Conditions</b>	<b>Proposed Project Site Conditions</b>	<b>Net Change on Project Site</b>	<b>Campus-wide Development Allowed Under 2007 CMP</b>
Student housing (Block 6)	173 beds (Blocks 1 & 6) 7 units (Block 1) <sup>1</sup>	550 beds	<b>355 beds</b>	1,198 units <sup>2</sup> (approximately 2,995 beds)
Neighborhood-serving retail/student support services (Block 6)	None	<del>33,000</del> <del>25,000</del> gross square feet (GSF)	<b>33,000</b> <del>25,000</del> <b>GSF</b>	CMP calls for neighborhood retail on Holloway Avenue, but specific square footage or location on Holloway Avenue is not identified.
Parking facilities	53 auto spaces <sup>3</sup> 9 motorcycle spaces <sup>3</sup>	<del>72</del> <del>70</del> parking spaces	<b>0 parking spaces<sup>4</sup></b>	No net increase in parking
Creative Arts replacement building (Block 1)	None	<del>75,000</del> <u>76,350</u> GSF	<del>75,000</del> <u>76,350</u> <b>GSF</b>	133,500 GSF Creative Arts 149,000 GSF Classroom/Faculty Offices <sup>6</sup>
Concert hall (Block 1)	None	60,000 GSF 800 seats	<b>60,000 GSF</b> <b>800 seats</b>	Square footage included in Creative Arts space above

**Source:** Data compiled by SF State in 2016.

<sup>1</sup> The seven units are occupied by approximately 3.1 people per unit which is equivalent to 22 beds.

<sup>2</sup> CMP EIR Table 3-3 (Final EIR, Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR).

<sup>3</sup> Parking located on Tapia Drive.

<sup>4</sup> Parking would be removed elsewhere on campus to provide for no net increase in parking with the Project.

<sup>5</sup> ~~22,000~~ ~~11,000~~ GSF of the total space would be for general classroom space.

<sup>6</sup> CMP EIR Table 3-2 (Final EIR, Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR).

## 1.5 IMPACT SUMMARY

Table 1-2 provides a complete list of the conclusions from the analyses of all potential Project impacts, which are related to aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, historic resources and transportation. All other environmental topics were adequately addressed in the 2007 CMP EIR and Tiered Initial Study (see Section 1.8, below for additional information about topics not carried forward for additional analysis in the EIR).

As this EIR is tiered to the 2007 CMP EIR, the table identifies the related CMP EIR impacts to facilitate the determination about whether the Project would result in new significant or substantially more severe impacts than those identified in the CMP EIR. The table summarizes: (1) the potential environmental impacts that would occur as the result of implementation of the 2007 CMP and CMP EIR mitigation measures (identified in gray text); (2) the potential environmental impacts that would occur as the result of implementation of the Project; (3) the level of Project impact significance with adopted CMP mitigation; (4) any additional Project mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce new significant environmental impacts; and (5) the level of Project impact significance after mitigation measures are implemented.

This Final EIR determined that the Project would result in one new significant and unavoidable impact compared to the impacts identified in the CMP EIR. The Project would have a significant adverse cumulative impact related to historical resources. The proposed demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 and removal of existing landscape features on the Project site would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, identified during the preparation of this EIR, as it would erode its integrity. The Project's contribution to this significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable (see Project Impact CULT-5B in Table I-2). This significant cumulative impact can be reduced through the implementation of CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2A through CULT-2C as part of the Project and through the implementation of Project Mitigation CULT-5B identified in Table I-2. However, the impact is significant and unavoidable as the implementation of the feasible mitigation measure would not reduce the impact to less than significant. This is considered a new significant cumulative impact, as the CMP EIR did not contemplate impacts to eligible historic districts and did not identify a significant cumulative impact on historic resources.

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	
<i>Tiered Project EIR</i>				
<i>Aesthetics</i>				
<b>Project Impact AES-0</b>	<b>The Project would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>Mitigation not required</b>	<b>LS</b>
CMP Impact AES-1	Development under the Campus Master Plan would not substantially damage the small groves of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine located in and around the Campus Core landscape zone that constitute scenic resources on the campus	LS	Adopted CMP Mitigation AES-1A, AES-1B, and AES-1C included in the CMP MMRP, but do not apply to the Project	LS
<b>Project Impact AES-1</b>	<b>The Project would not substantially damage the small groves of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine or otherwise substantially damage a scenic resource</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>Mitigation not required</b>	<b>LS</b>
CMP Impact AES-2	Development under the Campus Master Plan would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the existing SF State campus	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
<b>Project Impact AES-2</b>	<b>The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the existing site or SF State campus surroundings</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>Mitigation not required</b>	<b>LS</b>
CMP Impact AES-3	Development of new housing in University Park South under the Campus Master Plan could potentially degrade the existing visual character of the adjacent Parkmerced neighborhood, if not properly designed	PS	Adopted CMP Mitigation AES-3 included in the CMP MMRP and the Project	LS
<b>Project Impact AES-3</b>	<b>The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the adjacent</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>No additional mitigation required</b>	<b>LS</b>

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
	<b>Parkmerced area given the implementation of design guidelines and compatibility with approved plans for Parkmerced</b>			
CMP Impact AES-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not create new sources of substantial light or glare on campus that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area	LS	Adopted CMP Mitigation AES-4A and AES-4B included in the CMP MMRP and the Project	LS
<b>Project Impact AES-4</b>	<b>The Project would not create new sources of substantial light or glare on or adjacent to campus that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>No additional mitigation required</b>	<b>LS</b>
CMP Impact AES-5	Development under the Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other vicinity development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts due to substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the area	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
<b>Project Impact AES-5</b>	<b>The Project, in conjunction with other vicinity development, would not result in significant cumulative impacts due to substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the area</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>Mitigation not required</b>	<b>LS</b>

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation	
<i>Air Quality</i>				
CMP Impact AIR-1  Project Impact AIR-1	Construction activities under the Campus Master Plan would result in emissions of PM <sub>10</sub> and PM <sub>2.5</sub> on a short-term basis  <b>The Project would not violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation</b>	PS  <b>LS</b>	Adopted CMP Mitigation AIR-1 included in the CMP MMRP and the Project  <b>No additional mitigation required</b>	LS  <b>LS</b>
CMP Impact AIR-2  Project Impact AIR-2	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan  <b>The Project would not conflict with or obstruct the implementation of the applicable air quality plan</b>	PS  <b>LS</b>	Adopted CMP Mitigations AIR-2A and AIR-2B and AIR-2C included in the CMP MMRP and the Project and <u>implemented campus wide</u>  <b>No additional mitigation required</b>	LS  <b>LS</b>
CMP Impact AIR-3  Project Impact AIR-3	Traffic generated by development under the Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with traffic associated with other regional growth, would result in an increase in local CO concentrations at study area intersections  <b>The Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations</b>	LS  <b>LS</b>	Mitigation not required  <b>Mitigation not required</b>	LS  <b>LS</b>

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CMP Impact AIR-4	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan in conjunction with other regional growth in the air basin could potentially result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan	PS	Adopted CMP Mitigation AIR-2A and AIR-2B and AIR-2C included in the CMP MMRP and the Project and implemented campus wide	LS
Project Impact AIR-4A	The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable new increase of any criteria pollutant for which the Project region is nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard	LS	No additional mitigation required	LS
Project Impact AIR-4B	The Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts with respect to air quality	LS	No additional mitigation required	LS
Project Impact AIR-5	The Project would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
<i>Greenhouse Gas Emissions</i>				
Project Impact GHG-1	The Project would not generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
Project Impact GHG-2	The Project would not conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of GHGs	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
Project Impact GHG-3	The Project would not result in cumulatively considerable emissions of GHGs	LS	Mitigation not required	LS

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Historic Resources</i>			
CMP Impact CULT-2	PS	Adopted CMP Mitigations CULT-2A, CULT-2B, and CULT-2C included in the CMP MMRP and the Project	SU
<b>Project Impact CULT-2A</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>No additional mitigation required</b>	<b>LS</b>
<b>Project Impact CULT-2B</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>No additional mitigation required</b>	<b>LS</b>

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CMP Impact CULT-5	Development under the Campus Master Plan could contribute to cumulative damage to and/or loss of... historical resources in the City and County of San Francisco	PS	Adopted CMP Mitigations CULT-2A, CULT-2B, and CULT-2C included in the CMP MMRP and the Project	LS
Project Impact CULT-5A	The proposed demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 and removal of existing landscape features on the Project site would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Historic District, as it would erode its integrity; however, the Project's contribution to this significant cumulative impact would not be cumulatively considerable	LS	No additional mitigation required	LS
Project Impact CULT-5B	The proposed demolition of Blocks 1 and 6 and removal of existing landscape features on the Project site would contribute to a significant cumulative impact on the historic significance of the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District, as it would erode its integrity; the Project's contribution to this significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable	S	<p><u>Project Mitigation CULT-5B:</u> The following mitigation measures are recommended in advance of the Project, and elaborate on the mitigation measure outlined in the Campus Master Plan EIR's Mitigation CULT-2C (ii):</p> <p><b>DOCUMENTATION:</b> SF State shall facilitate documentation of the affected historic resource and its setting. Generally, this documentation shall be in accordance with Historic American Building Survey (HABS) Level II per Campus Master Plan EIR Mitigation CULT-2C(ii), which includes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Drawings: Select original Church and Schultze drawings of Blocks 1 and 6, if available from Parkmerced Investors LLC or the San Francisco Planning Department, should be photographed with large-format negatives or photographically reproduced on Mylar.</li> </ol>	SU

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			<p>Measured drawings are not required, as these were completed for each type of building as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced site (completed by Page &amp; Turnbull in 2016).</p> <p>ii. Photographs: Archival printed digital photographs of exterior and interior views of Blocks 1 and 6. These photographs must adequately document the character-defining features of the buildings and should be produced by a qualified professional who is familiar with the character-defining features of the buildings, as identified in the Historic Resource Evaluation completed by Page &amp; Turnbull in 2009 and information provided in this report. Photographs should include general views that illustrate the setting; the exterior façades; the courtyard façades; details including front entrances and/or typical doorways; typical windows; exterior details indicative of the era of construction or of historic or architectural interest; and interior views to capture spatial relationships and any decorative elements. An example of printed digital photographs, site plans, and photo captions can be found in the Parkmerced HABS-HALS photographs produced as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced Investors LLC site. These photograph sets are located at the</p>	

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			<p>San Francisco Public Library History Center and the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. The photograph set for Blocks 1 and 6 should correspond to the previously produced sets.</p> <p>iii. Written data: Not required, as these blocks are covered in the HABS-HALS written report produced as part of the mitigation for demolition of the Parkmerced Investors LLC site.</p> <p>HABS material standards regarding reproducibility, durability, and size shall be met. The HABS Level II documentation shall be completed by professionals who meet or exceed the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards for History or Architectural History.</p> <p>Three copies of the drawings and photographs should be provided to the San Francisco Public Library History Center, the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System, and SF State University.</p> <p>This mitigation would create a collection of preservation materials that would be available to the public and inform future research. Implementation of this mitigation measure will assist in reducing the project-specific impacts: however, according to Section 15126.4 (b) (2) of the Public Resources Code (CEQA),</p>	

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
			<p>HABS-level documentation of a historical resource as mitigation for significant impacts of demolition of the resource will typically not mitigate the impacts to less-than-significant.</p> <p><b>VIDEO RECORDATION:</b>            SF State will facilitate the creation of a walk-through video of Blocks 1 and 6 and their Parkmerced setting, including an exterior overview of adjacent streets (with medians and traffic circles), nearby tower apartments, and primary public spaces at Parkmerced such as the central Common and the Meadow. The documentation shall be conducted by a professional videographer, preferably one with experience recording architectural resources. The documentation shall be narrated by a qualified architectural historian. The documentation shall include as much information as possible—using visuals in combination with narration—about the materials, construction methods, current condition, historic use, and historic context of the historical resources. Copies of the video documentation shall be submitted to the San Francisco Public Library History Room, the Northwest Information Center, and SF State University. This mitigation measure will supplement the traditional HABS-HALS documentation.</p>	

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<i>Transportation</i>				
CMP Impact TRA-1	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan could potentially contribute substantial traffic at two intersections in southwest San Francisco	S	Adopted CMP Mitigation TRA-1 included in the CMP MMRP and the Project <u>and implemented campus wide</u>	SU
<b>Project Impact TRA-1</b>	<b>The Project would not increase vehicle trips above the adjusted CMP EIR trip envelope and therefore would not result in new or increased level of service impacts over those identified in the CMP EIR.</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>No additional mitigation required</b>	<b>LS</b>
CMP Impact TRA-2	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would result in a substantial increase in transit	PS	Adopted CMP Mitigations TRA-2A, TRA-2B, and TRA-2C included in the CMP MMRP and the Project <u>and implemented campus wide</u>	LS
<b>Project Impact TRA-2</b>	<b>The Project would not increase transit trips above the adjusted CMP EIR trip envelope and therefore would not result in new or increased impacts over those identified in the CMP EIR</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>No additional mitigation required</b>	<b>LS</b>
CMP Impact TRA-3	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect conditions for pedestrians or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
<b>Project Impact TRA-3</b>	<b>Implementation of the Project would not adversely affect conditions for pedestrians or otherwise interfere with accessibility, nor would the Project create hazardous conditions for pedestrians</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>Mitigation not required</b>	<b>LS</b>

**Table 1-2  
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
CMP Impact TRA-4	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect conditions for bicyclists	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
<b>Project Impact TRA-4</b>	<b>Implementation of the Project would not adversely affect conditions for bicyclists or otherwise interfere with accessibility, nor would the Project create hazardous conditions for bicyclists</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>Mitigation not required</b>	<b>LS</b>
CMP Impact TRA-6	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies or programs supporting alternative transportation	LS	Mitigation not required	LS
<b>Project Impact TRA-6</b>	<b>Implementation of the Project would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies or programs supporting alternative transportation</b>	<b>LS</b>	<b>Mitigation not required</b>	<b>LS</b>
<b><i>Other CMP EIR Significant Unavoidable Impacts from Tiered Initial Study</i></b>				
<i>Noise</i>				
CMP Impact NOIS-1	Construction of campus facilities under the Campus Master Plan could expose nearby sensitive receptors to excessive airborne noise	PS	Adopted CMP Mitigation NOIS-1 included in the CMP MMRP and the Project	SU

NA = not applicable; LS = less than significant; PS = potentially significant; S= significant; SU = significant and unavoidable; MMRP = Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

## 1.6 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

The following alternatives are analyzed in detail in Chapter 6 of this Focused Tiered Final EIR in comparison to the Project. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to determine whether an alternative would feasibly attain some or most of the Project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening some of the significant effects of the Project. A two-step process was used to conduct the alternatives analysis in this Final EIR. First, potential alternatives were examined for their feasibility and ability to meet most of the Project objectives. Those that clearly were found to be infeasible were rejected without further environmental review. Alternatives that may be feasible and that would attain at least some of the basic Project objectives were carried forward and analyzed with regard to whether they would reduce or avoid any significant impacts of the Project. Chapter 6 evaluates five alternatives to the Project, including those listed below and summarized in Table 1-3, below:

- No Project Alternative – Development under Adopted Campus Master Plan
- No Project Alternative – No New Development/Preservation
- Reduced Project Alternative – Partial Reuse/Preservation
- Reduced Project Alternative – No Development on Block 6
- Alternative Site Location – Avoidance of Former Parkmerced Properties

**Table 1-3  
Characteristics of Alternatives**

Alternative	Student Housing Beds	Retail and Support Space (GSF)	Creative Arts Replacement Building Space (GSF)	Concert Hall Space (GSF)	Location
Proposed Project	550	<del>33,000</del> 25,000	<del>75,000</del> 76,350	60,000	Block 1 Block 6
No Project – Development under Adopted CMP	550	0	<del>75,000</del> 76,350	0	Block 1 Block 5
No Project – No New Development/Preservation	0	0	0	0	Block 1 Block 6
Reduced Project Alternative – Partial Reuse/Preservation	100 – 120	10,000 – 12,000	<del>75,000</del> 76,350	60,000	Block 1 Block 6
Reduced Project Alternative – No Development on Block 6	0	0	<del>75,000</del> 76,350	60,000	Block 1 Block 6
Alternative Site Location – Avoidance of Former Parkmerced Properties	550	<del>33,000</del> 25,000	<del>75,000</del> 76,350	60,000	West Campus Green UPN Site

The No Project Alternative – No New Development/Preservation would avoid all of the impacts of the Project, as no development would occur under this alternative. However, this alternative would not locate student housing on campus and therefore would not reduce vehicle trips on typical days compared to existing conditions. Despite not reducing vehicle trips on typical days, this alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative, as it would avoid the significant cumulative impact on the Parkmerced Remnant Historic District and avoid other less-than-significant impacts. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet any of the Project objectives, as discussed in Chapter 6.

If the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d)(2) requires that the EIR identify another alternative as environmentally superior. Of the remaining alternatives, the environmentally superior alternative is the Alternative Site Locations alternative that calls for avoiding development on the Project site, which consists of two blocks in the southern portion of the campus that have former Parkmerced apartments and other character-defining features. This alternative would avoid the significant unavoidable cumulative historic resource impact of the Project, as it would not contribute to this impact. It would also provide for the full housing program and associated vehicle and transit trip reduction benefits, similar to the Project. However, the construction of the Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall on the West Campus Green would not meet most of the Project objectives for these uses and would not provide for the most efficient and effective use of the West Campus Green and the Tapia Triangle (Block I) for all of the planned future Creative Arts programs.

This alternative also would not meet the Project objective that aims to integrate and make efficient use of more recently acquired properties along the southern edge of campus, as the Project would be pursued in the northern portion of the campus. It would not meet the objective to locate the building in immediate proximity to the academic core of the campus, where pedestrian access to the core is readily available. This alternative also would not facilitate redefining Holloway Avenue as a “college main street.”

## **1.7 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY**

This EIR addresses environmental issues associated with the Project that are known to the lead agency or were raised by agencies or interested parties during the public and agency NOP review period. These issues include the following:

- The potential displacement of people associated with the replacement of existing housing units in UPS with denser housing.
- The aesthetics of the proposed development as it transitions to the Parkmerced area to the south.

- The identification and historic resource impacts of the Project and recommended mitigation measures.
- Transportation impacts in the vicinity of campus.
- The potential worsening of over-flow parking in the surrounding neighborhoods and associated neighborhood traffic.
- Effects of campus growth on local public services.

More comprehensive and detailed listings of issues raised during scoping are provided in the beginning of each section in Chapter 4. Comments received during the Scoping period for the Project are included as Appendix B.

## **1.8 TOPICS NOT CARRIED FORWARD FOR FURTHER ANALYSIS**

The Tiered Initial Study (Appendix A) found that the Project could have a “potentially significant” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impacts on the environment, but most effects (1) were adequately analyzed in the 2007 CMP EIR pursuant to applicable legal standards and (2) were addressed by mitigation measures based on that earlier analysis, as described in Appendix A, Section 4, Initial Study Checklist. An EIR was determined to be required to analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed, including aesthetics, air quality, greenhouse gas emissions, historic resources, and transportation. These topics are evaluated in this EIR and the conclusions of the analyses are summarized in Table I-2.

All other effects were determined to not warrant further analyses in this EIR as they were determined to be adequately analyzed in the 2007 CMP EIR, based on the analysis in the Tiered Initial Study. Specifically, the Tiered Initial Study determined that the Project would not result in new significant or substantially more severe impacts compared to those identified in the CMP EIR and do not require further analysis in this EIR. Therefore, additional analyses of those topics are not provided herein.

## **1.9 REFERENCES**

SF State (San Francisco State University). 2007a. San Francisco State University Campus Master Plan. Prepared by WRT, Solomon, E.T.C. July 2007. Accessed September 2016.  
<http://cpdc.sfsu.edu/plan>.

SF State. 2007b. San Francisco State University Campus Master Plan EIR (SCH No. 2006102050), Final. August 2007. Prepared by URS Corporation. <http://cpdc.sfsu.edu/plan>.

SF State. 2010. Climate Action Plan. May 2010. Accessed September 2016.  
[http://sustain.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.sustain/files/assets/doc/SFState\\_CAP.pdf](http://sustain.sfsu.edu/sites/sites7.sfsu.edu.sustain/files/assets/doc/SFState_CAP.pdf).

INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK