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July 28, 2016

Ms. Wendy Bloom
Campus Planning
California State University, San Francisco
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project—Notice of Preparation

Dear Ms. Bloom:

Thank you for including the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the environmental review process for the Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use project. The new Caltrans mission, vision, and goals signal a modernization of our approach to California’s transportation system, in which we seek to reduce statewide vehicle miles traveled (VMT) by 15 percent by 2020 and increase non-auto modes of active transportation. Caltrans aims to increase non-auto mode shares by 2020 through tripling bicycle, and doubling pedestrian and transit trips. These targets also support the Metropolitan Transportation Commission’s (MTC) Regional Transportation Plan/Sustainable Communities Strategy (RTP/SCS), which promotes the increase of non-auto mode shares by ten percentage points and a decrease in automobile VMT per capita by ten percent. The following comments are based on the Notice of Preparation.

Project Understanding
The proposed project would construct the Creative Arts replacement building, an associated concert hall, and a mixed-use development including student housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and student support services. The project would result in a net increase of housing to accommodate 360 new students, 25,000 gross square feet of new retail and student support space, 135,000 gross square feet of educational space. There is no net increase in parking proposed in this project. The proposed project is tiered from the previously certified Campus Master Plan (CMP) in 2007. The nearest State highway is 19th Avenue (US 1), approximately 200 feet from the proposed Holloway Mixed-Use Building.

Lead Agency
As the Lead Agency, the California State University, San Francisco (SFSU) is responsible for all project mitigation, including any needed improvements to State highways. The project’s fair share contribution, financing, scheduling, implementation responsibilities, and Lead Agency monitoring should be fully discussed for all proposed mitigation measures.
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Vehicle Trip Reduction
Caltrans comments SFSU for emphasizing pedestrian and alternative transportation in the CMP, including Transportation Demand Management strategies. Such measures will be critical in order to facilitate efficient transportation access to and from the site and to reduce VMT and greenhouse gas emissions associated with the project.

Transportation Management Plan
A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) or construction TIS may be required of SFSU for approval by Caltrans prior to construction where traffic restrictions and detours affect State highways. TMPs must be prepared in accordance with California Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. For further TMP assistance, please contact the Office of Traffic Management Plans/Operations Strategies at 510-286-4579 and see the following website:


Encroachment Permit
Please be advised that any traffic control that encroaches onto the State right-of-way (ROW) requires an encroachment permit that is issued by Caltrans. Traffic-related mitigation measures should be incorporated into the construction plans prior to the encroachment permit process. To apply, a completed encroachment permit application, environmental documentation, and five (5) sets of plans clearly indicating State ROW must be submitted to the following address:

David Salladay, District Office Chief
Office of Permits, MS 5E
California Department of Transportation, District 4
P.O. Box 23660
Oakland, CA 94623-0660

See the following website for more information:

http://www.dot.ca.gov/hq/traffops/developserv/permits

Should you have any questions regarding this letter, please contact Jesse Schofield at 510-286-5562 or jesse.schofield@dot.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

PATRICIA MAURICE
District Branch Chief
Local Development - Intergovernmental Review

c: State Clearinghouse

"Provide a safe, sustainable, integrated and efficient transportation system to enhance California’s economy and livability"
Dear Ms. Bloom:

The Native American Heritage Commission has received the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the project referenced above. The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Pub. Resources Code § 21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code section 21084.1, states that a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064.5 (b) (CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (b)).) If there is substantial evidence, in light of the whole record before a lead agency, that a project may have a significant effect on the environment, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall be prepared. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080 (d); Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, § 15064 subd.(a)(1) (CEQA Guidelines § 15064 (a)(1)).) In order to determine whether a project will cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource, a lead agency will need to determine whether there are historical resources with the area of project effect (APE).

CEQA was amended significantly in 2014. Assembly Bill 52 (Gatto, Chapter 532, Statutes of 2014) (AB 52) amended CEQA to create a separate category of cultural resources, “tribal cultural resources” (Pub. Resources Code § 21074) and provides that a project with an effect that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.2). Public agencies shall, when feasible, avoid damaging effects to any tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21084.3 (a)). AB 52 applies to any project for which a notice of preparation or a notice of negative declaration or mitigated negative declaration is filed on or after July 1, 2015. If your project involves the adoption of or amendment to a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation or proposed designation of open space, on or after March 1, 2005, it may also be subject to Senate Bill 18 (Burton, Chapter 905, Statutes of 2004) (SB 18). Both SB 18 and AB 52 have tribal consultation requirements. If your project is also subject to the federal National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.) (NEPA), the tribal consultation requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (154 U.S.C. 300101, 36 C.F.R. § 800 et seq.) may also apply.

The NAHC recommends consultation with California Native American tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of your proposed project as early as possible in order to avoid inadvertent discoveries of Native American human remains and best protect tribal cultural resources. Below is a brief summary of portions of AB 52 and SB 18 as well as the NAHC’s recommendations for conducting cultural resources assessments. Consult your legal counsel about compliance with AB 52 and SB 18 as well as compliance with any other applicable laws.

AB 52

AB 52 has added to CEQA the additional requirements listed below, along with many other requirements:

1. Fourteen Day Period to Provide Notice of Completion of an Application/Decision to Undertake a Project: Within fourteen (14) days of determining that an application for a project is complete or of a decision by a public
agency to undertake a project, a lead agency shall provide formal notification to a designated contact of, or tribal representative of, traditionally and culturally affiliated California Native American tribes that have requested notice, to be accomplished by at least one written notice that includes:

a. A brief description of the project.
   b. The lead agency contact information.
   c. Notification that the California Native American tribe has 30 days to request consultation. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (d)).
   d. A "California Native American tribe" is defined as a Native American tribe located in California that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC for the purposes of Chapter 905 of Statutes of 2004 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21073).

2. Begin Consultation Within 30 Days of Receiving a Tribe’s Request for Consultation and Before Releasing a Negative Declaration, Mitigated Negative Declaration, or Environmental Impact Report: A lead agency shall begin the consultation process within 30 days of receiving a request for consultation from a California Native American tribe that is traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the proposed project. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1, subds. (d) and (e)) and prior to the release of a negative declaration, mitigated negative declaration or environmental impact report. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1(b)).
   a. For purposes of AB 52, "consultation shall have the same meaning as provided in Gov. Code § 65352.4 (SB 18). (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.1 (b)).

3. Mandatory Topics of Consultation If Requested by a Tribe: The following topics of consultation, if a tribe requests to discuss them, are mandatory topics of consultation:
   a. Alternatives to the project.
   b. Recommended mitigation measures.
   c. Significant effects. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

4. Discretionary Topics of Consultation: The following topics are discretionary topics of consultation:
   a. Type of environmental review necessary.
   b. Significance of the tribal cultural resources.
   c. Significance of the project’s impacts on tribal cultural resources.
   d. If necessary, project alternatives or appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation that the tribe may recommend to the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (a)).

5. Confidentiality of Information Submitted by a Tribe During the Environmental Review Process: With some exceptions, any information, including but not limited to, the location, description, and use of tribal cultural resources submitted by a California Native American tribe during the environmental review process shall not be included in the environmental document or otherwise disclosed by the lead agency or any other public agency to the public, consistent with Government Code sections 6254 (r) and 6254.10. Any information submitted by a California Native American tribe during the consultation or environmental review process shall be published in a confidential appendix to the environmental document unless the tribe that provided the information consents, in writing, to the disclosure of some or all of the information to the public. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (c)(1)).

6. Discussion of Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources in the Environmental Document: If a project may have a significant impact on a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency’s environmental document shall discuss both of the following:
   a. Whether the proposed project has a significant impact on an identified tribal cultural resource.
   b. Whether feasible alternatives or mitigation measures, including those measures that may be agreed to pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (a), avoid or substantially lessen the impact on the identified tribal cultural resource. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (b)).

7. Conclusion of Consultation: Consultation with a tribe shall be considered concluded when either of the following occurs:
   a. The parties agree to measures to mitigate or avoid a significant effect, if a significant effect exists, on a tribal cultural resource; or
   b. A party, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached. (Pub. Resources Code § 21080.3.2 (b)).
8. **Recommending Mitigation Measures Agreed Upon in Consultation in the Environmental Document:** Any mitigation measures agreed upon in the consultation conducted pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2 shall be recommended for inclusion in the environmental document and in an adopted mitigation monitoring and reporting program, if determined to avoid or lessen the impact pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.3, subdivision (b), paragraph 2, and shall be fully enforceable. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (a)).

9. **Required Consideration of Feasible Mitigation:** If mitigation measures recommended by the staff of the lead agency as a result of the consultation process are not included in the environmental document or if there are no agreed upon mitigation measures at the conclusion of consultation, or if consultation does not occur, and if substantial evidence demonstrates that a project will cause a significant effect to a tribal cultural resource, the lead agency shall consider feasible mitigation pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21084.3 (b). (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (e)).

10. **Examples of Mitigation Measures That, If Feasible, May Be Considered to Avoid or Minimize Significant Adverse Impacts to Tribal Cultural Resources:**
    a. Avoidance and preservation of the resources in place, including, but not limited to:
       i. Planning and construction to avoid the resources and protect the cultural and natural context.
       ii. Planning greenspace, parks, or other open space, to incorporate the resources with culturally appropriate protection and management criteria.
     b. Treating the resource with culturally appropriate dignity, taking into account the tribal cultural values and meaning of the resource, including, but not limited to, the following:
       i. Protecting the cultural character and integrity of the resource.
       ii. Protecting the traditional use of the resource.
       iii. Protecting the confidentiality of the resource.
     c. Permanent conservation easements or other interests in real property, with culturally appropriate management criteria for the purposes of preserving or utilizing the resources or places.
     d. Protecting the resource. (Pub. Resource Code § 21084.3 (b)).
     e. Please note that a federally recognized California Native American tribe or a nonfederally recognized California Native American tribe that is on the contact list maintained by the NAHC to protect a California prehistoric, archaeological, cultural, spiritual, or ceremonial place may acquire and hold conservation easements if the conservation easement is voluntarily conveyed. (Civ. Code § 815.3 (c)).
     f. Please note that it is the policy of the state that Native American remains and associated grave artifacts shall be repatriated. (Pub. Resources Code § 5097.991).

11. **Prerequisites for Certifying an Environmental Impact Report or Adopting a Mitigated Negative Declaration or Negative Declaration with a Significant Impact on an Identified Tribal Cultural Resource:** An environmental impact report may not be certified, nor may a mitigated negative declaration or a negative declaration be adopted unless one of the following occurs:
    a. The consultation process between the tribes and the lead agency has occurred as provided in Public Resources Code sections 21080.3.1 and 21080.3.2 and concluded pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21080.3.2.
    b. The tribe that requested consultation failed to provide comments to the lead agency or otherwise failed to engage in the consultation process.
    c. The lead agency provided notice of the project to the tribe in compliance with Public Resources Code section 21080.3.1 (d) and the tribe failed to request consultation within 30 days. (Pub. Resources Code § 21082.3 (d)).

The NAHC's PowerPoint presentation titled, "Tribal Consultation Under AB 52: Requirements and Best Practices" may be found online at: http://nahc.ca.gov/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/AB52TribalConsultation_CalEPAPDF.pdf

**SB 18**

SB 18 applies to local governments and requires local governments to contact, provide notice to, refer plans to, and consult with tribes prior to the adoption or amendment of a general plan or a specific plan, or the designation of open space. (Gov. Code § 65352.3). Local governments should consult the Governor's Office of Planning and Research's "Tribal Consultation Guidelines," which can be found online at: https://www.opr.ca.gov/docs/09_14_05_Updated_Guidelines_922.pdf
Some of SB 18's provisions include:

1. **Tribal Consultation**: If a local government considers a proposal to adopt or amend a general plan or a specific plan, or to designate open space it is required to contact the appropriate tribes identified by the NAHC by requesting a "Tribal Consultation List." If a tribe, once contacted, requests consultation the local government must consult with the tribe on the plan proposal. A tribe has 90 days from the date of receipt of notification to request consultation unless a shorter timeframe has been agreed to by the tribe. (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (a)(2)).

2. **No Statutory Time Limit on SB 18 Tribal Consultation**: There is no statutory time limit on SB 18 tribal consultation.

3. **Confidentiality**: Consistent with the guidelines developed and adopted by the Office of Planning and Research pursuant to Gov. Code section 65040.2, the city or county shall protect the confidentiality of the information concerning the specific identity, location, character, and use of places, features and objects described in Public Resources Code sections 5097.9 and 5097.993 that are within the city's or county's jurisdiction. (Gov. Code § 65352.3 (b)).

4. **Conclusion of SB 18 Tribal Consultation**: Consultation should be concluded at the point in which:
   a. The parties to the consultation come to a mutual agreement concerning the appropriate measures for preservation or mitigation; or
   b. Either the local government or the tribe, acting in good faith and after reasonable effort, concludes that mutual agreement cannot be reached concerning the appropriate measures of preservation or mitigation. (Tribal Consultation Guidelines, Governor’s Office of Planning and Research (2005) at p. 18).

Agencies should be aware that neither AB 52 nor SB 18 precludes agencies from initiating tribal consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with their jurisdictions before the timeframes provided in AB 52 and SB 18. For that reason, we urge you to continue to request Native American Tribal Contact Lists and “Sacred Lands File” searches from the NAHC. The request forms can be found online at:

http://nahc.ca.gov/resources/forms/

**NAHC Recommendations for Cultural Resources Assessments**

To adequately assess the existence and significance of tribal cultural resources and plan for avoidance, preservation in place, or barring both, mitigation of project-related impacts to tribal cultural resources, the NAHC recommends the following actions:

1. **Contact the appropriate regional California Historical Research Information System (CHRIS) Center** (http://ohp.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=1068) for an archaeological records search. The records search will determine:
   a. If part or all of the APE has been previously surveyed for cultural resources.
   b. If any known cultural resources have been already been recorded on or adjacent to the APE.
   c. If the probability is low, moderate, or high that cultural resources are located in the APE.
   d. If a survey is required to determine whether previously unrecorded cultural resources are present.

2. **If an archaeological inventory survey is required**, the final stage is the preparation of a professional report detailing the findings and recommendations of the records search and field survey.
   a. The final report containing site forms, site significance, and mitigation measures should be submitted immediately to the planning department. All information regarding site locations, Native American human remains, and associated funerary objects should be in a separate confidential addendum and not be made available for public disclosure.
   b. The final written report should be submitted within 3 months after work has been completed to the appropriate regional CHRIS center.

3. **Contact the NAHC for**:
   a. A Sacred Lands File search. Remember that tribes do not always record their sacred sites in the Sacred Lands File, nor are they required to do so. A Sacred Lands File search is not a substitute for consultation with tribes that are traditionally and culturally affiliated with the geographic area of the project's APE.
b. A Native American Tribal Consultation List of appropriate tribes for consultation concerning the project site and to assist in planning for avoidance, preservation in place, or, failing both, mitigation measures.

4. Remember that the lack of surface evidence of archaeological resources (including tribal cultural resources) does not preclude their subsurface existence.
   a. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plan provisions for the identification and evaluation of inadvertently discovered archaeological resources per Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5(f) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5(f)). In areas of identified archaeological sensitivity, a certified archaeologist and a culturally affiliated Native American with knowledge of cultural resources should monitor all ground-disturbing activities.
   b. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the disposition of recovered cultural items that are not burial associated in consultation with culturally affiliated Native Americans.
   c. Lead agencies should include in their mitigation and monitoring reporting program plans provisions for the treatment and disposition of inadvertently discovered Native American human remains. Health and Safety Code section 7050.5, Public Resources Code section 5097.98, and Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, section 15064.5, subdivisions (d) and (e) (CEQA Guidelines section 15064.5, subds. (d) and (e)) address the processes to be followed in the event of an inadvertent discovery of any Native American human remains and associated grave goods in a location other than a dedicated cemetery.

If you have any questions, please contact me at my email address: sharaya.souza@nahc.ca.gov.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Sharaya Souza
Staff Services Analyst

cc: State Clearinghouse
Dear Ms. Bloom:

The San Francisco Planning Department, acting in the capacity of responsible agency as defined by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15082(b), has prepared the following comments on environmental issues to consider in preparation of an environmental impact report for the Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project on San Francisco State University (SFSU)’s campus. Comments focus primarily on Project Description information relevant to the analysis of the project’s potential environmental impacts; the project’s contribution to cumulative impacts from reasonably foreseeable projects; and mitigation measures to lessen environmental effects.

As lead agency, the California State University Trustees carry out environmental review for projects on the 144-acre SFSU campus in accordance with the CEQA. The Planning Department’s role in connection to the proposed project is that of responsible agency with discretionary approval authority over the proposed project’s street vacation of Tapia Drive and associated streetscape improvements in determining conformity with the city’s General Plan.

The proposed project entails demolition of existing housing at “Block 1” (168 beds) and “Block 6” (8 units) in the southern portion of the campus and construction of student housing (550 beds) with 25,000 square feet of ground-floor commercial retail and support space at Block 6. Up to 70 parking spaces would be provided by consolidating and eliminating on-street campus parking elsewhere. The project also entails construction of a 75,000-square-foot Creative Arts building and 60,000-square-foot, 800-seat concert hall on Block 1 at Font Boulevard and Holloway Avenue. The Initial Study identifies these uses as components of SFSU’s adopted Campus Master Plan. The CMP’s impacts were studied in the CMP EIR, certified in 2007; the proposed project would tier off the CMP EIR, and incorporate by reference relevant information and analysis. Comments related to the proposed Project Description are presented first, followed by topic-specific comments, organized in the order presented in the Initial Study checklist.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

- On Figure 1 and others, ensure key orienting features (scale, north arrow, street names, campus buildings, etc.) are mapped legibly. Adjust boundary lines (Figure 1) and labeling (Figure 3) to avoid covering street names to ensure surrounding streets and project locations are accurately identified on EIR maps.

- Consider additional site plans in the EIR at the “block” level for existing and proposed conditions that show building footprints in relation to surrounding streets, open areas and other features so the reader may assess the relative scale and location of the proposed housing and arts/concert hall buildings.

- Include also a campus map showing linkages to surrounding city streets and transit stops that illustrate the spatial relationships, paths and distances proposed uses have relative to others on the campus and to the adjacent Park Merced neighborhood (see Initial Study 2.2.2, Project-specific Objectives, #4).

- Tabulate project data (expand IS Table 1 or similar) to show project relationship to the Master Plan’s program: uses; size/area (in square feet), projected population (student; residential; employment as part of project/Master Plan); and other relevant Master Plan components anticipated through the 2020 horizon.

LAND USE, PLANS AND POLICIES

- Provide description of SFSU’s Campus Master Plan and identify policies from the CMP that guide campus development. Identify city, regional and statewide policies that may be applicable to the proposed project, including: the San Francisco General Plan, Better Streets Plan, the City’s Transit First Policy, Vision Zero, etc.

- The Planning Department implements CEQA Guidance in its approach to evaluating a project’s relationship to plans and policies that is based on identifying possible planning or policy conflicts that may result in direct or indirect significant environment impacts.

- Provide a definition of state trustee agency, and clarify the lead agency’s responsibilities and functions in relation to the proposed project and campus master planning. Discuss the campus setting in light of jurisdictional boundaries that regulate planning, implementation, approval and monitoring of the project. Note the land uses and properties along campus edge and describe the physical setting and relevant planning regulations in the San Francisco Planning Code (zoning), General Plan, height and bulk districts, etc. for informational purposes.
• Clarify the pertinent zoning or regulatory land use framework that applies to the property SFSU acquired in 2005. Provide a map of SFSU’s campus in the context of surrounding height, bulk and use districts under City and County jurisdiction to illustrate how changes in the built environment on the campus relate to its edges.

• Where possible, substantiate statements of “project consistency” with information included in this EIR in support of its conclusions. The Initial Study indicates the height of the proposed apartment building is 90 feet and inconsistent with the CMP EIR (actual height not noted). The Initial Study also notes that the project is aligned with the goals of the (adjacent Park Merced? Campus?) Master Plan without referencing relevant criteria considered that supports such a determination. Planning inconsistencies should be identified to determine whether project conflicts may cause direct and indirect physical effects on the environment. Readers may have limited access to CMP reference documents – where possible, please strive to sufficiently document conclusions in this analysis by limiting reference to materials that may not be readily accessible.

AESTHETICS

• In accordance with CEQA Section 21099 – Modernization of Transportation Analysis for Transit Oriented Projects – aesthetics and parking shall not be considered in determining if a project has the potential to result in significant environmental effects, provided the project meets all of the following three criteria:

  a) the project is in a transit priority area; and
  b) the project is on an infill site; and
  c) the project is residential, mixed-use residential, or an employment center.

• If the lead agency determines that all three of the criteria apply to this project, it appears that an analysis of the proposed project’s aesthetic and light and glare impacts in the EIR may not be required. CEQA Section 21099 provides that a Lead Agency continues to maintain the authority to consider aesthetic impacts pursuant to local design review ordinances or other discretionary powers. The Planning Department recognizes that the public and decision makers continue to be interested in information pertaining to the aesthetic effects of a proposed project and may desire that such information be provided as part of the environmental review process. The Department addresses this by including visual simulations in an EIR’s Project Description that depict the project conditions solely for informational purposes. This may be one way to approach the Initial Study’s Aesthetics findings in light of the provisions of CEQA Section 21099, as determined applicable to this project.
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES (BIRD-SAFE BUILDINGS)

- The campus is located within 300 feet of open spaces greater than 2 acres, meaning the surrounding vicinity, particularly west of Lake Merced Boulevard may function as an important urban bird refuge. The City and County has adopted standards and best design practices related to window treatments, lighting and site design that aim to reduce location- and building-feature hazards to avian species. The sponsor is encouraged to consult and incorporate the applicable Standards for Bird-safe Buildings into project designs as feasible. See: http://sf-planning.org/standards-bird-safe-buildings.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

- The City and County of San Francisco’s Strategies to Address Greenhouse Gas Emissions presents a comprehensive assessment of policies, programs, and ordinances that represents San Francisco’s Qualified Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Reduction Strategy. The Planning Department considers projects that are consistent with the City’s Qualified GHG Reduction Strategy to have less-than-significant GHG emissions impacts.

- The Initial Study does not describe the regulatory context, stated goals and relevant thresholds that will be used to evaluate the project’s construction and operational greenhouse gas emissions. The sponsor may consider whether evaluating the project’s GHG emissions impacts in light of its potential to conflict (or be found compatible) with strategies or policies that CSU may have adopted to conform to the emissions targets established by the state’s Global Warming Solutions Act (see http://www.calstate.edu/cpdc/sustainability/policies-reports/). Such an approach would be similar to the Planning Department’s method for evaluating the significance of a project’s GHG emissions impacts, and the lead agency may likewise consider such an approach sufficient for this project.

TRANSPORTATION AND CIRCULATION

- The Initial Study’s checklist responses do not clearly note whether the EIR would evaluate transportation impacts in a manner consistent with the provisions of CEQA Section 21099 or whether some other metric, such as level of service (LOS) is intended to be reported.

- If transportation impacts to intersection levels of service were evaluated for the 2007 Master Plan, has analysis been conducted to determine whether conditions today reflect those assumed for 2016 in the CMP EIR?
The CMP EIR cites a year 2020 planning horizon for considering cumulative impacts that accounts for the build out of the CMP and projected population growth. The CTA and Planning Department currently bases its future transportation projections to a future year 2040 horizon. How does the EIR’s analysis intend to address this later, future condition?

In terms of evaluating impacts to transit, the latest screenline data is attached (through year 2040) and all four screenlines should be evaluated for this project.

**Street Vacation**

The project would require vacation of Tapia Drive, a public street that borders the east and north sides of Block 1. Any modification of the public right-of-way that deviates from the City’s *Public Works Standard Plans and Specifications* may require a Major Encroachment Permit (MEP) from the Bureau of Street Use and Mapping. Information on the Major Encroachment permitting process is available at: http://www.sfdpw.org/permits-0

Street vacation requests are subject to Planning Department review for conformity with the City’s General Plan and Better Streets Plan. Proposals are weighed in terms of the public advantages afforded in exchange for the permanent loss of public use and public values from a street vacation.

**Safety**

The Initial Study does not appear to consider the project’s potential effects on pedestrian circulation. Please include a review of possible pedestrian impacts in light of possible conflicts with driveways, impacted walkways, and possible unsafe conditions that should be evaluated as part of the transportation review of this project.

The EIR should also describe the Vision Zero policy framework and note that 19th Ave is a Vision Zero Corridor, which is characterized as a high injury network for pedestrian and vehicles. The project should prioritize improving safety for all users along this corridor.

Access ramps are missing at the following intersections:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue / Holloway Avenue</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crespi Drive / Serrano Drive / Varela Avenue</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue and Crespi Drive</td>
<td>NW</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th Avenue and Holloway Ave</td>
<td>SW</td>
<td>Left</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bicycle, Loading and Suggested Improvements

- Several bicycle routes surround the SFSU campus. These routes should be considered relative to the proposed project sites and any impacts to access or bicycle circulation associated with the project’s vehicular access points should be addressed and corrected.
- Information related to the amount, location, and type of bicycle parking should be included in the EIR.
- Details pertaining to how the buildings will accommodate loading activities should be provided. Will loading occur on street? Would there need to be restrictions placed on project site street frontages to facilitate deliveries and move-ins?
- Per the San Francisco Better Streets Plan, 19th Avenue is classified as a Residential Throughway. The Better Streets Plan recommends minimum sidewalk widths of 15 feet on such streets.
- Per the San Francisco Better Streets Plan, Holloway Avenue is classified as a Neighborhood Residential Street. The Better Streets Plan recommends a minimum sidewalk width of 12 feet on such streets.
- The EIR should include details pertaining to the University’s Transportation Demand Measures and public realm improvements it would implement as part of this project.

HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL RESOURCES

- The EIR should describe the properties evaluated for historic significance on the SFSU campus for the Master Plan in 2007. The Historic Resource Evaluation (HRE) should be summarized and provide sufficient information of the campus’ setting that clarifies for the reader the buildings and/or other physical features that were evaluated in the 2007, and whether any other buildings or campus features may require updated analysis in this EIR.
- Clearly describe the parameters used in 2007 in the evaluation of historic resource impacts – did this HRE also consider Park Merced? Is the evaluation of historic significance or impacts to off-site resources contemplated in the 2007 Master Plan EIR?
- Discuss the criteria used to determine whether a building may be considered a potential historic resource for purposes of environmental review. Are there any differences in the methods used by the CSU to evaluate impacts to on-campus resources that may differ from the criteria or methods used to evaluate potential impacts to the former Park Merced properties that warrant additional clarification in the EIR?
• The Initial Study finds a significant impact associated with buildout of the Master Plan but does not clarify whether this impact is associated with demolition of existing housing or other buildings. The analysis should clearly explain the specific impacts associated with buildout of the Master Plan—clarifying for example, whether impacts are to individually-eligible resources or to a district. The EIR should clearly evaluate the sites to determine eligibility of (and impacts to) a potential district as well as individual resources.

• The information being updated for former Park Merced properties should clarify how this would be used to supplement the evaluations prepared for the CMP incorporated by EIR reference.

• Given the potential that documentation of affected buildings would not fully mitigate historic resource impacts, the sponsor is encouraged to work collaboratively to provide a robust documentation of the sites’ history. This documentation and should be informed by the research conducted for the Park Merced project. The lead agency’s architectural consultant should coordinate and consult with the Planning Department’s historic preservation specialists to confirm the scope of work related to the Historic American Buildings Survey.

MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

• The EIR should clearly note how the assessment of past, present and reasonably foreseeable projects are being considered. The Initial Study makes numerous statements related to the adequacy of the 2007 CMP EIR and its utility to address cumulative impacts of this project.

• The EIR should acknowledge the planning horizon established in the 2007 CMP EIR and note that the review is evaluating conditions in 2016. Further, as noted, the City’s transportation planners currently consider population growth projections through a horizon year of 2040.

• The sponsor would be advised to coordinate with Planning Department staff to review projects it may consider reasonably foreseeable in light of this project’s implementation schedules to ensure that the potential for the project to contribute considerably to cumulative effects has been studied and, if necessary, mitigation is identified.

• The EIR should review the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) prepared for the Park Merced project to identify whether measures required of that project should be coordinated with those that may be necessary for implementation of the proposed project, such as construction-related noise mitigation or similar.
Please feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss any of the comments in the letter.

Sincerely,

Michael Jacinto  
San Francisco Planning Department  
Environmental Planning Division

Attachments:  
Bird Refuge Sites  
Transportation Screenline Memorandum  
Park Merced Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program
Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings

THE FACTS

Over 100 million bird deaths annually

Reflective, transparent materials cause hazardous collisions

Birds attempt to reach shelter, food and migratory paths reflected in glass

THE CODE

Per San Francisco Planning Code Section 139, “Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings,” there are two types of bird hazards:

Location-Related Hazards: Buildings within 300 feet of an Urban Bird Refuge.

Building Feature-Related Hazards: Uninterrupted glazed segments 24 square feet or larger.

THE TRIGGERS

New Buildings
Additions
Alterations - replacing 50% or more of glazing

Resources

Standards for Bird-Safe Buildings document
sfplanning.org/index.aspx?page=2506

Golden Gate Audubon
goldengateaudubon.org

American Bird Conservancy
abcbirdtape.org

U.S Fish and Wildlife Service
fws.gov

LEED Pilot Credit #55 Bird Façade
usgbc.org
Location-related hazards require facade treatment. Buildings with feature-related hazards are also required to treat hazards.

Applied to 90% of glazing from grade up to 60 feet (Bird Collision Zone)

Applied to 100% of Building Feature-Related Hazard

2x4 Rule Required: Patterns smaller than 4” tall by 2” wide

**Glazing Options**

- Glass that reflects the ultraviolet light (which birds can see) such as ‘Ornilux’
- Glass which has photovoltaic cells embedded such as ‘IQ Glass’, or ‘Voltalux’
- Dichroic glass
- Fritted glass such as Viracon Silk-screen
- Etched Glass
- Translucent glass such as ‘Profilit’
- Film

**Building & Fenestration Strategies**

- Layering and recessing glazed surfaces
- Louvers
- Overhangs and awnings
- Screening
- Netting
- Angled or faceted glazing - minimize reflectivity
- Opaque surfaces
- Structurally break-up large expanses of glass

**Additional Precautions: Lighting & Wind Generators**

- Avoid beacon effect and blind spots
- Minimal external lighting
- No uplighting
- Shielded lighting
- No event searchlights
- Wind Generators must appear solid

**Comparison of Different Treatments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Upkeep</th>
<th>Longevity</th>
<th>Application</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NETTING</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FILM</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRITTED/ETCHED</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UV/PV</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCREENS</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOUVERS</td>
<td>*****</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>$$$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 STARS/$ = MINIMAL DURABLE EASY PRICEY

Exception: Zoning Administrator Waivers

- Bird collision zone treatment exempt for: residential-zoned buildings less than 45 feet tall with limited glass facade (less than 50% glazing); building feature-related treatment still required.

- More treatment required (95%) for: residential-zoned buildings less than 45 feet tall with substantial glass facade (more than 50% glazing).

- May waive or modify requirements per recommendation of qualified biologist.
**MITIGATION MEASURES FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural Resources and Archeological Paleontological Resources Mitigation Measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mitigation Measure M-CR-1: Documentation and Interpretation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Documentation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Project Sponsor shall retain a professional who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards for Architectural History to prepare written and photographic documentation of the Parkmerced complex within the Project Site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The documentation for the property shall be prepared based on the National Park Service’s (NPS) Historic American Building Survey (HABS) / Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) Historical Report Guidelines, and will include a selection of measured drawings based upon NPS Historic American Landscape Survey (HALS) Guidelines. This type of documentation is based on a combination of both HABS/HAER standards (Levels I, II and III) and NPS’s policy for photographic documentation as outlined in the National Register of Historic Places and National Historic Landmarks Survey Photo Policy Expansion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The measured drawings for this documentation shall follow HALS Level I standards. To determine the number of the measured drawings, the professional shall consult with the San Francisco Planning Department’s Preservation Coordinator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The written historical data for this documentation shall follow HABS / HAER Level I standards. The written data shall be accompanied by a sketch plan of the property. Efforts should also be made to locate original construction drawings or plans of the property during the period of significance. If located, these drawings should be photographed, reproduced, and included in the dataset. If construction drawings or plans cannot be located, as-built drawings shall be produced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either HABS/HAER standard large format or digital photography shall be used. If digital photography is used, the ink and paper combinations for printing photographs must be in compliance with NR-NHL Photo Policy Expansion and have a permanency rating of approximately 115 years. Digital photographs will be taken as uncompressed, TIF file format. The size of each image will be 1600x1200 pixels at 330 ppi (pixels per inch) or larger, color format, and printed in black and white. The file name for each electronic image shall correspond with the index of photographs and photograph label. Photograph views for the dataset shall include (a) contextual views; (b) views of each side of each building and interior views, where possible; (c) oblique views of buildings; and (d) detail views of character-defining features, including features on the interiors of some buildings. All views shall be referenced on a photographic key. This</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prior to construction submittal of HABS/HAER/HALS guidelines documentation for approval by Planning Department.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consultant to submit report to Planning Department</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prior to construction, transmit documentation to the SF Library, and NWIC.
photographic key shall be on a map of the property and shall show the photograph number with an arrow to indicate the direction of the view. Historic photographs shall also be collected, reproduced, and included in the dataset.

The Project Sponsor shall transmit such documentation to the History Room of the San Francisco Public Library, and to the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Information Resource System.

All documentation will be revised and approved by the San Francisco Planning Department’s Preservation Coordinator prior to granting any demolition permit.

**Interpretation**

The Project Sponsor shall provide a permanent display of interpretive materials concerning the history and architectural features of the original Parkmerced complex within public spaces of the Project Site. Interpretation of the site’s history shall be conducted and written by an architectural historian or historian, who meets the Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualification Standards, and shall be conducted in coordination with an exhibit designer. The interpretative materials should be placed in a prominent public setting and be permanent. The media, and other characteristics of such interpretive display shall be approved by the San Francisco Planning Department’s Preservation Coordinator prior to any demolition or removal activities.

**Archives**

The Project Sponsor shall donate original Leonard Schultz and Thomas Church architectural drawings of Parkmerced to the University of California, Berkeley Environmental Design Archives. Confirmation from UC Berkeley shall be received and the San Francisco Planning Department’s Preservation Coordinator shall be notified.

| **M-CR-3a: Archaeological Testing, Monitoring, Data Recovery and Reporting for first Project Phase** |
| Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant. | Prior to and during construction | Consultant to prepare Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP) in consultation with the ERO. |
| The project archaeologist to consult with the ERO as indicated. Considered complete after review and approval of the Final Archaeological Resources Report by the ERO. |
consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and the requirements of the ARDTP (Archeo-Tec, Archeological Research Design and Treatment Plan, Parkmerced Project, March 2010) at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). In instances of inconsistency between the requirements of the project ARDTP and the requirements of this mitigation measure, the requirements of this archaeological mitigation measure shall prevail. All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Archaeological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce to a less-than-significant level potential effects on a significant archaeological resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (a)(c).

### Archaeological Testing Program

The archaeological consultant shall prepare and submit to the ERO for review and approval an archaeological testing plan (ATP). The archaeological testing program shall be conducted in accordance with the approved ATP. The ATP shall identify the property types of the expected archaeological resource(s) that potentially could be adversely affected by the proposed project, the testing method to be used, and the locations recommended for testing. The purpose of the archaeological testing program will be to determine to the extent possible the presence or absence of archaeological resources and to identify and to evaluate whether any archaeological resource encountered on the site constitutes an historical resource under CEQA. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings to the ERO. If based on the archaeological testing program the archaeological consultant finds that significant archaeological resources may be present, the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine if additional measures are warranted. Additional measures that may be undertaken include additional archaeological testing, archaeological monitoring, and/or an archaeological data recovery program. If the ERO determines that a significant archaeological resource is present and that the resource could be adversely affected by the proposed project, at the discretion of the project sponsor either:

| A) | The proposed project shall be re-designed so as to avoid any adverse effect on the significant archaeological resource; or |
| B) | A data recovery program shall be implemented, unless the ERO determines that the archaeological resource is of greater interpretive than research significance |

Prior to and during construction

If applicable, upon discovery of human remains and/or associated or unassociated funerary objects, the consultant shall notify the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco, and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) who shall make reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of human remains and/or associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Consultant to prepare draft and final Archeological Resources Report reports. The ERO to review and approve the Final Archeological Resources Report
and that interpretive use of the resource is feasible.

Archaeological Monitoring Program (AMP)

If the ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant determines that an archaeological monitoring program shall be implemented the archaeological monitoring program shall minimally include the following provisions:

- The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the AMP reasonably prior to any project-related soils-disturbing activities commencing. The ERO in consultation with the archaeological consultant shall determine what project activities shall be archaeologically monitored. In most cases, any soils-disturbing activities, such as demolition, foundation removal, excavation, grading, utilities installation, foundation work, driving of piles (foundation, shoring, etc.), site remediation, etc., shall require archaeological monitoring because of the risk these activities pose to potential archaeological resources and to their depositional context;

- The archaeological consultant shall advise all project contractors to be on the alert for evidence of the presence of the expected resource(s), of how to identify the evidence of the expected resource(s), and of the appropriate protocol in the event of apparent discovery of an archaeological resource;

- The archaeological monitor(s) shall be present on the project site according to a schedule agreed upon by the archaeological consultant and the ERO until the ERO has, in consultation with the project archaeological consultant, determined that project construction activities could have no effects on significant archaeological deposits;

- The archaeological monitor shall record and be authorized to collect soil samples and artifactual/eco-factual material as warranted for analysis;

- If an intact archaeological deposit is encountered, all soils-disturbing activities in the vicinity of the deposit shall cease. The archaeological monitor shall be empowered to temporarily redirect demolition/excavation/pile driving/construction activities and equipment until the deposit is evaluated. If in the case of pile-driving activity (foundation, shoring, etc.), the archaeological monitor has cause to believe that the pile-driving activity may affect an archaeological resource, the pile-driving activity shall be terminated until an appropriate evaluation of the resource has been made in consultation with the ERO. The archaeological consultant shall immediately notify the ERO of the encountered archaeological deposit. The archaeological consultant shall make a reasonable effort to assess the identity, integrity, and significance of the
encountered archaeological deposit, and present the findings of this assessment to the ERO.

Whether or not significant archaeological resources are encountered, the archaeological consultant shall submit a written report of the findings of the monitoring program to the ERO.

**Archaeological Data Recovery Program**

The archaeological data recovery program shall be conducted in accord with an archaeological data recovery plan (ADRP). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and ERO shall meet and consult on the scope of the ADRP prior to preparation of a draft ADRP. The archaeological consultant shall submit a draft ADRP to the ERO. The ADRP shall identify how the proposed data recovery program will preserve the significant information the archaeological resource is expected to contain. That is, the ADRP will identify what scientific/historical research questions are applicable to the expected resource, what data classes the resource is expected to possess, and how the expected data classes would address the applicable research questions. Data recovery, in general, should be limited to the portions of the historical property that could be adversely affected by the proposed project. Destructive data recovery methods shall not be applied to portions of the archaeological resources if non-destructive methods are practical.

The scope of the ADRP shall include the following elements:

- Field Methods and Procedures. Descriptions of proposed field strategies, procedures, and operations.
- Cataloguing and Laboratory Analysis. Description of selected cataloguing system and artifact analysis procedures.
- Discard and De-accession Policy. Description of and rationale for field and post-field discard and de-accession policies.
- Interpretive Program. Consideration of an on-site/off-site public interpretive program during the course of the archaeological data recovery program.
- Security Measures. Recommended security measures to protect the archaeological resource from vandalism, looting, and non-intentionally damaging activities.
- Final Report. Description of proposed report format and distribution of results.
- Curation. Description of the procedures and recommendations for the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant</th>
<th>Prior to and during construction</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
curation of any recovered data having potential research value, identification of appropriate curation facilities, and a summary of the accession policies of the curation facilities.

Human Remains and Associated or Unassociated Funerary Objects

The treatment of human remains and of associated or unassociated funerary objects discovered during any soils-disturbing activity shall comply with applicable State and Federal laws. This shall include immediate notification of the Coroner of the City and County of San Francisco and in the event of the Coroner’s determination that the human remains are Native American remains, notification of the California State Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) who shall appoint a Most Likely Descendant (MLD) (Pub. Res. Code Sec. 5097.98). The archaeological consultant, project sponsor, and MLD shall make all reasonable efforts to develop an agreement for the treatment of, with appropriate dignity, human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects (CEQA Guidelines Sec. 15064.5(d)). The agreement should take into consideration the appropriate excavation, removal, recordation, analysis, custodianship, curation, and final disposition of the human remains and associated or unassociated funerary objects.

Final Archaeological Resources Report

The archaeological consultant shall submit a Draft Final Archaeological Resources Report (FARR) to the ERO that evaluates the historical significance of any discovered archaeological resource and describes the archaeological and historical research methods employed in the archaeological testing/monitoring/data recovery program(s) undertaken. Information that may put at risk any archaeological resource shall be provided in a separate removable insert within the final report.

Once approved by the ERO, copies of the FARR shall be distributed as follows: California Archaeological Site Survey Northwest Information Center (NWIC) shall receive one (1) copy and the ERO shall receive a copy of the transmittal of the FARR to the NWIC. The Major Environmental Analysis division of the Planning Department shall receive two copies (bound and unbound) and one unlocked, searchable PDF copy on a CD or DVD of the FARR along with copies of any formal site recordation forms (CA DPR 523 series) and/or documentation for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places/California Register of Historical Resources. In instances of high public interest in or the high interpretive value of the resource, the ERO may require a different final report content, format, and distribution than that presented above.

Mitigation Measure M-CR-3b: Archaeological Treatment Plan for Subsequent Project Phases

Based on a reasonable presumption that archaeological resources may be present within
the Project Site, the following measures shall be undertaken to avoid any potentially significant adverse effect from subsequent project phases the Proposed Project on buried archaeological resources. The Project Sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified archaeological consultant having expertise in California prehistoric and urban historical archaeology. The archaeological consultant shall prepare an archaeological treatment plan (TP). The archaeological consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure at the direction of the Environmental Review Officer (ERO). All plans and reports prepared by the consultant as specified herein shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO.

Archaeological Treatment Plan. The archaeological consultant shall meet and consult with the ERO on the scope of the TP prior to preparation of the TP. The TP shall be submitted to the ERO for review and approval prior to the Project ground-breaking activities for subsequent project phases. Archaeological field investigations for subsequent project phases shall be conducted in accordance with the approved TP. The TP shall identify project-specific vertical / horizontal areas of archaeological sensitivity and appropriate archaeological identification and evaluation strategies, and archaeological mitigatory protocols applicable to specific project activities / improvements (for example, excavation building foundation installation, grading, etc.) with the potential to affect archaeological properties. Mitigation strategies requiring archaeological testing plans (ATP) and archaeological monitoring plans (AMP) shall conform to the requirements for preparation and implementation including preparation of archaeological investigation and data recovery results reporting of an ATP and AMP in Mitigation Measure M-CR-3a.

**M-CR-5: Paleontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program**

The Project Sponsor shall retain the services of a qualified palaeontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology to design and implement a Palaeontological Resources Monitoring and Mitigation Program (PRMMP). The PRMMP shall include a description of when and where construction monitoring would be required; emergency discovery procedures; sampling and data recovery procedures; procedure for the preparation, identification, analysis, and curation of fossil specimens and data recovered; preconstruction coordination procedures; and procedures for reporting the results of the monitoring program.

The PRMMP shall be consistent with the Society for Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) Standard Guidelines for the mitigation of construction–related adverse impacts to palaeontological resources and the requirements of the designated repository for any fossils collected. During construction, earth-moving activities shall be monitored by a qualified palaeontological consultant having expertise in California paleontology in the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project sponsor to retain appropriately qualified consultant to prepare PRMMP, carry out monitoring, and reporting</td>
<td>Prior to and during construction. The project palaeontological consultant to consult with the ERO as indicated; completed when ERO accepts final report</td>
<td>ERO to approve final PRMMP. Consultant shall provide brief monthly reports to ERO during monitoring or as identified in the PRMMP, and notify the ERO immediately if work should stop for data recovery during monitoring.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TP for each phase to be completed prior to ground-breaking for that phase. ATP and AMPs, where necessary, shall be prepared pursuant to schedule in M-CR-3a.
areas where these activities have the potential to disturb previously undisturbed native sediment or sedimentary rocks. Monitoring need not be conducted in areas where the ground has been previously disturbed, in areas of artificial fill, in areas underlain by nonsedimentary rocks, or in areas where exposed sediment would be buried, but otherwise undisturbed.

The consultant’s work shall be conducted in accordance with this measure and at the direction of the City’s Environmental Review officer (ERO). Plans and reports prepared by the consultant shall be submitted first and directly to the ERO for review and comment, and shall be considered draft reports subject to revision until final approval by the ERO. Paleontological monitoring and/or data recovery programs required by this measure could suspend construction of the Proposed Project for up to a maximum of four weeks. At the direction of the ERO, the suspension of construction can be extended beyond four weeks only if such a suspension is the only feasible means to reduce potential effects on a significant paleontological resource as previously defined to a less-than-significant level.

**Transportation and Circulation**

**M-TR-1: Parkmerced Construction Traffic Management Program.**

The Project Sponsor shall develop and implement a Construction Traffic Management Program to minimize impacts of the Project and its contribution to cumulative impacts related to construction activities and construction traffic. The program shall provide necessary information to various contractors and agencies as to how to maximize the opportunities for complementing construction management measures and to minimize the possibility of conflicting impacts on the roadway system, while safely accommodating the traveling public in the area. The program shall supplement and expand, rather than modify or supersede any manual, regulations, or provisions set forth by SFMTA, DPW or other City departments and agencies.

Preparation of the Construction Management Program shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor, and shall be reviewed and approved by SFMTA and DPW prior to initiation of construction. The program shall:

- Identify construction traffic management practices in San Francisco, as well as other jurisdictions that could provide useful guidance for a project of this size and characteristic.
- Describe procedures required by different departments and/or agencies in the City for implementation of a construction management plan, such as reviewing agencies, approval process, and estimated timelines.
- Identify construction traffic management strategies and other elements for the
Project, and present a cohesive program of operational and demand management strategies designed to maintain acceptable traffic operations during periods of construction activities in the Project area. These could include construction strategies, demand management strategies, alternate route strategies, and public information strategies.

- Coordinate with other projects in construction in the immediate vicinity, so that they can take an integrated approach to construction-related traffic impacts.
- Present guidelines for selection of construction traffic management strategies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-TR-2A:</th>
<th>Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s)</th>
<th>No left hand turn lane would be constructed.</th>
<th>Sponsor to provide revised plans to Planning Department as part of Development Agreement; Planning Department to review and acknowledge change in proposed street configurations.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Do not construct the proposed northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue onto Crespi Drive. The northbound left-turn lane from 19th Avenue to Crespi Drive would require southbound traffic on 19th Avenue to stop to allow northbound left-turning traffic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-TR-2C:</th>
<th>Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA</th>
<th>The following effective PM peak hour auto trip generation rates for each major land use proposed (accounting for the mix of uses and the level of transit service proposed) and the total number of PM peak hour trips generated by the Proposed Project that would trigger the need for this mitigation measure are shown below:</th>
<th>SFMTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Construct a dedicated northbound right-turn lane from Lake Merced Boulevard to eastbound Winston Drive. This improvement would provide a dedicated lane for the relatively large number of vehicles expected to execute the northbound right-turn movement. Implementation of the roadway improvement would require roadway widening to the east, which necessitates relocation of the sidewalk, a utility box, a signal mast, and several other elements.

Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The feasibility of this measure is uncertain due to the adjacent unsignalized intersection, approximately 75 feet south of Winston Drive, which would conflict with the northbound right-turn lane.

[SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]
A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 930 trips based on the trip generation rates as described above. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the
| M-TR-2D: Provide a third northbound through lane and a second southbound left-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard intersection. This mitigation measure would require restriping the northbound right-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/State Drive intersection as a through lane and removing the on-street parking on the north side of the intersection to recreate the dedicated right-turn lane (assuming that it is required for acceptable operations at this intersection). Additionally, providing a second southbound left-turn lane at this intersection would require removal of on-street parking on the south side of Font Boulevard to create a second receiving lane, as well as the removal of some spaces on the west side of Lake Merced Boulevard and shifting the through travel lanes to the west to make room for the second southbound left-turn lane. Implementation would require significant roadway restriping and signal optimization and coordination at multiple intersections, as well as the removal of approximately 25 parking spaces. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. [SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.] | Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 930, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 930, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA |

| M-TR-2E: Reconfigure the westbound right-turn and southbound left-turn as the primary movements of the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way. This would | Project sponsor and sponsor’s | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the | SFMTA |
convert the northbound approach of Lake Merced Boulevard into the “minor” approach to the intersection. Although the configuration may be able to fit within the existing right-of-way at the intersection, further study is needed to determine the feasibility of this measure. A conceptual intersection configuration is presented in the Project’s Transportation Study. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.

| M-TR-9: Eliminate the weaving segment between the loop on-ramp from Brotherhood Way and the loop off-ramp to Brotherhood Way by reconfiguring the interchange. Specifically, evaluate the feasibility of closing the loop on-ramp from eastbound Brotherhood Way to northbound SR 1 and instead constructing an eastbound left-turn lane from Brotherhood Way on the east side of the structure. The direct on-ramp from westbound Brotherhood Way to northbound SR 1 should be configured with one access point to serve traffic from westbound Brotherhood Way and those making a left-turn from eastbound Brotherhood Way. The eastbound left turn-lane can and shall be constructed to approximately 150 feet in length. Ultimately, this measure may require a design exception from Caltrans. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. | construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA | issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,128, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,128, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA |
| M-TR-12: Contribute fair share toward developing and implementing revised transit service plan that increases capacity on the M Ocean View. Fund a fair-share contribution towards evaluating and implementing a revised operating plan to increase frequencies on the M Ocean View from 10 minute headways (as proposed by the project) to 7.5 minute headways north of Parkmerced. This would increase capacity such that the northeast screenline would operate within SFMTA’s capacity utilization threshold in each peak hour. Under this plan, similar to the proposed service plan, every other train would continue east through the Ingleside neighborhood.

The Proposed Project’s fair-share contribution toward implementing a comprehensive revised operating plan should be proportional to the magnitude of the Proposed Project’s impact in relation to additional capacity identified in a revised operating plan. | Project sponsor and SFMTA | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the completion and operation of the proposed Muni realignment and associated service plan updates. The study shall determine whether additional capacity can be provided on the M Ocean View, and if so, what the Proposed Project’s fair share contribution to the service plan updates shall be.

If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, a fair share contribution must be made prior to the realignment of the M Ocean View through the Parkmerced site. | SFMTA |

| M-TR-21A: Purchase an additional light rail vehicle for the M Ocean View. Purchase and insert another light-rail vehicle into the system in order to maintain headways. This will allow Muni to maintain proposed headways on the M Ocean View with a slightly longer route. The procurement of new light rail vehicles shall be completed by | Project sponsor and SFMTA | Either M-TR-21A or M-TR-21B (but not both) shall be implemented upon rerouting the M | SFMTA |
SFMTA, and shall be completed prior to operating the rerouted system. However, new transit vehicles required to serve the Proposed Project shall not be the financial responsibility of SFMTA.

| M-TR-21B: | Install Transit Signal Priority (TSP) treatments to improve transit travel times on the M Ocean View such that M-TR-21A (an additional vehicle) is not required. A study shall be conducted to determine whether TSP treatments could improve transit travel times along the M Ocean View corridor. If feasible, implement Transit Signal Priority (TSP) measures along the M Ocean View corridor between the Project Site and the West Portal Station. To reduce the Proposed Project’s impact to the M Ocean View line, the TSP measures would need to improve the travel time by approximately 50 seconds in the AM peak period and 30 seconds in the PM peak period. Achieving these reductions would reduce the Project’s impact to travel time to less than half the headway of the current M Ocean View. SFMTA and Caltrans shall design the measure prior to operating the rerouted system; however, funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.  
[SFMTA and Caltrans to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA or Caltrans determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.] | Ocean View through the Parkmerced site. If both measures are deemed feasible and effective at reducing impacts to less than significant levels, M-TR-21B shall be implemented and M-TR-21A shall not be required. | SFMTA and Caltrans |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| M-TR-22A: | Construct intersection mitigations to reduce congestion caused by vehicular delay. To address Project impacts to the 18 46th Avenue, the Project Sponsor in cooperation with SFMTA shall implement the improvements described in mitigation measures M-TR-2C (construct a dedicated northbound right-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive intersection), M-TR-2D (reconfigure the northbound approach to consist of a third through lane and provide a second southbound left-turn lane at the Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard intersection), and M-TR-2E (Reconfigure the westbound right-turn and southbound left-turn as the primary movements of the Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way intersection). This involves lane modifications at several intersections along Lake Merced Boulevard to increase vehicular capacity, thus reducing approach delay at those intersections.  
[SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.] | Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA | Either M-TR-21A or M-TR-21B (but not both) shall be implemented upon rerouting the M Ocean View through the Parkmerced site. If both measures are deemed feasible and effective at reducing impacts to less than significant levels, M-TR-21B shall be implemented and M-TR-21A shall not be required. | SFMTA and Caltrans |

<p>| SFMTA and Caltrans | Ocean View through the Parkmerced site. If both measures are deemed feasible and effective at reducing impacts to less than significant levels, M-TR-21B shall be implemented and M-TR-21A shall not be required. | SFMTA and Caltrans | SFMTA |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-TR-22B: Maintain the proposed headways of the 18 46th Avenue. The Project Sponsor in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of the following improvements which could reduce Project impacts on transit operations along the Lake Merced Boulevard corridor, generally between Brotherhood Way and Winston Drive. The study shall create a monitoring program to determine the implementation extent and schedule (as identified below) to maintain the proposed headways of transit lines impacted by the Project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A transit-only queue-jump lane should be considered on Lake Merced Boulevard at Font Boulevard. This treatment could be constructed within the existing curb-to-curb right of way for the northbound direction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Southbound queue-jumps are viable at State Drive and Font Boulevard with removal of on-street parking. However, these treatments may conflict with mitigation measure M-TR-2C collectively summarized in M-TR-22A), which have been designed to reduce the Project’s traffic impacts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These improvements would collectively benefit not only the 18 46th Avenue prior to the TEP improvements, but also SamTrans Route 122, and the proposed “shopper shuttle.” Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor shall fully fund the costs of implementing the transit priority improvements (either the improvements identified above, or alternative improvements of equal or greater effectiveness and comparable cost) as determined by the study and the monitoring program. Other options to be evaluated in the study could include comprehensive replacement of stop-controlled intersections with interconnected traffic signals equipped with transit priority elements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA | See below with regard to M-TR-22C | SFMTA |

| M-TR-22C: Purchase additional transit vehicles as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways on the 18 46th Avenue. Should mitigation measures M-TR-22A or M-TR-22B not be feasible or effective, the Project Sponsor shall work with SFMTA to purchase additional transit vehicles and contribute to operating costs and facility improvements as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways for the transit line. The Project Sponsor shall be responsible for the procurement and financing of the new transit vehicles. |

| Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) in consultation with SFMTA | A feasibility study of M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 465, based on the trip generation rates described | SFMTA |
To the extent they are deemed either physically feasible or effective at reducing the severity of Impact TR-22, mitigation measures M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 465, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.

The schedule for implementing M-TR-22C shall be determined by the feasibility study for M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B.

| M-TR-25B: Maintain the proposed headways of the 29 Sunset. The Project Sponsor in cooperation with SFMTA shall conduct a study to evaluate the effectiveness and feasibility of installing transit priority elements along Lake Merced Boulevard, between Winston Drive and Sunset Boulevard. This may include, but is not limited to, queue-jump lanes and transit-only lanes. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. The Project Sponsor shall fully fund the costs of implementing the transit priority improvements (either the improvements identified above, or alternative improvements of equal or greater effectiveness and comparable cost) as determined by the study and the monitoring program | SFMTA, with funding from Project Sponsor | See discussion of M-TR-25C | SFMTA |
SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.

**M-TR-25C:** Purchase additional transit vehicles as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways on the 29 Sunset. Should mitigation measures M-TR-25A or M-TR-25B not be feasible or effective, the Project Sponsor shall work with SFMTA to purchase additional transit vehicles and contribute to operating costs and facility improvements as necessary to mitigate the Project impacts to headways for the transit line. The procurement of new transit vehicles shall be completed by SFMTA. However, new transit vehicles required to serve the Proposed Project shall not be the financial responsibility of SFMTA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SFMTA, with funding from Project Sponsor</th>
<th>SFMTA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- A feasibility study of M-TR-25A and M-TR-25B must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,551, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.

To the extent they are deemed either physically feasible or effective at reducing the severity of Impact TR-25, mitigation measures M-TR-25A and M-TR-25B must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,551, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.

The schedule and/or need for implementing M-TR-25C shall be determined by the feasibility study for
**M-TR-26:** Maintain proposed headways on SamTrans Route 122. To address Project impacts to SamTrans Route 122, implement mitigation measures M-TR-22A (lane modifications at several intersections along Lake Merced Boulevard) and M-TR-22B (implementation of transit priority and queue-jump treatments on Lake Merced Boulevard).
Since SamTrans Route 122 shares a route with the 18 46th Avenue, improvements designed to reduce travel time impacts to the 18 46th Avenue would also benefit SamTrans Route 122.
As described in the discussion of mitigation measures M-TR-22A and M-TR-22B, feasibility of these measures is uncertain.

| Project Sponsor and Sponsor's Construction Contractor(s) in Consultation with SFMTA | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,880, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2BC. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,880, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA |

**SFMTA**

| **M-TR-36A:** Retime signal at 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue to allocate more green time to the east-west movements. 19th Avenue is a coordinated corridor with closely spaced intersections. Traffic progression relies on the interconnectivity between each signal. Retiming this particular intersection would require evaluation of the corridor. SFMTA would be responsible for evaluating and implementing a new signal timing plan. | SFMTA to carry out feasibility study. If feasible, SFMTA to monitor traffic conditions at this intersection to determine when modifications are needed. | SFMTA |

| **M-TR-25A and M-TR-25B.** | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,725, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA |

[SFMTA and Caltrans to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA or Caltrans determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]
### M-TR-36B: Construct a dedicated westbound right-turn lane and convert the shared westbound through/right-turn lane to a dedicated westbound through lane at the Brotherhood Way/Chumasero Drive intersection.

Construction of this mitigation measure would require roadway widening into the Project Site. However, if the existing pedestrian overcrossing across Brotherhood Way at this intersection remains, widening the roadway to implement this measure may not be feasible due to conflicts with structural support columns for the overcrossing. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.

*SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.*

| SFMTA to carry out feasibility study. Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) to carry out design and implementation in consultation with SFMTA | Upon construction of proposed improvements to the Brotherhood Way/Chumasero Drive intersection, as specified in the Development Agreement. | Sponsor to provide revised plans to Planning Department as part of Development Agreement; Planning Department to review and acknowledge change in proposed intersection configurations. |

### M-TR-36C: Install a traffic signal at Lake Merced Boulevard/John Muir Drive. The Project Sponsor should contribute a fair-share toward funding this mitigation measure. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.

*SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.*

| SFMTA to carry out feasibility study. If determined feasible, project sponsor to provide fair-share funding and SFMTA to | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 1,725, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA |
| **M-TR-36D:** Convert the dedicated southbound through lane into a dedicated left-turn lane at John Daly Boulevard/Lake Merced Boulevard. This would result in the southbound approach consisting of a shared through-right-turn lane and triple left-turn lanes. To achieve adequate lane utilization, John Daly Boulevard would have to be configured to have three eastbound through travel lanes east of the intersection. This would require the removal of some pedestrian elements and converting the existing right-turn lane into the Westlake Shopping Center into a shared through/right-turn lane. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor. | design and construct. | Parkmerced exceed 2,326, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,326, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | City of Daly City A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | City of Daly City |
| **M-TR-36E:** Install an auxiliary lane from Brotherhood Way through the Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive intersection to provide three northbound through lanes. Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.  

[SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.] | SFMTA to conduct feasibility study. Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) to design and construct in consultation with SFMTA | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA |

*M-TR-36F:* Install an auxiliary lane from Brotherhood Way through the Lake Merced Boulevard/Gonzalez Drive intersection to provide three northbound through lanes. | SFMTA to conduct feasibility study. | A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA |
Funding, implementation, and construction of this measure shall be the responsibility of the Project Sponsor.

[SFMTA to determine if this is feasible, and if SFMTA determines that it is not, this mitigation measure shall not be implemented.]

| **M-TR-44:** Provide additional capacity on the south and north screenlines by adding additional buses to the 28 19th Avenue and 28L 19th Avenue Limited lines. Providing additional service on the bus line would require further feasibility and capacity studies with coordination from SFMTA. The Project sponsor would be responsible to fund a “fair share” contribution towards the implementation of this mitigation measure. | Project sponsor and sponsor’s construction contractor(s) to design and construct in consultation with SFMTA | issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,946, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. | SFMTA to conduct feasibility and capacity study. Project sponsor to make fair-share contribution. If feasible, SFMTA to purchase and operate vehicles. A feasibility study must be completed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,667, based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C. If the mitigation measure |
is deemed feasible, the mitigation measure must be constructed prior to the issuance of the certificate of occupancy for any building that, after completion, would make the total number of net new PM peak hour trips at Parkmerced exceed 2,667 based on the trip generation rates described in M-TR-2C.

### Noise

**M-NO-1a: Reduce Noise Levels During Construction**

The following practices shall be incorporated into the construction contract agreement documents to be implemented by the construction contractor:

- Provide enclosures and mufflers for stationary equipment, shroud or shield impact tools, and install barriers around particularly noisy activities at the construction sites so that the line of sight between the construction activities and nearby sensitive receptor locations is blocked to the maximum feasible extent;

- Use construction equipment with lower noise emission ratings whenever possible, particularly for air compressors;

- Provide sound-control devices on equipment no less effective than those provided by the manufacturer;

- Locate stationary equipment, material stockpiles, and vehicle staging areas as far as practicable from sensitive receptor locations;

- Prohibit unnecessary idling of internal combustion engines;

- Require applicable construction-related vehicles and equipment to use designated truck routes to access the project sites;

- Implement noise attenuation measures to the extent feasible, which may include, but are not limited to, noise barriers or noise blankets. The Project Sponsor and construction contractor(s) must ensure compliance with these measures during Construction of each phase. Planning Department oversight is required to monitor adherence to the agreed-upon mitigation measures.
Placement of such attenuation measures shall be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works prior to issuance of development permits for construction activities.

Designate a Noise Disturbance Coordinator who shall be responsible for responding to complaints about noise during construction. The telephone number of the Noise Disturbance Coordinator shall be conspicuously posted at the construction site and shall be provided to the City. Copies of the construction schedule shall also be posted at nearby noise-sensitive areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-NO-1b: Pile Driving Noise-Reducing Techniques and Muffling Devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project Sponsor shall require its construction contractor to use noise-reducing pile driving techniques if nearby buildings are subject to pile driving noise and vibration. These techniques shall include pre-drilling pile holes (if feasible, based on soils; see Mitigation Measure M-NO-2, pp. V.F.20-V.F.21) to the maximum feasible depth, installing intake and exhaust mufflers on pile driving equipment, vibrating piles into place when feasible, and installing shrouds around the pile driving hammer where feasible. Construction contractors shall be required to use construction equipment with state-of-the-art noise shielding and muffling devices. In addition, at least 48 hours prior to pile driving activities, the Project Sponsor shall notify building owners and occupants within 500 feet of the project site of the dates, hours, and expected duration of such activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-NO-2: Pre-Construction Assessment to Minimize Vibration Levels Associated with Impact Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Project Sponsor shall hire a qualified geotechnical engineer to conduct a pre-construction assessment of existing subsurface conditions and the structural integrity of nearby buildings subject to pile driving noise and vibration prior to receiving a building permit. If recommended by the geotechnical engineer, for structures or facilities within 50 feet of pile driving activities, the Project Sponsor shall require ground-borne vibration monitoring of nearby structures. Such methods and technologies shall be based on the specific conditions at the construction site such as, but not limited to, the following:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pre-construction surveying of potentially affected structures;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Underpinning of foundations of potentially affected structures, as necessary;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The construction plan shall include a monitoring program to detect ground settlement or lateral movement of structures in the vicinity of impact activities. Monitoring results shall be submitted to the Department of Building Inspection. In the event of unacceptable ground movement, as determined by the Department of Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor and qualified geotechnical engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical engineer to provide reports to Department of Building Inspection for review and approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inspection, all impact work shall cease and corrective measures shall be implemented. The impact program and ground stabilization measures shall be reevaluated and approved by the Department of Building Inspection.
The proposed realignment of the Muni M Ocean View light rail and its operations shall be designed with input from a qualified acoustical consultant so that light rail operation noise levels are attenuated at and in the vicinity of the final alignment so that the San Francisco Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise standards are not exceeded. The Light Rail Noise and Vibration Reduction Plan shall be prepared by a qualified acoustical consultant and submitted to the City for review and approval prior to construction of the proposed realignment. The plan shall identify noise attenuation measures that would ensure compliance with the City’s community noise guidelines, including, but not limited to, requiring light rail operators to reduce vehicle speeds when approaching and departing and operating within the Project Site. The following noise and vibration attenuation measures shall be included as part of the plan:

- **Rail Bed Design:** The light rail trackwork shall be designed to prevent the production of excessive vibration levels at the nearest sensitive structures. The design should include the installation of high-resilience direct fixation fasteners for embedded track, ballast mat for ballast and tie track, or other measures as determined by a qualified light rail vibration consultant.

- **Rail Grinding and Replacement:** As rails wear, both noise levels from light rail by-passes and vibration levels can increase. By grinding down or replacing worn rail, noise and vibration levels will remain at the initial operating levels. Rail grinding or replacement is normally performed every 3 to 5 years.

- **Wheel Truing and Replacement:** Wheel truing is a method of grinding down flat spots (commonly called “wheel flats”) on the light rail’s wheels. Flat spots occur primarily because of hard braking. When flat spots occur they can cause increases in both the noise and vibration levels produced by the light rail vehicles.

- **Vehicle Maintenance:** Vehicle maintenance includes performing scheduled and general maintenance on items such as air conditioning units, bearings, wheel skirts, and other mechanical units on the light rail vehicles. Keeping the mechanical system on the light rail vehicles in top condition will also help to control noise and vibration levels.

- **Operator Training:** Operators will be trained to maintain light rail travel speeds at those speeds given in the operation plan and to avoid “hard braking” whenever possible. As stated, hard braking can cause
wheel flats and may also damage track. Furthermore, by training operators to identify potential wheel flats and other mechanical problems with the trains, proper maintenance can be performed in a timely manner. During final engineering design, vibration propagation testing shall be conducted at the final light rail alignment near Gonzalez Drive and Diaz Avenue to confirm the predicted impact and finalize the mitigation measures. Where vibration impacts are confirmed, they shall be reduced to meet the FTA criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-NO-6: Residential Use Plan Review by Qualified Acoustical Consultant</th>
<th>Project Sponsor to retain qualified acoustical consultant</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of each individual building permit.</th>
<th>Consultant to submit reports to Department of Building Inspection. Building designers to follow the recommendations of the acoustical consultant. DBI to review plans to ensure recommendations are included in plans.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that interior noise levels induced by the light rail station, and by automobile, bus, and light rail traffic at noise sensitive uses do not result in excessive awakenings, or exceed an interior noise level standard of 45 dBA ($L_{dn}$), a qualified acoustical consultant shall review plans for all new residential uses, the new Pre K-5 school, and new day care facility, and provide recommendations to provide acoustical insulation or other equivalent measures to ensure that interior noise levels would not exceed acceptable limits and a cumulative noise level of 45 dBA ($L_{dn}$). These studies shall be presented to the Department of Building Inspection at the time that permits for individual buildings are submitted for review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-NO-7: Stationary Operational Noise Sources.</th>
<th>Project Sponsor to retain qualified acoustical consultant</th>
<th>Within three months of installation of stationary noise sources.</th>
<th>Planning Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All utility and industrial stationary noise sources (e.g., district energy system, wind turbines, etc.) shall be located away from noise sensitive receptors, be enclosed within structures with adequate setback and screening, be installed adjacent to noise reducing shields, or constructed with some other adequate noise attenuating features, to achieve compliance with the noise level limits of the San Francisco Noise Ordinance and to achieve acceptable levels at the property lines of nearby residences or other sensitive uses, as determined by the San Francisco Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Community Noise standards. Once the stationary noise sources have been installed, the Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified acoustics specialist to monitor noise levels to ensure compliance with local noise standards. Initial noise monitoring shall occur within three months after the installation of the stationary noise source, and a report of the results shall be made available to on-site tenants. Subsequent noise monitoring shall be conducted by the Project Sponsor, within three months of on-site tenants reporting persistent intrusive noise. If project stationary noise sources exceed the applicable noise standards, a qualified acoustical consultant shall be retained by the Sponsor to install additional noise attenuation measures or acoustic insulation in order to meet the applicable noise standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-NO-8:</strong> Residential Building Plan Review by Qualified Acoustical Consultant</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified acoustical consultant</td>
<td>Prior to issuance of a building permit for each individual building.</td>
<td>Department of Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To ensure that noise produced during garbage collection is reduced to the maximum practicable extent, a qualified acoustical consultant shall review plans for all new residential buildings and associated garbage collection facilities, and provide recommendations to provide enclosures, acoustical shielding, or other equivalent measures. These studies shall be presented to the Department of Building Inspection at the time that permits for individual buildings are submitted for review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Air Quality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M-AQ-3:</strong> Construction Exhaust Emissions.</th>
<th>Project Sponsor and Sponsor’s construction contractor(s).</th>
<th>Submit planned emission reduction strategies and copies of applicable construction specification related to off-road equipment for each construction phase prior to issuance of the site permit for that phase.</th>
<th>Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The applicant shall implement feasible combustion emission reduction strategies, during construction activities, including the following measures:  
- The project applicant shall keep all off-road equipment well-tuned and regularly serviced to minimize exhaust emissions, and shall establish a regular and frequent check-up and service/maintenance program for equipment.  
- Off-road diesel equipment operators shall be required to shut down their engines rather than idle for more than five minutes, unless such idling is necessary for proper operation of the equipment.  
- Clear signage shall be provided for construction workers at all access points. |  |  |  |
| The applicant shall require construction contracts to specify implementation of the following combustion emission reduction strategies, during construction activities:  
- The project should use equipment with engines compliant with USEPA Tier 3 engine standards or better for all off-road equipment, or utilize Retrofit Emission Control Devices which consist of diesel oxidation catalysts, diesel particulate filters or similar retrofit equipment control technology verified by the California Air Resources Board (CARB) (http://www.arb.ca.gov/diesel/verdev/verdev.htm), where feasible.  
- The project shall use equipment with engines compliant with USEPA Tier 4 engine standards or better for 50 percent of the fleet by 2015, increasing to 100 percent by 2020. |  |  |  |
| The project shall use 2007 or newer model year haul trucks, where feasible. |  |  |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M-AQ-15:</strong> Mechanical Ventilation Systems for New Residential Uses.</th>
<th>Project Sponsor and Sponsor’s construction</th>
<th>Prior to issuance of a building permit for each individual building.</th>
<th>Planning Department and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New residential uses within 200 feet from the edge of the Project Site boundary along Junipero Serra Boulevard, including ramps on Brotherhood Way, 19th Avenue, or Brotherhood Way shall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
incorporate mechanical ventilation systems. If the project anticipates operable windows or other sources of infiltration of ambient air, the residences shall be provided with a central HVAC (heating, ventilation and air conditioning) system that includes high efficiency filters for particulates (MERV-13 or higher). The system should operate to maintain positive pressure within the building interior to prevent entrainment of outdoor air indoors. Alternatively, if the development limits infiltration through non-operable windows and other techniques, the residences shall be provided with a ventilation and filtration system that meets the following specifications: (1) ASHRAE MERV-13 supply air filters; (2) >= 1 air exchanges per hour of fresh outside filtered air; (3) >= 4 air exchanges / hour recirculation; and (4) <= 0.25 air exchanges per hour in unfiltered infiltration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Wind and Shadow</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-WS-1a: Wind Impact Analysis for Proposed Buildings Over 100 feet in Height.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A wind impact analysis shall be required for any proposed building over 100 feet in height. Wind tunnel testing shall be required for each building unless, upon review by a qualified wind consultant, it is determined that the exposure, massing, and/or orientation of the building are such that adverse wind impacts would not occur. The analysis shall assess wind conditions for the building in conjunction with the anticipated pattern of development on surrounding blocks. All feasible means (such as relocating or reorienting certain buildings, sculpting buildings to include podiums and roof terraces, or installing landscaping) to eliminate hazardous winds, if predicted, shall be implemented. A significant wind impact would be a substantial increase in the number of hours that the 26 mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or a substantial increase in the area subjected to winds greater than 26 mph.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **M-WS-1b: Wind Tunnel Testing for Proposed Buildings Over 50 feet in Height.** |
| Wind tunnel testing shall be required for any proposed building over 50 feet in height that is within 200 feet of any of the existing 13-story buildings on the Project Site. The analysis shall assess wind conditions for the building in conjunction with the anticipated pattern of development on surrounding blocks. All feasible means (such as relocating or reorienting certain buildings, sculpting buildings to include podiums and roof terraces, or installing landscaping) to eliminate hazardous winds, if predicted, shall be implemented. A significant wind impact would be a substantial increase in the number of hours that the 26 mph wind hazard criterion is exceeded or a substantial increase in the area subjected to winds greater than 26 mph. |
| Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant | Prior to building permit issuance for any proposed building over 50 feet in height that is within 200 feet of any of the existing 13-story buildings on the Project Site | Planning Department and Department of Building Inspection |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Biological Resources</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M-BI-1a: Pre-construction Survey for Gumplant.</strong> A pre-construction survey shall be conducted to locate and fence the boundaries of any gumplant populations with a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25-foot buffer zone. To determine if any previously unknown special-status plant or animal species would be affected, a preconstruction survey shall be conducted within the construction area in the spring (May and June) by a qualified biologist authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities.

**M-BI-1b: Avoidance of Gumplant During Construction.** The configuration of the construction area shall be modified to avoid any special-status species encountered during the pre-construction survey. No construction activities shall occur within the buffer area. The Project Sponsor shall ensure that the construction area is fenced to the minimum size necessary to avoid impacts from the outfall to the willow basin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BI-1b: Avoidance of Gumplant During Construction</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M-BI-1c: Restoration and Expansion of Gumplant Population.** If it is not possible to avoid the gumplant population during construction, the Project Sponsor shall implement a restoration and mitigation plan in consultation with the San Francisco Planning Department (City) and CDFG. Impacts to the San Francisco gumplant will be mitigated by restoring the affected area and expanding the size of the population by increasing the area and number of individual gumplant plants. The size and density of the affected gumplant population shall be measured prior to construction. This mitigation plan shall describe methods for planting, monitoring, and maintaining the affected area. Performance standards to determine success of the mitigation shall be attained that show that the cover and density of the population affected has been replaced. An annual report shall be submitted to the City and CDFG that documents maintenance and monitoring methods and results. Such monitoring and maintenance shall continue for at least 5 years beyond the implementation of the mitigation plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BI-1c: Restoration and Expansion of Gumplant Population</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**M-BI-2a: Preconstruction Survey for Common Yellowthroat Nesting Activities and Buffer Area.** If outfall repair or construction activities occur along the Lake Merced shoreline during the breeding season of the common yellowthroat (March-August), a qualified ornithologist authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities shall conduct a preconstruction survey of the work area to determine if any birds are nesting in or in the vicinity of the outfall. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BI-2a: Preconstruction Survey for Common Yellowthroat Nesting Activities and Buffer Area</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item</th>
<th>Responsible Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDFG and Planning Department</td>
<td>CDFG and Planning Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 50 feet shall be established between the work area and the nest(s). No work will be allowed within the buffer until the young have successfully fledged. The size of the nest buffer can be reduced as a result of consultation with the CDFG. Such a reduction shall be dependent on a relatively low frequency and intensity of disturbance and the tolerance of the nesting birds to human disturbance.

| M-BI-2b: Monitoring for Western Pond Turtles During Construction. | Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant | During construction for each phase | CDFG and Planning Department |
| M-BI-2c: SWPPP Design Details for Site Drainage and Water Quality Control in Outfall Construction Area. | The SWPPP is required and shall include design details and construction specifications for all site drainage control and other water quality control strategies. It shall also detail the implementation schedule, methods and locations of erosion and water quality control features. The California Stormwater Quality Association Construction Handbook provides guidance for selecting and implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs) that would eliminate or reduce the discharge of pollutants from construction sites to waters of the state. Three levels of BMPs are considered for each potential pollutant: source control, management control, and treatment control. BMPS which could be implemented as part of the SWPPP include: hydroseeding, straw mulch, temporary stream bank stabilization, silt fences, sediment traps, temporary stream crossings, stockpile management, and spill prevention and control. | Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant | Prior to and during construction for each phase | SFPUC |
| M-BI-3a: Restrict Vegetation Removal Activities in Wetland and Riparian Areas During Outfall Construction. | Vegetation removal activities in wetland and riparian habitats in the willow basin and along the shoreline of Lake Merced shall be restricted to as small an area as possible. Construction areas shall be no longer than 40 feet and shall be shorter where possible. In addition, construction shall avoid large willow and wax myrtle trees. | Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant | Prior to and during construction for each phase | Planning Department |
| M-BI-3b: Vegetation Restoration in Outfall Construction Area. | The vegetation of any affected riparian or wetland area shall be restored to the same or to a more | Project Sponsor to retain qualified | A mitigation plan shall be developed prior to the | Planning Department |
biologically valuable condition. This shall entail planting of vegetation, if it is not expected to return on its own, and removal of non-native species. A mitigation plan that describes site preparation, planting, performance standards, maintenance (including weed control), and monitoring methods shall be developed for impacts to marsh and riparian vegetation. The performance standards shall include a mitigation ratio of 1:1, standards for cover, plant composition of the restored area, and erosion, at the end of 5 years. Remedial activities shall be outlined in the plan to address any of the restoration areas that are not attaining performance standards at the end of 5 years. The mitigation area shall be monitored and maintained for at least 5 years. Monitoring and maintenance activities shall be summarized in an annual report to be prepared for each of the 5 years the area is monitored. This mitigation plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City prior to the approval of the final map for the project.

<p>| M-BI-4: Breeding Bird Pre-construction Surveys and Buffer Areas. Vegetation removal activities for the Proposed Project and stormwater treatment option areas and building demolitions shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (i.e., September through February) to avoid impact to nesting birds or preconstruction surveys shall be conducted for work scheduled during the breeding season (March through August). Preconstruction surveys shall be conducted by a qualified ornithologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, to determine if any birds are nesting in or in the vicinity of vegetation or buildings to be removed. The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active songbird nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 50 feet between the nest and work area shall be established. If active raptor nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 200 feet shall be established between the nest and the work area. No work will be allowed with the buffer(s) until the young have successfully fledged. In some instances, the size of the nest buffer can be reduced and its size shall therefore be determined by the biologist in consultation with the CDFG, and shall be based to a large extent on the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, and the type and frequency of disturbance. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant | Vegetation removal activities shall be conducted during the non-breeding season (i.e., September through February), OR preconstruction surveys shall be conducted for work scheduled during the breeding season (March through August). The preconstruction survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of work from March through May, and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active raptor nests are found in the work area, no work will be allowed with the buffer(s) until the young have successfully fledged. |
| CDFG and Planning Department | approval of the final map for Project. The mitigation area shall be monitored and maintained for at least 5 years. Monitoring and maintenance activities shall be summarized in an annual report to be prepared for each of the 5 years the area is monitored. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>M-BI-7a: Pre-maintenance Surveys for Active Bird Nests and Buffer Areas.</strong></th>
<th><strong>M-BI-7b: Monitoring During Maintenance Activities.</strong></th>
<th><strong>M-BI-8a: Pre-permitting Surveys for Birds and Bats.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If maintenance of the stormwater treatment system occurs during the nesting season (March-August), a qualified ornithologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, shall conduct a survey of the work area to determine if any birds are nesting in the work area or in the vicinity. The survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of maintenance work from March through May (since there is higher potential for birds to initiate nesting during this period), and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August. If active songbird nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 50 feet between the nest and the work area shall be established. If active raptor nests are found in the work area, a buffer of 200 feet shall be established between the nest and the work area. No work will be allowed within the buffer until the young have successfully fledged. In some instances, the size of the buffer can be reduced and its size shall therefore be determined by the biologist in consultation with the CDFG, and shall be based to a large extent on the nesting species, its sensitivity to disturbance, and the type and frequency of disturbance.</td>
<td>The on-site stormwater features shall be monitored by a qualified biologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, during maintenance activities to ensure that no western pond turtles or other special-status amphibians or reptiles are present and subject to harm. If turtles or other special-status reptiles and amphibians are present, the biologist shall capture and relocate them, or ensure that they are moved to an area outside of the construction zone and away from harm.</td>
<td>To obtain baseline information on existing bird use of the proposed wind turbine alignment along Lake Merced Boulevard, the Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified wildlife biologist, authorized by CDFG to conduct such activities, to conduct bi-weekly bird use counts (BUCs) of the area for two years using methods described in Anderson and CEC/CDFG. Three point count stations spaced approximately 500 feet apart in the existing median between Lake Merced Boulevard and Vidal Drive would likely be sufficient to detect all birds using and/or flying through the area, although the final study design shall be subject to review and approval by the CDFG. Methods other than BUCs may be used if improved methods for documenting bird use at proposed wind turbine sites are developed in the interim period between the certification of this EIR and the initiation of the wind turbine program. Obtaining baseline information on existing bat use of the wind turbine alignment is complicated by the fact that bats are much more difficult to detect than birds and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If maintenance of the stormwater treatment system occurs during the nesting season (March-August), a qualified ornithologist shall conduct a survey of the work area. The survey shall be conducted within 15 days prior to the start of maintenance work from March through May, and within 30 days prior to the start of work from June through August.</td>
<td>Ongoing monitoring after completion of each phase</td>
<td>Prior to permit issuance for wind turbines, bi-weekly bird use counts (BUCs) shall be conducted for two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDFG and Planning Department</td>
<td>CDFG and Planning Department (Reporting Only)</td>
<td>CDFG and Planning Department (Reporting Only)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
available monitoring methods (i.e., acoustic monitoring of echolocation calls) may not be feasible in a dense urban environment. As such, the Project Sponsor shall retain a qualified bat expert to conduct a one-day habitat assessment of the proposed wind turbine alignment. Based on the results of the assessment, the bat expert shall provide recommendations on the appropriate level of monitoring required to establish baseline patterns of seasonal bat activity along the proposed wind turbine alignment. If the bat expert believes that focused bat surveys are not necessary or that the proposed wind turbines do not pose a significant risk to local bat populations, he/she shall explain his/her opinions following standard scientific report format.

Similarly, the Project Sponsor shall retain a biologist experienced with nocturnal bird survey methods (e.g., radar, acoustic monitoring, visual surveys using night vision equipment) to conduct an assessment of the proposed wind turbine alignment and assess the feasibility of conducting nocturnal surveys for migrating birds. Given substantial uncertainty and variation over the optimal protocols for detecting nocturnal migrating birds and the viability of such protocols to predict collision risk, it is important to identify species of primary concern and develop site-specific questions that any nocturnal studies should address prior to implementing a nocturnal monitoring program. The biologist retained to conduct the nocturnal bird survey feasibility assessment shall provide such information in their report.

Data gathered during the pre-permitting surveys shall be used to develop baseline estimates of bird and bat fatality rates (expressed as fatalities/megawatt/year) from the proposed wind turbines. Given the lack of scientific studies on wind turbine-wildlife interactions in urban areas and vertical-axis wind turbine (VAWT) impacts on wildlife, it will be difficult if not impossible to apply known fatality rates from other studies to the project site (although such information may become available by the time the wind turbine program is implemented). As such, baseline fatality estimates shall be developed with input from scientists experienced with statistical analysis of wind turbine-wildlife interactions.

**M-BI-8b: Operations Monitoring Program.** The Project Sponsor shall implement a scientifically defensible operations monitoring program to estimate bird and bat fatality rates from the new wind turbines. Operations monitoring typically consists of counts of bird and bat carcasses in the vicinity of turbines and ongoing bird use data collection (i.e., continued BUCs) using the most current methods prescribed by the California Energy Commission and CDFG. Given the lack of published information on impacts to birds and bats from urban wind turbines and the site’s proximity to a major wildlife habitat feature (i.e., Lake Merced), and the Pacific flyway a minimum of two years of post-construction monitoring shall be conducted. The operations monitoring program shall be developed with input from the CDFG, USFWS, and scientists experienced in

| Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant | Prior to permit issuance for wind turbines, a biologist experienced with nocturnal bird survey methods (e.g., radar, acoustic monitoring, visual surveys using night vision equipment) shall conduct an assessment of the proposed wind turbine alignment. | CDFG and USFWS and Planning Department (Reporting Only) |
the analysis of wind turbine-wildlife interactions.

### M-BI-8c: Implementation of Management Strategies (Wind Turbines)

If results of operations monitoring indicate that bird and/or bat fatality rates exceed those predicted during the pre-permitting phase, the City shall require implementation of some or all of the following management strategies or compensation measures:

1. Seasonal shutdown (e.g., spring or fall migratory period, depending on results of surveys) of a particular turbine or turbines that may be found to be contributing a disproportionate amount to bird and/or bat fatalities.

2. Contribution of funds towards the management, restoration, enhancement, and/or protection of the local habitats used by species affected by wind turbines (e.g., lands managed by San Francisco Recreation and Park Natural Areas Program or the National Park Service Golden Gate National Recreation Area).

Contribution of funds towards research programs aimed at wind turbine-wildlife interactions, nocturnal bird study methods, and/or collision risk.

### M-BI-8d: Design Elements to Minimize Bird and/or Bat Strikes

The following measures shall be incorporated into wind turbine design to minimize the likelihood of bird strikes:

1. FAA-mandated obstruction lighting at the turbine tops shall consist of red or white strobe-type lights rather than steady-burning lights, as several studies have demonstrated reduced mortality of night-migrating birds at facilities using strobe-type lights.

2. No guy wires shall be used to support the wind turbines, as they are a known hazard to birds.

3. To prevent bird collisions with overhead power lines, turbines shall be powered via underground electrical connections.

4. Bare soil or manicured grass around turbine bases may provide habitat for small mammals, resulting in increased prey availability for raptors and putting them at increased risk of collision. To discourage small mammals from burrowing under or near turbine bases, gravel or artificial turf shall be placed at least 5 feet around each turbine foundation.

Additional design elements proven to minimize bird and/or bat strikes shall be implemented as information on such measures becomes available in the scientific literature and/or agency guidance documents.

### M-BI-8e: Incidental Take Permit

As mentioned above, the proposed wind turbines...
may result in mortality of bank swallows, which is state-listed as threatened under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA) or other species of concern. Given the current uncertainty over the extent and magnitude of potential take of bank swallows or other species of concern, the Project Sponsor shall apply to the CDFG for an incidental take permit pursuant to Section 2081 of CESA and implement all CDFG conditions of that permit, which may include the some or all of the mitigation measures described above. The permit application will comply with the applicable requirements of Section 738.2 of CESA, as it may be amended.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M-BI-9: Bird-Safe Design Practices. The Project Sponsor shall ensure that the new residential towers should follow bird-safe design practices as much as possible to minimize the potential for increased bird-window collisions. Building facades should create “visual noise” via cladding or other design features that make it easier for birds to identify buildings as such and not mistake windows for open sky or trees. Windows should not be comprised of clear or reflective glass, which is coated with a reflective film to control solar heat gain. Instead, windows should incorporate different glass types such as UV-A or fritted glass. Windows should also incorporate UV-absorbing and UV-reflecting stripe and grid patterns in locations with the highest potential for bird-window collisions (e.g., lower levels near trees).</th>
<th>retain qualified professional consultant</th>
<th>permit issuance from the San Francisco Department of Building Inspection, a take permit application from CDFG shall be issued.</th>
<th>Planning Department (reporting only)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-BI-10: Study of Willow Basin to Control Water Level and Duration of Inundation. A hydrological study shall be conducted on the willow basin to determine whether the additional input of storm runoff will affect the duration and depth of ponding. If the level of water will rise to within 3 feet of the base of any wax myrtle and remain at that level for more than 4 days, then the outlet of the willow basin shall be modified to prevent such rise of water level and duration. If the water level already exhibits these characteristics, then no change shall be made to ensure that the existing depth and duration of ponding in the willow basin remains as is.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
<td>Prior to building permit issuance for each phase, bird-safe design practices shall be included.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hydrology and Water Quality

| M-HY-1: Best Management Practices for SWPPP. A pollution prevention plan shall | Project Sponsor and SFPUC | Submit copy of NOI and SFPUC | Planning Department |
be developed for all construction activities on the Project Site. The applicant shall apply for coverage under the NPDES General Construction Activity Permit from the State Water Quality Control Board by filing a Notice of Intent (NOI), and, as part of the permit and monitoring process, prepare and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP shall include design details and construction specifications for all site drainage control and other water quality control strategies, including Best Management Practices (BMPs) and other measures for stormwater pollution reduction. These include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Soil stabilization controls, such as hydroseeding and/or placement of straw mulch;
- Watering for dust control;
- Perimeter silt fences;
- Sediment traps/basins;
- Minimizing the length of open trenches and stockpile volumes;
- Slip prevention and control, such as minimizing grading during the rainy season; and

Controlled entry and egress from the excavation area to minimize off-site tracking of sediment, and vehicle and equipment wash-down facilities.

### Hazards and Hazardous Materials


The Proposed Project would be carried out in four major Phases over a 20-year construction period. Within the geographic boundaries to be redeveloped within each Phase, the Project Sponsor shall, if appropriate, identify large, planned areas of redevelopment. For the purpose of this mitigation measure, each such area is referred to as a "Sub-Phase." The steps below shall be taken for each Sub-Phase. If the Project Sponsor does not identify such areas within a Phase, then each step shall be taken for the geographic boundaries of the entire Phase at once.

**Step 1: Soil Testing**

Soil testing would be done incrementally over the 20-year construction period, including pre-testing of each Sub-Phase, prior to excavation and/or soil disturbance. Prior to obtaining building permits for a particular Sub-Phase, the Project Sponsor shall hire a consultant to collect soil samples (borings) from selected locations in the work area in which soil would be disturbed and/or excavated. (This initial soil sampling and reporting shall be done prior to excavation, but additional soil testing from on-site soil stockpiles...)

Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant for Steps 1, 2 and 4. Construction contractor to carry out and report on activities required in Step 3.

Soil report and SMP shall be approved by the San Francisco Department of Public Health prior to permit issuance for each phase, with a copy to the Planning Department.

Construction contractor to provide annual reports to Department of Public Health (or quarterly reports if required by SMP), with copies to the Planning Department, of activities carried out...
may also be required, if there are indications [e.g., odors, visible staining] of contamination in the excavated soil.)

The soil samples shall be tested for these Compounds of Concern: total lead, petroleum hydrocarbons, volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and four heavy metals: chromium, nickel, copper, and zinc. The consultant shall analyze the soil borings as discrete, not composite samples. The consultant shall prepare a report on the soil testing for the Compounds of Concern that includes the laboratory results of the soil testing and a map that shows the locations from which the consultant collected the soil samples.

The Project Sponsor shall submit the report on the soil testing for the Compounds of Concern for the Sub-Phase and a fee of $501 in the form of a check payable to the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH), to the Hazardous Waste Program, Department of Public Health, 1390 Market Street, Suite 210, San Francisco, California 94102. The fee of $501 shall cover three hours of soil testing report review and administrative handling. If additional review is necessary, DPH shall bill the Project Sponsor for each additional hour of review over the first three hours, at a rate of $167 per hour. These fees shall be charged pursuant to Section 31.47(c) of the San Francisco Administrative Code. DHP shall review the soil testing program to determine whether soils on the Project Site are contaminated with any of the Compounds of Concern at or above potentially hazardous levels.

### Step 2: Preparation of Site Mitigation Plans

Incrementally over the 20-year construction period, for each Sub-Phase, prior to beginning demolition, excavation, and construction work for that area, the Project Sponsor shall prepare a Site Mitigation Plan (SMP). The SMP for the Sub-Phase shall include a discussion of the level of contamination of soils by Compounds of Concern, if any, based on the soils testing in Step 1. The SMP shall set forth mitigation measures for managing contaminated soils on the site, if any, including but not limited to: 1) the alternatives for managing contaminated soils on the site (e.g., encapsulation, partial or complete removal, treatment, recycling for reuse, or a combination); 2) the preferred alternative for managing contaminated soils on the site and a brief justification; and 3) the specific practices to be used to handle, haul, and dispose of contaminated soils on the site. The SMP for each Sub-Phase shall be submitted to the Department of Public Health (DPH) for review and approval. A copy of the SMP shall be submitted to the Planning Department to become part of the case file. Additionally, the DPH may require confirmatory samples for the project site.

### Step 3: Handling, Hauling, and Disposal Contaminated Soils

(a) Specific work practices: The construction contractor shall be alert for the presence of contaminated soils during excavation and other construction activities on the site (detected pursuant to Step 3 for each construction phase.

Consultant to submit closure report to DPH for approval pursuant to Step 4 for each phase; a copy of the approved report shall be provided to the Planning Department.
through soil odor, color, and texture and results of on-site soil testing), and shall be prepared to handle, profile (i.e., characterize), and dispose of such soils appropriately (i.e., as dictated by local, State, and federal regulations, including OSHA work practices) when such soils are encountered on the site.

(b) Dust suppression: Soils exposed during excavation for site preparation and project construction activities shall be kept moist throughout the time they are exposed, both during and after work hours.

(c) Surface water runoff control: Where soils are stockpiled, visqueen shall be used to create an impermeable liner, both beneath and on top of the soils, with a berm to contain any potential surface water runoff from the soil stockpiles during inclement weather.

(d) Soils replacement: If necessary, clean fill or other suitable material(s) shall be used to bring portions of the Project Site, where lead-contaminated soils have been excavated and removed, up to construction grade.

(e) Hauling and disposal: If soils are contaminated such that they must be hauled off-site for treatment and/or disposal, contaminated soils shall be hauled off the Project Site by waste hauling trucks appropriately certified with the State of California and adequately covered to prevent dispersion of the soils during transit, and shall be disposed of at the permitted hazardous waste disposal facility registered with the State of California.

Step 4: Preparation of Closure/Certification Report for Each Sub-Phase

After excavation and foundation construction activities are completed for a particular Sub-Phase, the Project Sponsor shall prepare and submit a closure/certification report to DPH for review and approval for that area. The closure/certification report shall include the mitigation measures (if any were necessary) in the SMP for handling and removing contaminated soils, if any, from the Project Site, and if applicable, whether the construction contractor modified any of these mitigation measures, and how and why the construction contractor modified those mitigation measures.

M-HZ-2B: Hazards (Decontamination of Vehicles)

If, for any Sub-Phase, the San Francisco Department of Public Health (DPH) determines that the soils in that area are contaminated with contaminants at or above potentially hazardous levels, all trucks and excavation and soil handling equipment working in that area shall be decontaminated following use and prior to removal from the site. Gross contamination shall be first removed through brushing, wiping, or dry brooming. The vehicle or equipment shall then be washed clean (including tires). Prior to removal from the work site, all vehicles and equipment shall be inspected to ensure that contamination has been removed.

### IMPROVEMENT MEASURES FOR THE PARKMERCED PROJECT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</th>
<th>During construction for each phase, if determined by the San Francisco DPH</th>
<th>Department of Public Health</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant

During construction for each phase, if determined by the San Francisco DPH

Department of Public Health
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Sponsorship and Coordination</th>
<th>Timing Notes</th>
<th>Responsible Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I-TR-7</td>
<td>Provide a southbound right turn deceleration lane at the new access from 19th Avenue at Cambon Drive to avoid interference with HOT lane operations. As an improvement measure, to avoid conflict with the through traffic, a right-turn deceleration lane should be constructed on the west side of the fourth southbound lane, allowing vehicular access from 19th Avenue to Cambon Drive, minimizing disruption to flow in the HOT lane. This would require the removal of on-street parking in the vicinity of the ingress.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor with coordination of SFMTA and Caltrans</td>
<td>Simultaneous with implementation of HOT lane.</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-TR-29</td>
<td>Install colored bike lanes to direct cyclists through the Brotherhood Way/Junipero Serra Boulevard interchange and raise auto awareness of bicycles. This improvement measure may not achieve the same level of comfort for a cyclist that exists under current conditions, but it would improve conditions with implementation of the auxiliary lanes. Implementation of this improvement measure would require approval by Caltrans, which operates the facility.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor with coordination of SFMTA and Caltrans</td>
<td>Simultaneous with construction of other project-proposed improvements at Junipero Serra Boulevard / Brotherhood Way interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-WS-A</td>
<td>Design Feature Consideration for Proposed Buildings. Building massing can affect wind flow. Podiums or terraced roofs create horizontal “shelves” that can deflect downward wind flow away from streets and sidewalks. These types of design features should be considered for the proposed buildings at the intersection of Chumasero Drive and Brotherhood Way and the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and Brotherhood Way. Like podiums and terraced roofs, canopies can deflect downward wind flow from streets and sidewalks.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
<td>Prior to building permit issuance for proposed buildings at the intersection of Chumasero Drive and Brotherhood Way and the intersection of Junipero Serra Boulevard and Brotherhood Way.</td>
<td>Department of Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-WS-B</td>
<td>Incorporation if Landscaping to Reduce Wind Speeds. Landscaping can be effective at reducing wind speeds. Porous materials (latticework, screens, vegetation, etc.) offer more effective wind shelter than solid surfaces. Landscaping should be installed in appropriate locations throughout the Project Site to reduce wind speeds. Wind-sheltering elements should be located west of the area being protected and should be of sufficient height.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor to retain qualified professional consultant</td>
<td>Prior to building permit issuance for each phase</td>
<td>Planning Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GE.a</td>
<td>Use of Soldier-Pile-and-Lagging Shoring System. The Project Sponsor has agreed to follow the conclusions and recommendations of the 2008 Geologic, Geotechnical and Seismic Findings report to use a soldier-pile-and-lagging shoring system to shore up soils during excavation for building foundations and basements.</td>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Prior to building permit issuance for each phase</td>
<td>Department of Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-GE.b</td>
<td>Soil Corrosivity Tests. The Project Sponsor has agreed to follow the conclusions and recommendations of the 2008 Geologic,</td>
<td>Project Sponsor</td>
<td>Prior to building permit issuance for each phase</td>
<td>Department of Building Inspection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Geotechnical and Seismic Findings report to test the soils for corrosivity and take appropriate measures to protect new construction in contact with the soil from corrosion.
TO: Planning Department Transportation Consultant List
FROM: Planning Department Transportation Team
DATE: May 15, 2015
SUBJECT: Transit Data for Transportation Impact Studies

Purpose
The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an update to the data used in transportation analyses for determining capacity utilization for the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (SFMTA) individual lines and screenlines. Additionally, included for your convenience is the regional transit screenline information previously distributed in the March 10, 2014 “Regional & Local 2040 Cumulative Transit Screenlines for Transportation Impact Studies” memo.

Background
The SFMTA Board has adopted an “85 percent” capacity utilization performance standard for transit vehicle loads. In other words, SFMTA local transit lines should operate at or below 85 percent capacity utilization. The SFMTA Board has determined that this performance standard more accurately reflects actual operations and the likelihood of “pass-ups” (i.e., vehicles not stopping to pick up more passengers). The Planning Department, in preparing and reviewing transportation impact studies, has similarly utilized the 85 percent capacity utilization standard as a threshold of significance for determining peak period transit demand impacts to the SFMTA lines. By contrast, regional transit agencies use 100 percent capacity utilization standard, and therefore the Planning Department uses 100 percent capacity utilization as a threshold of significance for determining peak period transit demand impacts to regional transit.

Over time and as with this current update, SFMTA will provide the Planning Department updated ridership counts using automatic passenger count data for buses and updated manual counts for rail. Previously, the Planning Department released a memo in December 18, 2012, with 2010/2011 SFMTA transit data, and Cumulative transit data for the year 2035. This was subsequently updated in June 2013 with transit data used during the SFMTA TEP review process, and in March 2014 with Cumulative SFMTA and regional data for the year 2040. This May 2015 memo supersedes these previous transit data memos (and while the Cumulative screenline data has not changed since March 2014, it is being provided again in this memo for your convenience). The notable updates contained in this May 2015 memo are the newly available Fall 2013 SFMTA Line Load and Capacity data provided in Attachment A, and updated SFMTA Existing Screenline provided in Attachment B.

SFMTA and Regional Transit Screenline Analysis
Typically, transit impacts are analyzed through a screenline analysis. A screenline analysis assumes that there are identifiable corridors or directions of travel which are served by a grouping of transit lines. Therefore, an individual line would be combined with other transit lines in a corridor and corridors combined into a screenline in determining significance. However, on a case-by-case basis the Planning Department may request individual line capacity utilization
analysis as described below. In either case, the same methodology for impact determination would apply.

Four screenlines have been established in San Francisco to analyze potential impacts of projects on SFMTA service: the northeast screenline, the northwest screenline, the southeast screenline, and the southwest screenline, with sub-corridors within each screenline. The SFMTA routes by screenline and sub-corridors are shown in Attachment B. As discussed above, the Planning Department uses the 85 percent capacity utilization standard as the threshold of significance for identifying transit crowding impacts. If a project generates enough trips on a screenline or corridor that would cause that screenline or corridor to exceed the 85 percent capacity utilization performance standard, it would be considered to result in a significant transit impact. Similarly, if a screenline or corridor operates at above the 85 percent capacity utilization threshold, the analysis needs to calculate the percentage of trips that the proposed project would contribute to the corridor or screenline. If the percent contribution to the screenline or corridor ridership is five percent or greater, then the proposed project would contribute substantially to transit crowding and a significant transit impact.

Four principal regional transit providers serve San Francisco: BART from the East Bay and Peninsula; SamTrans from the Peninsula; AC Transit from the East Bay, and Golden Gate Bridge, Highway and Transportation District (GGBHTD) from the North Bay. Two additional ferry providers exist besides GGBHTD: Alameda Harbor Bay Ferry from the East Bay and Blue & Gold Fleet from the North Bay and East Bay. For regional transit providers, the Maximum Load Point (MLP) is typically at the San Francisco City limit (i.e., the East Bay MLP would occur at the Transbay Tube and on the Bay Bridge; the North Bay MLP would occur at the Golden Gate Bridge; and the South Bay MLP would occur at the southern city border). The regional transit providers by screenline are provided in Attachment C. The Planning Department uses 100 percent capacity utilization as the threshold of significance for identifying regional transit crowding impacts.

**SFMTA Individual Line Analysis**

As mentioned above, transit impacts may also be analyzed on a corridor or line-by-line basis at times. Generally, if a proposed project would generate enough trips on a particular line that it would cause the route to exceed the 85 percent capacity utilization, it would be considered to result in a significant transit impact. Similarly, using the line-by-line analysis, if the bus route operates above the 85 percent performance standard, the analysis needs to calculate the percentage of trips that the proposed project contributes to the line. If the percent contribution to the total peak hour ridership at the MLP is five percent or greater, then the proposed project would contribute substantially to transit crowding and would result in a significant transit impact.

**Applicability**

Generally, the attached updated SFMTA data should be used in any transportation impact study that has yet to reach the screecheck submittal phase and all future transportation impact studies and technical memoranda, unless otherwise directed by your transportation planner. The
transportation planner, in coordination with the environmental planner, will determine on a case-by-case basis whether a project is not subject to this general applicability requirement. Applicability questions should be directed to the transportation planner.
Attachment A – Fall 2013 SFMTA Line Load and Capacity by Time Period and Direction of Travel
### MLP - Maximum Load Point

**Maximum Load Representations**

- **Muni Screenlines**
  - **May 2015 Update**
  - **MuniMaxLoad_MTAFall2013v5.xlsx**

**Route Load and Capacity by Time Period and Direction of Travel**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Frequency per vehicle</th>
<th>Max Load (hrs)</th>
<th>Peak Hour Load</th>
<th>MLP (Maximum Load Point)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>02 3.0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>02 3.0</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1/80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>735</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- MLP: Maximum Load Point
- Muni Screenlines: Updated Muni Screenlines as of May 2015
- MuniMaxLoad_MTAFall2013v5.xlsx: Updated Muni Screenlines
- Maximum Load Point: Stop along the route with the highest total load & may not be the same as the point with the most boardings.

### Metrics:

- **Headway**
- **Average Max**
- **Peak Hour**
- **MLP (Maximum Load Point)*

### Unit:

- **per vehicle**

### Source:

- **FALL 2013 Municipal Transportation Agency**
- **AM - Outbound (Muni Operations Direction)**
- **AM - Inbound (Muni Operations Direction)**

### Additional Notes:

- Updated data provided by MTA including updates to headways, vehicle capacity, average max load, and MLP. Rest of data calculated from those values.
- MLP: Maximum load point represents the stop along the route with the highest total load & may not be the same as the point with the most boardings.

**FALL 2015 v5**
2) MLP, maximum load point represents the stop along the route with the highest total load & may not be the same as the point with the most boardings.
Attachment B – SFMTA Existing & 2040 Screenline Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muni Screenline Sub-corridor</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (Inbound)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour (Outbound)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny/Stockton(^2)</td>
<td>2,211</td>
<td>3,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lines(^3)</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>2,749</td>
<td>4,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary(^4)</td>
<td>1,821</td>
<td>2,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California(^5)</td>
<td>1,610</td>
<td>2,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter/Clement(^6)</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton/Hayes(^7)</td>
<td>1,277</td>
<td>1,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa(^8)</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>1,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>5,946</td>
<td>7,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street(^9)</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission(^10)</td>
<td>1,643</td>
<td>2,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno/Bayshore(^11)</td>
<td>1,689</td>
<td>2,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lines(^12)</td>
<td>1,466</td>
<td>1,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>5,147</td>
<td>7,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway lines(^13)</td>
<td>6,330</td>
<td>6,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haight/Noriega(^14)</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>1,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lines(^15)</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>7,916</td>
<td>8,459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muni Screenlines Total</strong></td>
<td>21,758</td>
<td>27,671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screenlines and corridors operating at capacity utilization of 85 percent or greater are highlighted in **bold**.

1. Muni bus and rail data collected in 2013.
2. 8X Bayshore Express, 30 Stockton, 30X Marina Express, 41 Union, 45 Union-Stockton
3. F Market & Wharves, 10 Townsend, 12 Folsom-Pacific
4. 38 Geary, 38L Geary Limited, 38AX Geary ‘A’ Express, 38BX Geary ‘B’ Express
5. 1 California, 1AX California ‘A’ Express, 1AX California ‘B’ Express
6. 2 Sutter, 3 Clement
7. 5 Fulton, 21 Hayes
8. 31 Balboa, 31AX Balboa ‘A’ Express, 31BX Balboa ‘B’ Express
9. T Third Street
11. 8AX Bayshore ‘A’ Express, 8BX Bayshore ‘B’ Express, 8X Bayshore Express, 9 San Bruno, 9L San Bruno Limited
12. J Church, 10 Townsend, 12 Folsom-Pacific, 19 Polk, 27 Bryant
13. K Ingleside, L Taraval, M Ocean View, N Judah
14. 6 Parnassus, 71/71L Haight-Noriega Limited, 16X Noriega Express, NX Judah Express
15. F Market & Wharves

## TABLE A-2
### CUMULATIVE (2040) PEAK HOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Muni Screenline Sub-corridor</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (Inbound)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour (Outbound)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearny/Stockton⁴</td>
<td>7,394</td>
<td>9,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lines¹</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>1,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>8,152</td>
<td>11,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Northwest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geary⁵</td>
<td>2,673</td>
<td>3,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California⁶</td>
<td>1,989</td>
<td>2,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutter/Clement⁷</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton/Hayes⁸</td>
<td>1,962</td>
<td>1,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balboa⁷</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>1,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>7,895</td>
<td>9,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southeast</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third Street⁸</td>
<td>2,422</td>
<td>5,712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission⁹</td>
<td>3,117</td>
<td>3,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Bruno/Bayshore¹⁰</td>
<td>1,952</td>
<td>2,197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Lines¹¹</td>
<td>1,795</td>
<td>2,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>9,286</td>
<td>12,944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Southwest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subway lines¹²</td>
<td>6,314</td>
<td>7,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haight/Noriega¹³</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>1,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other lines¹⁴</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Screenline Total</strong></td>
<td>7,904</td>
<td>9,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Muni Screenlines Total</strong></td>
<td>33,237</td>
<td>43,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screenlines and corridors operating at capacity utilization of 85 percent or greater are highlighted in bold. Some of the individual lines within certain corridors have been adjusted to be in the appropriate city “quadrant” per the screenline. Thus, for some sub-corridors (e.g., Kearny/Stockton AM Peak Hour), the total does not match the individual lines’ maximum load point ridership and capacity.

1. 8X Bayshore Express, 30 Stockton, 30X Marina Express, 41 Union, 45 Union-Stockton, T-Third
2. E Embarcadero, F Market & Wharves, 10 Townsend, 12 Folsom-Pacific
3. 38 Geary, 38L Geary Limited, 38X Geary Express
4. 1 California, 1 California Short, 1AX California 'A' Express, 1BX California 'B' Express
5. 2 Clement, 2 Clement Short
6. 5 Fulton, 5L Fulton Limited, 21 Hayes
7. 31 Balboa, 31AX Balboa 'A' Express, 31BX Balboa 'B' Express
8. T Third Street
10. 8AX Bayshore Express, 8BX Bayshore Express, 9 San Bruno, 9L San Bruno Limited
11. J Church, 10 Townsend, 19 Polk, 27 Bryant
12. K Ingleside, L Taraval, M Ocean View, N Judah
13. 6 Parnassus, 71L Haight-Noriega Limited, 16X Noriega Express, NX Judah Express
14. F Market & Wharves

Source: SFMTA March 2014.
Attachment C – Regional Transit Providers Existing and 2040 Cumulative Screenline Data
# TABLE B-1
## EXISTING (2012) PEAK HOUR

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Screenline</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (Inbound)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour (Outbound)</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>Ridership</th>
<th>Capacity</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>19,716</td>
<td>22,050</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,716</td>
<td>22,050</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>1,568</td>
<td>2,829</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,256</td>
<td>3,926</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>69.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>805</td>
<td>1,615</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td>22,094</td>
<td>26,049</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22,777</td>
<td>27,591</td>
<td>82.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Transit Bus</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,384</td>
<td>2,817</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td>1,082</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td>2,412</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,352</td>
<td>4,776</td>
<td>49.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>10,682</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,682</td>
<td>14,910</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>2,171</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,377</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>18,530</td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13,200</td>
<td>18,330</td>
<td>72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Screenlines Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,615</strong></td>
<td><strong>49,081</strong></td>
<td><strong>76.6%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>38,330</strong></td>
<td><strong>50,697</strong></td>
<td><strong>75.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screenlines and transit providers/services operating at capacity utilization of 100 percent or greater are highlighted in **bold**.

Source: SFMTA TEP Project, Case No. 2011.0558E, October 2012
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regional Screenline</th>
<th>AM Peak Hour (Inbound)</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour (Outbound)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ridership</td>
<td>Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>32,608</td>
<td>33,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC Transit</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td>4,682</td>
<td>5,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td>44,290</td>
<td>51,110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Transit Bus</td>
<td>1,990</td>
<td>2,543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>1,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td>3,609</td>
<td>4,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BART</td>
<td>13,942</td>
<td>24,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caltrain</td>
<td>2,310</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SamTrans</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferries</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td>16,582</td>
<td>28,502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Screenlines Total</td>
<td>64,481</td>
<td>84,114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Screenlines and transit providers/services operating at capacity utilization of 100 percent or greater are highlighted in **bold**.

Source: SFMTA, March 2014
Attachment D – Glossary of Terms

Average Max Load – The actual ridership (or load) number at the maximum load point for the worst half hour (doubled) during the peak period.

Headway – The scheduled peak period time between buses, streetcars, trains, or light rail vehicles on the same line.

Maximum Load Point – The transit stop on a given line with the estimated greatest demand.

Net Available Capacity – The estimated number of passengers that can be accommodated during the peak hour on a line without exceeding the line’s capacity. Calculation is peak hour capacity multiplied by 85 percent minus the peak hour load.

Peak Hour – The one-hour during the peak period where ridership at a maximum load point is estimated to be at its highest.

Peak Hour Capacity – The estimated volume of ridership that can be accommodated per line during the peak hour. The calculation is equal to the peak hour (60 minutes) divided by the peak hour scheduled headway multiplied by the capacity of the line (provided by SFMTA).

Peak Hour Capacity Utilization – The estimated percent capacity of the line that is being used by riders during the peak hour. The calculation is equal to the peak hour load (ridership) divided by the peak hour capacity.

Peak Hour Load – The estimated ridership for a bus or rail route at the maximum load point during the peak hour. Calculation is sixty minutes divided by the headway multiplied by the average max load.

Peak Period – The time period during the day where crowding on the transit system is at its highest. During the AM, it is defined between 6 AM to 9 AM. During the PM, it is defined between 4 PM to 7 PM.

100 Percent Capacity per Vehicle – The capacity per SFMTA vehicle that includes both seated and standing capacity, where standing capacity, is somewhere between 30 to 80 percent seated capacity (depending upon the specific transit vehicle configuration). The capacity per regional transit vehicle is equal to the seated capacity. The following presents the 100 percent capacity of different SFMTA vehicles:¹

- historic streetcar – 70 passengers (F Market & Wharves);
- light rail vehicle – 119 passengers (J Church, KT Ingleside);
- modified light rail – 238 passengers (L Taraval, M Ocean View, and N Judah);

¹ Note that the different capacities for each line are provided by SFMTA and are subject to change.
• standard bus – 63 passengers (remaining lines not listed in modified bus); and
• modified bus:
  o 45 passengers (35 Eureka, 36 Teresita, 37 Corbett, 39 Coit, 56 Rutland, and 66 Quintara)
  o 69 passengers (81X Caltrain Express, 82X Levi Plaza Express$^2$)
  o 73 passengers (1AX California ‘A’ Express)$^3$
  o 94 passengers (1BX California ‘B’ Express,$^2$ 8X Bayshore Express, 8AX Bayshore ‘A’ Express, 8BX Bayshore ‘B’ Express, 14 Mission, 14L Mission Limited, 14X Mission Express, 38 Geary, 38L Geary Limited, 41 Union,$^3$ 49 Van Ness-Mission)
  o Other (lines 16X Noriega Express and 30 Stockton)$^4$

---

$^2$ Only during AM inbound peak period.
$^3$ Only during AM peak period.
$^4$ These two lines have other modified buses specific to these lines that differ throughout the day (see Attachment C).
MEMORANDUM

DATE:     August 2, 2016
FROM:    Charles Rivasplata, SFMTA
TO:      Wendy Bloom, Director - Capital Planning
          San Francisco State University
RE:      San Francisco State University Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed-Use Project:
          Comments on the Tiered Initial Study for the Draft Environmental Impact Report

Staff at the SFMTA has reviewed the transportation-related sections of the July 6, 2016 Tiered Initial Study for the San Francisco State University (SFSU) Creative Arts/Holloway Mixed-Use Project. Staff submits the following comments (below):

Page 15, Bicycle Parking. The report should mention the number of Class 1 bicycle parking spaces proposed for the new Student Housing Building (located on the southeast corner of Holloway and Varela Avenues) and in the vicinity of the Creative Arts Replacement Building and Concert Hall.

Page 15, Loading Facilities. Can the surrounding streets adequately handle large trucks accessing the loading and service areas for the Creative Arts and the Student Housing Buildings? What are the turning radii of large trucks entering these areas?

Page 55, Last Paragraph. This segment provides a very good summary of the proposed analysis to determine whether the project could result in increased impacts above those described in the 2007 Campus Master Plan (CMP) EIR.

The SFMTA looks forward to reviewing transportation-related aspects of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) when it becomes available.
INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM

DATE: August 8, 2016

TO: Wendy Bloom, Campus Planner, SFSU Capital Planning, Design and Construction

FROM: Irina P. Torrey, AICP, Bureau Manager

SUBJECT: SFSU Creative Arts and Mixed Use Development NOP

The attached table provides SFPUC comments on the information that should be included in the EIR, as well information for the project proponent regarding SFPUC requirements with respect to the hydraulic analysis and water facility design.

If you require further information, please contact Sally Morgan at (415) 934-3938 or smorgan@sfwater.org. Thanks for the opportunity to provide input.

Attachment: Table of SFPUC's compiled comments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter Name &amp; SFPUC Division</th>
<th>Document Section Title or Section Number</th>
<th>Page Number and Line or Paragraph Number</th>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Review Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fan Lau, Water Resources Division</td>
<td>Section 2.3.6 Utilities and Energy Use</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>General comment: The SFPUC, as the water service purveyor to the SFSU campus, strongly encourages the campus to endeavor to uphold the SFPUC's measures to protect local water resources, as set forth in the City and County of San Francisco's ordinances related to water conservation, recycled water, and non-potable water, a few of which are specifically referenced in the additional comments provided below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cheryl Muñoz, Water Resources Division</td>
<td>Section 2.3.6 Utilities and Energy Use</td>
<td>page 15, paragraph 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>The SFPUC has reviewed the Initial Study, and in accordance with the requirements of the Recycled Water Ordinance, it appears that a recycled water piping system(s) will be included. Please be aware of the following recycled water requirements. <strong>Recycled Water</strong> A project of the proposed size and location is required to comply with San Francisco's Recycled (or Reclaimed) Water Use Ordinance, adopted as Article 22 of the San Francisco Public Works Code. The project shall include all necessary plumbing for the future use of recycled water for non-potable applications including, but not limited to, toilet flushing and irrigation. Please refer to our web page for more information: <a href="http://www.sfwater.org/RWreqs">www.sfwater.org/RWreqs</a>. The SFPUC's City Distribution Division and the Department of Building Inspection’s Plumbing Division shall review all technical aspects of the water and recycled water infrastructure (mains, piping, valves, etc.) in the project designs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fan Lau, Water Resources Division</td>
<td>Section 2.3.6 Utilities and Energy Use</td>
<td>page 15, paragraph 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>On-site Non-potable Water SFSU and the City are currently in discussions regarding the installation and operation of onsite water reuse systems at SFSU with respect to San Francisco’s Mandatory Use of Alternate Water Supplies in New Construction Ordinance, adopted as Chapter 12C of the San Francisco Health Code. Please refer to <a href="http://www.sfwater.org/np">www.sfwater.org/np</a> for requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fan Lau, Water Resources Division</td>
<td>Section 2.4 Demolition and Construction</td>
<td>page 17, paragraph 8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Non-potable Water Use for Soil Compaction and Dust Control CCSF Ordinance 175-91 restricts the use of potable water for soil compaction and dust control activities undertaken in conjunction with any construction or demolition project occurring within the boundaries of San Francisco, unless permission is obtained from San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC). Non-potable water must be used for soil compaction and dust control activities during project construction or demolition. Recycled water is available from the SFPUC for dust control on roads and streets. However, per State regulations, recycled water cannot be used for demolition, pressure washing, or dust control through aerial spraying. The SFPUC operates a recycled water truck-fill station at the Southeast Water Pollution Control Plant that provides recycled water for these activities at no charge. For more information please contact (415) 695-7378.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Comments

### Document Name: SFSU Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed Use Project Notice of Preparation

**8-Aug-16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter Name &amp; SFPUC Division</th>
<th>Document Section Title or Section Number</th>
<th>Page Number and Line or Paragraph Number</th>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Review Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5   | Fan Lau, Water Resources Division | Section 4.17 Utilities and Service Systems | page 57, paragraph 2 | N/A | Water Supply Assessment  
SFSU and SFPUC are currently in discussions regarding how the proposed water demands should be analyzed, whether through a formal Water Supply Assessment or other document. |
| 6   | Ed Ho, WWE CSD | Additional wastewater flows associated with the development of Blocks 1 and 6 constitute an impact to the WWE which can be mitigated by calculating and paying SFPUC Capacity and Service Fees. |

In addition, the Project sponsor should be aware of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter Name &amp; SFPUC Division</th>
<th>Document Section Title or Section Number</th>
<th>Page Number and Line or Paragraph Number</th>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Review Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1   | City Distribution Division (CDD) | General | The project site is located within an area that is owned, operated, and maintained by Park Merced. In the event that these water mains are transferred to SFPUC ownership in the future, all water facilities, including potable, fire-suppression, and non-potable water systems, must conform to the current SFPUC City Distribution Division (CDD) and San Francisco Fire Department (SFFD) standards and practices. These include, but are not limited to, the following:  
- Protection of Existing Water and AWSS Facilities;  
- SFPUC Wastewater & Water Standards for Surface Improvement Projects (June 2014);  
- Rules and Regulations Governing Water Service to Customers;  
- SFPUC- CDD Design Criteria for Potable Water Systems;  
- Application for Water Supply and Responsibility of Applicants;  
- San Francisco Fire Code and Reliability;  
- California Waterworks Standards; California Code of Regulations Titles 17 and 22  
- Auxiliary Water Supply System (AWSS) Distribution Piping; and  
- Any other regulation governing the installation and protection of water facilities not already stated.  
To ensure adequate fire suppression reliability and capacity, the Project Sponsor may be required to include one or more of the following: two sources of water delivery (connections to two separate water mains), AWSS high pressure distribution piping, AWSS cistern, and/or Potable Water Supply System equipment. | |
<p>| 2   | Ed Ho, WWE CSD | Wastewater | Project Sponsor should be aware that for Block 6, our GIS indicates that the sewer main is on the south side of Holloway, not the north. Any connections to SFPUC mains must be consistent with CCSF Standards. |
| 2   | Ed Ho, WWE CSD | Wastewater | Access to and maintenance of SFPUC assets not located in the public right of way is considered impaired and may constitute an operational impact. So if any public right of way is to be vacated, Project Sponsor should consider the acquisition of any underlying SFPUC assets. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment Number</th>
<th>Commenter Name &amp; SFPUC Division</th>
<th>Document Section Title or Section Number</th>
<th>Page Number and Line or Paragraph Number</th>
<th>Figure Number</th>
<th>Review Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ed Ho, WWE CSD</td>
<td>Stormwater</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>Project Sponsor should be aware that while compliance with CCSF Stormwater Design Guidelines can reduce impacts to the combined sewage collection system, the cumulative impacts of climate change and development within this urban watershed can result in situations where stormwater flows exceed the capacity of the collection system, which can impact human health, the environment, public and private property and the SFPUC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Ms Bloom:
I wished to offer some suggestions on the above. I hope you will be able to pass it on to the relevant parties for consideration.
In the Master Plan several time the term "iconic building" has been mentioned. I feel strongly about the appearance of school buildings. They should look beautiful and inviting. The students see the façade of the school building before they see anything else. I can not forget the impact one particular school building had on my mind when I was a little. I felt so privileged when I got the opportunity to attend that school a decade later.
I do not think at SF State there are any iconic buildings or spots that would impress young minds. As possible options I'm attaching pictures of some impressive school buildings. Also attached is a suggestion for a statue of Minerva. Minerva is the icon prominently displayed in SF State logo. Let's make SF State a tourist attraction for the City of San Francisco.
Regards,

Dr. Dipendra K. Sinha
Trinity College, Cambridge

University of Southern California
I was very unfamiliar of what is going on around campus and off-campus. However, after hearing a little bit more about how the California Environmental Quality Act, I am surprised at the plethora of factors that goes into developing and facilitating an area. It is unbelievable how little informed we are in addition to how we tend to shape our living situations for ourselves. Before attending your event, I did not know how politically feasible a cohort to design a network would turn out. Your article about creating a new environment for the next generation to adapt to was very intriguing. I think that it is imperative for every student and faculty member to band together in order to initiate conversations that would deliberatively alter the individual's life, such as strengthening the community of future academics and physicians and researchers by providing our students with the options of more choices to live in a safer alternative off-campus housing as opposed to the dangers of West Oakland's off-campus housing situations. Moreover, students within the broadcasting and cinematic arts would be able to have a larger campus support to present and broadcast their voices, in addition to utilizing the latest technologies.
Written Comment Form

Please note that your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, is part of your entire comment. Including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Mail comments to:
Wendy Bloom
Director of Campus Planning
Capital Planning, Design & Construction
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132
wbloom@sfsu.edu (subject line of emails: “Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project”)

Public Scoping Ends: August 8, 2016

To ensure that comments will be considered during the scoping period, San Francisco State University must receive written comments by the close of the public scoping period (August 8, 2016). There will be additional opportunities to comment on the Draft EIR for the Project during the EIR public review period in the fall of 2016.
Thank you for including time is limited and there is some great options that SFSU can do to improve the situation if they look at the alternatives

I have some pics from SOM's prior alternatives Craig Hartman had the studies with Leo Chow for taller buildings at entry parking areas and central courtyards on pie shaped blocks for mix of unit types

May be a good alternative for the EIR with mills act funding for the townhouse and courtyards?

I will see if I can find the concept for you on block 9 longer block could be an interesting option on Holloway!

Ag

Sent from my iPhone

On Aug 2, 2016, at 8:44 AM, Wendy Bloom <wbloom@sfsu.edu> wrote:

Aaron,

Thank you for your comments on the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study for the Creative Arts Replacement and Holloway Mixed-Use Project. We’ve downloaded all the documents posted at the link below.

Best,

Wendy
I can send individual emails with documents attached if you cannot get links attached and downloaded.

A. Goodman
25 Lisbon St.
SF, CA 94112

D11 Resident (*currently)
D7 former Parkmerced resident (11 Fuente and 405 Serrano Drive Apt. #11-H) 5 years living in Parkmerced during the SFSU-CSU land changes and proposal Masterplans at both units
SF Tomorrow Board Member
RE: NOTICE OF PREPARATION - TIERED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY CREATIVE ARTS & HOLLOWAY MIXED-USE PROJECT

Wendy Bloom, and the Associated EIR and SFSU-CSU Planners;

I have submitted prior comments as a resident living in the Parkmerced Complex in a town-home and tower unit(s) prior at 11 Fuente and 405-Serrano Drive Apt.#11-H regarding the SFSU-CSU Masterplan EIR Document as an overall impacting project and especially on its impacts on the D7 district and community residing at Parkmerced in terms of housing, parking, traffic, transit, open-space, and loss of amenities to residents. I would first and foremost request you look at the memo’s sent prior due to the efforts in addressing and speaking at the NOP prior for the overall masterplan projects of the SFSU-CSU and Parkmerced projects. These comments were directed primarily at the impacts and lacking address of CSU-SFSU expansion and its effects short and long-term on the prior residential low-scale community of Parkmerced tenants which comprised of working families, seniors, and faculty-staff of SFSU, along with student populations that changed regularly due to the year short-term rental needs of students attending the SFSU-CSU campus.

The original “border” of the university was along Font and Holloway, but was stepped over by land-acquisitions by the University in 2000-2004 by SFSU-CSU President Corrigan, during his mentioned “viewpoints” available doing a google search online, discussing a new financing wing of the SFSU-Foundation (transformed into the U.Corp) to provide the CSU campus with new method or means of securing financing and development money’s for the CSU-SFSU growth of enrollment proposed and new facilities. Maps show directly the increase in overall land mass of the university campus in the acquisition of UPN (formerly Stonestown Apartments a family and senior housing area for workforce communities in the D7 area) along with UPS (portions of Parkmerced)

The prior impacts on housing and land-use have to date not been documented by the SF Planning Department or SFSU-CSU planners on the Parkmerced and SFSU-CSU proposed masterplanned developments to ascertain the consistent and continual loss of family/staff/senior housing in the district, and the continued pressures on the housing rental stock in its transformation and gentrification to
“student housing” that promotes student living at the cost of community needed general rental housing stock.

The impacts noted in the NOP ignore a number of concerns in regards to the overall prior EIR for the SFSU-CSU Masterplan and the more limited “tiered” EIR being done for these specific sites under the SFSU Masterplan’s original EIR document. The original EIR was not challenged to my knowledge legally due to the costs and difficulties in the communities tenants group prior, and the overall dual masterplans submitted that split the community of Parkmerced into two segments one owned by SFSU-CSU the other by the Parkmerced development. The proposed dual developments split a prior overall masterplanned community and threatened to displace and isolate the existing tenants living in the SFSU-CSU blocks proposed for redevelopment and change the scale and character of a low-scale community designed and built for the micro-climate that exists in this district.

I submitted prior comments on many of these issues which should be reviewed and referenced, including the importance of the landscaped courtyards of Thomas Dolliver Church and the need to ascertain, educate, and document physically the loss of individual designed courtyards done by a master-class landscape architect also affiliated with the modern movement in landscape architecture. A travelling exhibit was featured in The Cultural Landscapes “Marvels of Modernism” Landscapes @ Risk in 2008, and was featured in the Labor-Fest SF walks by groups from the Netherlands (which Edwin Oostermeijer continually conducted with me in relation to housing, planning, and landscape interests in the Parkmerced blocks). An example of the HABS study is in the Juan Bautista Circle. A more improved version for the educational means of the architectural and planning departments in SFSU-CSU should be provided possibly including 360 degree video possibly with the Creative Arts Center students and artists, and aerial plans along with interior and exterior detailing and courtyard photos showing prior views and the low-scale low-cost design elements that helped transform the individual courtyards into an exemplary example of T.Church’s work on Parkmerced.

The difficulty in addressing the NOP for this Tiered impact report is in the two blocks directly affected, which contain existing residents left stranded by the initial split in ownership, along with the more detailed front entry blocks in the Tapia Triangle (wood-working screens) and features not “disturbed” by SFSU-CSU Campus Housing to date in their landscape work on site and placement of benches, seating and trashcans in the internal courtyards of the sites.

The existing residents remaining should not be “displaced” to UPN or Stonestown as it is far away on the opposite northern end of the SFSU-CSU Campus. Options that look directly at protecting or relocating residents initially to other SFSU-CSU owned blocks for a staff/faculty housing block should be approached as an initial possible impact to reduce overall displacement from the existing site.

Block 1 and 6 are the initial proposals but should be reviewed in terms of overall impacts and referral to the prior boundaries of the original SFSU Campus build-out and should be designed to mesh and blend with or provide a buffer and low-scale transition between SFSU and Parkmerced future blocks. Options that look land-use wise at low-scale pencil thin towers, and Mills-Act rehabilitation of the existing blocks should be considered as the most environmental stance to the existing units and courtyards. Drive-ways and parking areas could be densified as an option to showcase the alternative not explored by the
Parkmerced Developers, but as a method initially done during the UPS rehabilitation, which included roof, and wall work and rehab on existing townhouse structures on the UPS site.

Block 41 should be noted as a loss-of-use of tenant amenities to the prior Parkmerced community inclusive of the community center, tennis courts, handball courts, garden planters, and fields (Title 9 Softball) that already are a loss to the prior and future residents of Parkmerced. No indication has been made by the Campus Planners that the future featured Moushaff Center will include community accessible features including a discounted access program to long-term tenants in Parkmerced, or future tenants of Parkmerced’s rebuild. Access for the tenants groups and existing meeting space for residents of the UPS blocks should be made available in any future build-out. Benefits to students such as transit passes, should be made also available to low-income residents and seniors, and students of the UPS blocks that reside there pre-post construction to emphasize use of mass-transit.

The 19th Ave Transit study also discussed issues of MOU’s with the SFSU-CSU campus, and the concern that documenting the traffic/transit and parking issues would be exacerbated by the removal of the central SFSU-CSU garage on campus. Already parking in and along Holloway and Font have visibly increased with cars parking along medians perpendicular and not at the 45 degree areas only prior on the existing streets. This increase has occurred consistently and lacking efforts to document and require funding towards the Tier-5 level transit improvements and future connection to Daly City BART is required to make this future project transit friendly and really an environmental effort to reduce traffic, parking and transit load created by the SFSU-CSU campus and enrollment increases. The increased density will have a similar increase in commute loads, and biking is not a currently safe endeavor that all people can utilize. So efforts to link and connect to Daly City BART with a new transit hub, should be the priority along with funding the M-J line connectivity to Balboa Park Station and Daly City BART as a bi-county improvement and development of critical importance to the success of this project.

On the initial study checklist;

*Significant impacts and factors that potentially are affected should be included as significant and are included and are elaborated below;*

- **Land-Use and Planning** - overall dividing an existing community 4.10(a) is a significant and increased impact based on the division of the prior Parkmerced masterplanned community in the sale of parcels to SFSU-CSU as the UPS blocks. Efforts to look at scale and planning of the future Parkmerced parcels, and either lessen the impact or look at ways to bridge softly the transition between the Parkmerced taller buildings with projects that lessen the overall massing and height of the future build-out with pencil thin housing towers, open plazas and accessible landscape features in all blocks on plinth levels, or directly from the streetside. 4.10 (B) is also a significant issue due to the demolition of sound housing (please see attached report on the existing condition of the housing in the UPS blocks and need to look at more preservation based solutions to density including infill and re-integration of denser housing using 6-8 and 4-6 story townhomes and tower buildings that could go up to 10-12 stories.

- **Population and Housing** - No information has been provided in terms of a nexus study, on the loss of family, senior, and staff housing on site at Parkmerced and the continual impact of
student growth, and spread into the Parkmerced blocks and Stonestown apartments. Documentation on the gentrification of these blocks since 2000-2016 should be part of the analysis on overall impacts and housing needs affordable to working class families which are a protected class in the city and county of SF. 4.13 items a b and c should all be seen as potentially significant new or increased impacts. These impacts have been well visually documented, and are a consistent issue with the future Parkmerced development in terms of unit costs and the lacking affordable housing options in the westside of San Francisco.

- **Public Services** – section 4.14 (a) should all be significant impacts in terms of Fire, Police, Emergency, Medical, Schools, and Parks and Public Facilities such as libraries and public outdoor features (tennis courts, basketball courts, and public pools). With increased enrollment all infrastructure is impacted especially easy access to public schools (Prior demolition of Frederick Burke Elementary) and the loss of block 41 for open space needs of Parkmerced residents and students living at the dormitories. Increase density already taxes the local fire-department and police departments including CSU campus police, and will cause longer response times unless adequately planned for in the future development. The Library project and new Creative Arts and Wellness Center should be made available to residents of UPS as prior suggested at a reduced rate, and provisions for new facilities suggested to replace existing and prior lost spaces for residents, students and staff. Buildings designed should provide for opportunities to house new amenities on plinth levels, in courtyards, or in the buildings themselves (underground) or at street level.

- **Geology and Soils** – Earthquake issues were noted on the Parkmerced EIR, and should be documented in terms of sandy-silty conditions, and concerns on liquefaction in the areas noted on the USGS maps. UPS townhomes were bolted and brick walls reinforced, but the overall projects proposed should take into account the standards for earthquakes and concerns with building taller towers adjacent to other buildings, along with base-isolation, and infrastructure which has aged significantly on site below grade.

- **Hydrology and Water Quality** - Concerns were mentioned prior on the issue of water retention, and need to look more proactively during the UPS rennovations and re-roofing at water conservation and “collection” on site for re-use and consumption. Grey-water and recycled water systems including water collection, and fog-water collection systems should be looked at to increase the inventiveness and solutions created with this project due to the fog micro-climate and possible new means of water collection. Water run-off and increased density on site, increases water use, and thus should be documented in terms of household quantities/occupants and water use monthly proposed, and how to lessen that impact due to laundry, and water facilities (toilets, showers, etc) in the future proposed development.

- **Noise** – section 4.12(a) noise increase was a cause of displacement of many families existing prior in UPN and UPS blocks, and is a consistent issue with the increased student population on campus and lacking enforcement in the CSU rules (no drinking smoking or pets, on CSU campus) which pushes more students to live in Parkmerced vs. Campus Housing. Noise roving parties and
consistent loud noise would cause many families to leave Parkmerced since 2000 initial purchases and expansion.

- **Recreation** – 4.15 (a and b) both are significant in how the project impacts open space (gradation of public to private spaces in existing units in the UPS blocks, which is based on the original garden rental apartment community concept. Future build out ideas proposed should include individual green-space and gardening potential in every block, along with gradation of public to private courtyards for future residents. Please also see Public Services comments above and issues with Block 41 mentioned prior.

- **Transportation and Traffic** – per section 4.16 A-F is highlighted as significant and should remain so or be extra highlighted as EXTREMELY URGENT and a PRIORITY, due to the overall issues of emergency access, and egress along 19th Ave post a disaster over the 1952 interchange, Alemany Fly-Over and I-280 interchange which will be impeded post earthquake. Also key to enforce is that the future removal of the SFSU-CSU parking garage central to campus will cause additional stress on parking, traffic and 19th Ave congestion due to the overall proximity of this development to the already congested and backed up 19th Ave and Junipero Serra Blvd. streets, including Font, Holloway, and Brotherhood Way. Many cars already transverse the Parkmerced site to the eastern and southern edges looking for temporary parking and even with underground parking facilities proposed by Parkmerced’s development, new garage structures, and or an improved MASS-TRANSIT fix (known as the Tier-5 level connection to Daly City BART) should be made a CSU-SFSU priority in terms of co-funding and planning efforts to encourage mass-transit connectivity through an areal or below grade subway extension. Many students and faculty / visitors speed around blocks in Parkmerced and along major thoroughfares, and thus consideration should be given to the location of safety measures to prevent pedestrian fatalities adjacent to schools, pre-schools and senior housing sites.

- **Costs** – **Financial Feasibility** – to date no financial update has been publicly sent out regarding the housing acquisition costs, due dates on their initial purchases (CALPERS) and the impacts on needed profit margins on these purchases, (Stonestown UPN, and UPS Parkmerced blocks) A prior report delineated costs upcoming in 2017 and thus there is a need to ascertain the increased Housing Maintenance and repairs issues on multiple buildings noted in the news including the science building, and other older campus facilities and the needs to re-store and structurally retrofit existing buildings. Financial Feasibility and the ability to final and secure funding in the current markets for construction is key and critical to completion of projects. It may not be an official EIR segment, but needs to be addressed in terms of the SFSU-CSU “largess” documented in Corrigan’s Viewpoint, its financial shifts between the SFSU-Foundation and now UCorp, and how it intends to protect and provide affordable living and education standards of a State CSU, with the increased costs of housing and construction documented in SF’s housing element and updates yearly.
Thank you for the opportunity to comment,
Please find the additional attached documents (Drop-Box link) to all files

https://www.dropbox.com/sh/85569dwtgl4j23o/AABFwfsWigiixNqY3bQEYy2a?dl=0

2010_03_12 Comment letter by the WOTPCC on the 19th Ave Corridor Study

2010_07 West of Twin Peaks Central Council Parkmerced Memo (relates to SFSU development)
Copy of SFSU MOU (In relation to transit costs, and development of the 19th Ave Transit Proposal and overall future costs to date undetermined and far beyond the cities current proposals, but increasingly critical due to traffic/transit issues in D7)

DOCOMOMO News Letter 2008 (Parkmerced)

National Trust Historic Preservation (Joint organization memo on significance of the Parkmerced and UPS University Park South blocks) that needs to be addressed as a CSU State Entity.

Parkmerced Soundness Report (A.Goodman) as a resident and local Architect concerned with the rehabilitation and possible use of the Mills-Act and alternatives in proposals environmentally.

SFSU-CSU Corrigan’s Viewpoint – online documents

SFSU Matserplan Map – showing different layouts and phasing than currently proposed, reasoning was not given for the changes, nor the reason how it provides more upfront to build a smaller parcel than the larger blocks initially.

SFSU-CSU Findings of Fact – was not challenged in court, but provides a questionable document as it was done prior to the Parkmerced EIR and legal challenge by San Francisco Tomorrow, which pointed out significant flaws in the EIR of Parkmerced’s project and proposal.

SFSU – Financial Feasibility – most recent document I have on financial issues related to SFSU’s growth and ability to construct these projects at the same time as handling the maintenance issues and ongoing construction projects on campus.

SF Heritage – memo on Parkmerced and need to look at a preservation based alternative.

Thank you again for including and reviewing as part of the general NOP discussion.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman
Dear Mr. Cooper,

Thank you for completing the 19th Avenue Corridor Study.

The WTPCC helped to initiate this study so that the cumulative impact of several individual planning projects could be reviewed comprehensively. Heretofore, each planning review project was examined on an individual basis and approved on its merits. It is our organizations belief that the 19th Avenue Corridor Study will help the Planning Department and the Western neighborhoods mitigate the combined infrastructure impacts of the Parkmerced, San Francisco State University, 800 Brotherhood Way, 77-111 Cambon, 700 Font (SFUSD), Stonestown, 445 Wawona (Arden Wood) and 1150 Ocean (Balboa Park) projects. Planning needs to take a close look at any large new development consisting of 20 residential units or more and/or 50,000 square feet of retail or commercial space that would be located along or near the southern portion of the 19th Avenue Corridor. This forwards the West of Twin Peaks Central Council's (WTPCC) written testimony for the 19th Avenue Corridor Study for your review.

COMMENTS/TESTIMONY

The build-out of the above identified development projects is estimated to increase the city's population by about 16,850 persons by 2030. These projects would include about 7,375 residential units, 460,000gsf of retail uses, 834,000 gsf of institutional/educational uses, 80,000 gsf of office uses, 214,000 gsf of community facilities, and an eight-screen movie theater.

-Water Delivery Services: We agree with your reports assessment that there will be an adequate water supply for the 16,850 people who will be added to the 19th Avenue corridor by 2030. The term adequate is deceptive in that the average daily per capita water consumption in San Francisco is an already a very low 58.7 gallons of water per day. This is an extraordinarily low amount when compared to the 120 gallons per day used by San Jose residents. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) growth demands for San Francisco dictate that the average daily water consumption in San Francisco may be as low as 47.8 gallons per day by 2030. This low level of water usage will become a quality of life issue.
San Francisco’s new 25 year master water contract, signed in the Summer of 2009, will allow San Francisco only 81 million gallons per day from Hetch Hetchy. The 94.5 million gallons of available water that you are projecting is not reliable and the SFPUC costs to achieve this 94.5 million is cost prohibitive. The costs to achieve this additional 13.5 million gallons of water (14% increase) through the WISP and Wastewater bonds will double to triple the cost of water and sewage for the average San Francisco consumer. At some point the City is going to have ask if the costs of this additional water and growth is worth burdening the existing population for the 7,375 net housing units that will be added by 2030. The Planning Department will have to monitor city water consumption very closely to make sure that planned growth is feasible AND affordable for the average citizen. The expected high cost of water and sewage will have a tremendous impact on future developments. The citizens of San Francisco will be subsidizing this population growth at a very high cost

-The study's conclusions for “available schooling” is completely inaccurate. The study concludes, "The geographic context for the analysis of the development projects’ effects on schools is the entire City, because while school assignments take into account parents’ preferences, which often include where a student lives, assignment is not necessarily to the closest neighborhood school." Due to changes in SFUSD admissions policy, proximity to a neighborhood school for elementary and middle-school children will now be prioritized geographically. Showing that there is availability throughout the entire system is no longer relevant. The study needs to show how the additional 1,500 children living in the 19th Avenue Corridor will be able to go to schools in the proximity of their neighborhoods. Under the new SFUSD admission guidelines the schools inside the 19th Avenue Corridor will not be able to adequately service the higher population of children.

Transit: It is commendable that Planning reviewed the 4A - 4C tier approaches. All four are good representations of logical and well thought out transportation options. The true test will be the Planning Departments Tier 5 option. As stated in the study, "Subsequent to the evaluation of these four future tiers, a Tier 5 study will be conducted that assesses large-scale and long-term projects to address corridor-wide transportation issues. This study will be scoped and conducted at a later date." It is critical that this Tier 5 study be completed as soon as possible.

The WTPCC questions the ability of the SFMTA to deliver on its promise of faster transit times. Muni’s delivery time has dropped steadily over the last five years. In 2008, the average speed of a Muni bus/train was 9.1mph. The average speed is now 8.75mph and still falling. Declining rates of speed add millions to the costs of operation and continue to make Muni less efficient. Muni light rail used to travel at speeds of up to 55 mph through the West Portal tunnel. Due to poor track conditions, light rail trains are traveling at a much slower rate of speed. Muni may be able to repair rail lines and purchase new buses because of the
capital improvement funds that they are and will be receiving. Muni’s operational funds are in shambles with Muni running huge operating deficits that will no longer be paid for through State funding. If Muni follows through on it's promised 10% service cuts by May 1st, 2010 Muni will have reduced it's operating services by 20% over the last year. As Muni’s operational budget continues to go deeper and deeper into debt, there is no reason to be optimistic about increases in Muni's service times. At Muni’s current reduction rate in operational service, Muni may be operating at 50% of its current service level by the time that the 19th Avenue Corridor developments are completed. Muni’s lack of service will cause more people to rely on automobiles and create higher rates of traffic congestion and a greater need for parking.

On page III.3 of the study states the following, "In addition, the review of operating speeds indicated that bus delays would noticeably increase under Tier 1 and Tier 2 conditions, due to projected congestion levels along the streets. The transportation improvements included in Tier 3, Tier 4A, Tier 4B and Tier 4C would help reduce the travel time increases, but buses would still operate more slowly than they do under existing conditions, which could have impacts on Muni schedule adherence and service reliability."

The 19th Avenue Corridor study is only evaluating transportation from a capital improvement point-of-view and must consider the SFMTA's operational budget constraints. Federal, State and developer funding will allow the city to proceed and build Tier 5 plan, but operationally Muni will not be able to perform to anticipated standards. We believe that the Planning Department should take a close look at what has happened at St. Francis Circle. This main intersection has the longest stoplight waiting times in San Francisco. These excessive intersection waits are caused by the Muni light-rail trains running directly through the intersection. The 19th Avenue Corridor plan will have the same problems at Ocean Avenue and going into the Park Merced development. Although the cost is anticipated to be four times greater, the Planning Department's Tier 5 plan should analyze having the Muni light-rail trains go underground at the Ocean Avenue intersection and going into Park Merced. Without the underground option, the expected increases in population and traffic will greatly impede 19th Avenue traffic.

Parking: The 19th Avenue Corridor plan is projecting that there will be a substantially greater parking demand primarily focused near Stonestown, SFSU and Parkmerced. The study states, "It is likely that both SFSU and Parkmerced will have a substantial parking shortfall. As a result, the unmet parking demand in the area would tend to spill over into the adjacent residential neighborhoods, exacerbating any current parking problems.” The bicycle lanes installed along Holloway Avenue would also reduce existing parking. Under new city planning guidelines parking is almost eliminated from the Balboa Park development and is rationed by income at Parkmerced. City Planning’s insistence on higher density housing developments with limited parking will only discourage a limited number
of people from owning an automobile. These cars will be warehoused in existing neighborhoods. As Muni fare costs soar and service becomes more constricted and unreliable, development residents will purchase MORE cars and have less incentive to ride Muni. Parking along the 19th Avenue Corridor and in the surrounding neighborhoods will be horrendous.

CONCLUSION:

The WTPCC wants to again thank the San Francisco Planning Department for producing such a detailed plan of the 19th Avenue Corridor developments. It is our hope that the approved developments will lead to a satisfying and affordable quality of life for West side neighborhoods. We are concerned that the Planning Departments good intentions may lead to unintended negative consequences with respect to water availability, school admissions, mass transportation operations and parking.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

George Wooding
President
West of Twin Peaks Central Council
July 11, 2010

Mr. Bill Wyco  
Environmental Review Officer  
San Francisco Planning Department  
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400  
San Francisco, CA. 94103

Subject: Re Parkmerced Project Draft EIR

Dear Mr. Wyco,

This forwards the West of Twin Peaks Central Council’s (WTPCC) Comments on: 1) the Parkmerced DEIR and 2) how this DEIR relates to the San Francisco Planning Departments recently published 19th Avenue Corridor Study.

The WTPCC helped to initiate the 19th Avenue Corridor study so that the cumulative impact of several individual planning projects could be reviewed comprehensively on the West side of San Francisco. Heretofore, each planning review project was examined on an individual basis and approved on its merits. It is our organizations belief that the 19th Avenue Corridor Study will help the Planning Department and the Western neighborhoods mitigate the combined infrastructure impacts of the Parkmerced, San Francisco State University, 800 Brotherhood Way, 77-111 Cambon, 700 Font (SFUSD), Stonestown, 445 Wawona (Arden Wood) and 1150 Ocean (Balboa Park) projects.

It was the intention of the San Francisco Planning Department to apply the findings of the 19th Avenue Corridor study to developments like the Parkmerced Project and by extension to the Parkmerced DEIR.

City Code requires the Planning Department to review any development consisting of 20 residential units or more and/or 50,000 square feet of retail or commercial space that would be located along or near the southern portion of the 19th Avenue Corridor. The build-out of the above identified development projects is estimated to increase the city’s population by about 16,850 persons by 2030. These projects would include about 7,375 residential units, 460,000 gsf of retail uses, 834,000 gsf of institutional/educational uses, 80,000 gsf of office uses, 214,000 gsf of community facilities, and an eight-screen movie theater.

PARKMERCED PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Parkmerced is an existing residential neighborhood with 3,221 residential units on approximately 152 acres of land in the southwest portion of San Francisco adjacent to Lake Merced. The existing on-site residential units are located in 11 towers and 170 two-story buildings. The proposed Parkmerced Project is a long-term mixed-use development program to comprehensively re-plan and redesign the site. The Parkmerced Project would increase residential density, provide a neighborhood core with new commercial and retail services, modify transit facilities, and improve utilities within the development. About 1,683 of the existing apartments located in 11
tower buildings would be retained. The remaining 1,538 existing garden apartments would be
demolished and fully replaced, and an additional 5,679 net new units would be added to the Project Site,
resulting in a total of about 8,900 units on the Project Site.

WTPCC FINDINGS/TESTIMONY

The WTPCC believes that the Parkmerced Project should be built and can be successfully completed,
however; after carefully reviewing the detail in the 19th Avenue Corridor study, the Parkmerced Project
DEIR and the financial situation of the developer - Stellar Management - the WTPCC has concluded
that: 1) the 19th Avenue Corridor study’s findings are overly optimistic and do not accurately represent
the ability of the City of San Francisco to provide the infrastructure improvements required to support
the proposed growth, and 2) Stellar Management’s current financial situation is very weak, and calls into
question their ability to actually deliver the proposed project at all. More importantly, the WTPCC feels
that the DEIR fails to adequately address the following issues:

- Project Financial Viability
- Water Delivery Services
- Schools & Education
- Transit Services
- Parking

**Financial Viability**

We realize that DEIR’s do not consider the financial components of a project. However, the net benefit
to the City in increased property taxes must be equal to or greater than the cost of providing and
maintaining the infrastructure needed to support that development. This must be considered for projects
of this size and potential negative impact.

We disagree with the premise that the infrastructure along the 19th Avenue corridor is adequate to
support the proposed growth. We also feel that the required improvements to that infrastructure will
demand significantly more capital investment than could ever be recovered by the City through the
increased property taxes that the growth would result in. The City is requiring that Stellar management,
the project developer pay for any property tax shortfalls caused by the project. This is unrealistic as the
developer will not have the additional funds needed and we believe that the financial burden of this
project will be subsidized by the general fund and ultimately the San Francisco taxpayers.

Stellar Management is currently in default of it’s mortgage payments. A Special Servicer, not Stellar
Management is controlling Parkmerced’s financial assets while they attempt to restructure the
developer’s debt. Stellar Managements has a $550 million note coming due in October. The Riverton
housing complex in Harlem, a 1,228 unit property owned by Stellar Management, was just foreclosed
on. The WTPCC is concerned about the Stellar Management’s ability to finance and complete this
project in a timely manner. Caveat Emptor (Buyer Beware).
Water Delivery Services

We agree with DEIR’s assessment that there will be an adequate water supply for the 16,850 people who will be added to the 19th Avenue corridor by 2030. The term adequate is deceptive in that the average daily per capita water consumption in San Francisco is already a very low 58.7 gallons of water per day. This is an extraordinarily low amount when compared to the 120 gallons per day used by San Jose residents. The Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) growth demands for San Francisco dictate that the average daily water consumption in San Francisco may be as low as 47.8 gallons per day by 2030. This low level of water usage will become a quality of life issue.

San Francisco's new 25 year master water contract, signed in the Summer of 2009, will allow San Francisco only 81 million gallons per day from Hetch Hetchy. The 94.5 million gallons of available water that you are projecting is not reliable and the SFPUC costs to achieve this 94.5 million is cost-prohibitive. The costs to achieve this additional 13.5 million gallons of water (14% increase) through the WISP and Wastewater bonds will double to triple the cost of water and sewage for the average San Francisco consumer. At some point the City is going to have ask if the costs of this additional water and growth is worth burdening the existing population for the 7,375 net housing units that will be added by 2030. The Planning Department will have to monitor city water consumption very closely to make sure that planned growth is feasible AND affordable for the average citizen. The expected high cost of water and sewage will have a tremendous impact on future developments. Once again, the citizens of San Francisco will be subsidizing the Parkmerced development at a very high cost.

Schools & Education

The 19th Avenue Corridor Study conclusion for “available schooling” is completely inaccurate. The study states:

"The geographic context for the analysis of the development projects' effects on schools is the entire City, because while school assignments take into account parents' preferences, which often include where a student lives, assignment is not necessarily to the closest neighborhood school."

Due to changes in SFUSD admissions policy, proximity to a neighborhood school for elementary and middle-school children will now be prioritized geographically. Showing that there is availability throughout the entire system is no longer relevant. The study needs to show how the additional 1,500 children living in the 19th Avenue Corridor will be able to go to schools in the proximity of their neighborhoods. Under the new SFUSD admission guidelines the schools inside the 19th Avenue Corridor will not be able to adequately service the higher population of children.

The SFUSD sold off the Frederick Burke Elementary School and thus eliminated the only public school in walking distance to the Park Merced Development. Stellar Management, the Parkmerced developer will be building a new Pre K – 5 school and a day care facility, however, These will not be public schools, and as such should not be considered when calculating the number of students that will be added to the SFUSD. The proposed new private school would not be large enough to adequately meet the needs of the Parkmerced children and children from the surrounding neighborhoods even if it were turned over to the SFUSD to operate.
San Francisco taxpayers will be subsidizing the costs for new schools to serve the additional residents that Parkmerced will bring to San Francisco.

**Transit Service**

It is commendable that Planning reviewed the 4A - 4C tier approaches for the 19th Avenue Corridor plan. All four are good representations of logical and well thought out transportation options. The true test will be the Planning Departments Tier 5 option. As stated in the study, "Subsequent to the evaluation of these four future tiers, a Tier 5 study will be conducted that assesses large-scale and long-term projects to address corridor-wide transportation issues. This study will be scoped and conducted at a later date." It is critical that this Tier 5 study be completed as soon as possible.

The WTPCC questions the ability of the SFMTA to deliver on its promise of faster transit times. Muni's delivery time has dropped steadily over the last five years. In 2008, the average speed of a Muni bus/train was 9.1mph. The average speed is now 8.75mph and still falling. Declining rates of speed add millions to the costs of operation and continue to make Muni less efficient. Muni light rail used to travel at speeds of up to 55 mph through the West Portal tunnel. Due to poor track conditions, light rail trains are traveling at a much slower rate of speed. Muni may be able to repair rail lines and purchase new buses because of the capital improvement funds that they are and will be receiving. Muni's operational funds are in shambles with Muni running huge operating deficits that may no longer be paid for through State funding. MUNI cut services by an additional 10% on May 1st, 2010. Muni has reduced its operating services by 20% over the last year and more service cuts are expected over the next five years. As Muni's operational budget continues to go deeper and deeper into debt, there is no reason to be optimistic about increases in Muni's service times. At Muni's current reduction rate in operational service, Muni may be operating at 50% of its current service level by the time that the 19th Avenue Corridor development projects are completed, especially the Parkmerced development.

Muni's lack of service will cause more people to rely on automobiles and create higher rates of traffic congestion and a greater need for parking. People want to get off of the bus, not on the bus. On page III.3 of the 19th Avenue Corridor study states the following, "In addition, the review of operating speeds indicated that bus delays would noticeably increase under Tier 1 and Tier 2 conditions, due to projected congestion levels along the streets. The transportation improvements included in Tier 3, Tier 4A, Tier 4B and Tier 4C would help reduce the travel time increases, but buses would still operate more slowly than they do under existing conditions, which could have impacts on Muni schedule adherence and service reliability."

The 19th Avenue Corridor study is only evaluating transportation from a capital improvement point-of-view and must consider the SFMTA's operational budget constraints. Federal, State and developer funding will allow the city to proceed and build Tier 5 plan, but operationally Muni will not be able to perform to anticipated standards. We believe that the Planning Department should take a close look at what has happened at St. Francis Circle. This main intersection has the longest stoplight waiting times in San Francisco with traffic stops averaging 90 - 120 seconds. These excessive intersection waits are caused by the Muni light-rail trains running directly through the intersection. MUNI trains traveling across or along 19th avenue and into the Parkmerced development will receive right-of-way priority over
other types of transportation. Stoplight waits are projected to increase by at least 27 seconds. Parkmerced's increased population density will have a tremendous impact on 19th Avenue traffic.

The Parkmerced Project includes construction of (or provides financing for construction of) a series of transportation improvements, which include rerouting the existing Muni Metro M Ocean View line from its current alignment along 19th Avenue. The new alignment, as currently envisioned, would leave 19th Avenue at Holloway Avenue and proceed through the neighborhood core in Parkmerced. The Muni M line trains would then travel alternately along one of two alignments: trains would either re-enter 19th Avenue south of Felix Avenue, and terminate at the existing Balboa Park station, or they would terminate at a new station, with full layover and terminal facilities, constructed on the Parkmerced Project Site at the intersection of Font Boulevard and Chumasero Drive. Although the cost is anticipated to be four times greater, the Planning Department's Tier 5 plan should analyze having the Muni light-rail trains go underground at the Ocean Avenue intersection and going into Park Merced. The Tier 5 plan should also consider connecting the M Ocean View line to the Daily City Bart Station.

Due to Stellar Management's current financial situation, it is questionable whether they will be able to afford to build these track extensions and additional stations or purchase the additional Muni trains that their agreement with the city will require. If Stellar Management does build the stops, San Francisco will still have to pay the future operation and maintenance costs. If the developer cannot complete the transit extension, San Francisco will be forced to pay for the extension and possibly more trains.

Parking

The 19th Avenue Corridor plan is projecting that there will be a substantially greater parking demand primarily focused near Stonestown, SFSU and Parkmerced. The study states, "It is likely that both SFSU and Parkmerced will have a substantial parking shortfall. As a result, the unmet parking demand in the area would tend to spill over into the adjacent residential neighborhoods, exacerbating any current parking problems." The bicycle lanes installed along Holloway Avenue would also reduce existing parking. Under new city planning guidelines parking is almost eliminated from the Balboa Park development and is rationed by income at Parkmerced. City Planning's insistence on higher density housing developments with limited parking will only discourage a limited number of people from owning an automobile. The Parkmerced Project has a one parking spot per apartment spot component. Additional cars will be warehoused in existing neighborhoods. As Muni fare costs soar and service becomes more constricted and unreliable, development residents will purchase MORE cars and have less incentive to ride Muni. Parking along the 19th Avenue Corridor and in the surrounding neighborhoods will be horrendous.

CONCLUSION

The WTPCC wants to again thank the San Francisco Planning Department for producing such a detailed plan of the 19th Avenue Corridor developments. However, we disagree with the overall finding of the study that supports the proposed growth by making overly optimistic estimations of the ability of the City of San Francisco to deliver the infrastructure improvements necessary to support this growth. We are concerned that the Planning Departments desire to facilitate increased housing density along 19th Avenue (in order to meet housing growth metrics prescribed in the 2009 Housing Element) may lead to
unintended negative consequences with respect to the City’s financial well-being, water availability, schools and education, mass transportation operations and parking.

The WTPCC supports the Parkmerced Project but believes that the project is hampered by the current economy, the financial strength of Stellar Management and the San Francisco Planning Departments over-optimistic analysis of the infrastructure support that the City of San Francisco can provide to the Parkmerced Project.

Sincerely,

George Wooding
President, West of Twin Peaks Central Council
Memorandum of Understanding  
City & County of San Francisco and California State University/ San Francisco State University  

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") is entered into by and between the City & County of San Francisco and California State University ("CSU") / San Francisco State University, a California public post-secondary institution for higher education, on this 29th day of October 2007.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, California State University includes institutions for higher education throughout the State including San Francisco State University (the "University"), a location within the City & County of San Francisco ("City"); and

WHEREAS, as part of its strategic vision to become the nation's preeminent public urban university, the University has prepared a San Francisco State University Campus Master Plan ("Master Plan") that establishes a long-term vision for the physical environment and identifies improvements to occur through 2020; and

WHEREAS, these improvements focus on accommodating increased enrollment from 20,000 to 25,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES), 711 additional faculty and staff, 657 additional housing units, expanded academic initiatives, and ways to best serve its many constituents—from students, faculty and staff to alumni, friends and neighbors—who contribute to the University's success; and

WHEREAS, the University produces over 7,000 well-educated graduates each year—80 percent of whom remain in the San Francisco Bay Area; and

WHEREAS, the University plays an important role in fueling the City's vibrant economic, cultural, and civic institutions; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes the significant contributions that the University makes to the community and supports the institution's efforts to modernize and plan for its future needs; and

WHEREAS, the City recognizes and supports the University's commitment to ensuring that it has the resources to provide outstanding educational opportunities for students and unrivaled cultural, recreational, and intellectual opportunities for the community; and

WHEREAS, the University has completed a Final Environmental Impact Report ("FEIR") as required by the California Environmental Quality Act, Public Resources Code §§ 21000 et seq. ("CEQA"); and

WHEREAS, the FEIR identifies at a programmatic level the environmental impacts that the Master Plan would have on the community and sets forth mitigation measures; and

WHEREAS, on March 30, 2007, the City submitted comments on the Campus Master Plan Draft EIR regarding identification and mitigation of off-campus impacts and offering to help facilitate a Memorandum of Understanding ("MOU") to address such impacts; and
Memorandum of Understanding  
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WHEREAS, the City and the University began MOU discussion in June 2007 and have expressed the desire to formalize an agreement addressing environmental impacts resulting from the Master Plan and to strengthen their relationship and support mutually beneficial cooperation in the future and particularly during the 2007–2020 implementation period of the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, in the course of MOU negotiations the City and the University identified differences of opinion regarding the methodology and conclusions set forth in the FEIR, particularly with respect to off-campus impacts and related mitigation measures; and

WHEREAS, the City and the University desire to avoid challenges and/or litigation over the FEIR through good faith negotiations and mutual commitments as set forth herein; and

WHEREAS, the University acknowledges its obligation under CEQA to negotiate with the City and seek funding for its fair share of mitigation costs to offset the public capital costs of providing City infrastructure as set forth herein, where a nexus exists between such improvements and the University’s redevelopment and growth as described in the Master Plan; and

WHEREAS, the City and the University seek to provide additional clarity and performance criteria with regard to off-campus mitigation measures and fair share contributions; and

WHEREAS, the City intends to administer any University payments in a separate account, overseen by the City Controller’s Office, which shall be used solely for expenditures authorized herein; and

WHEREAS, the Master Plan calls for some improvements, such as those in the Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue rights-of-way, that may be subject to City permit, the granting of which may be contingent upon performance of the fair share provisions of this MOU; and

WHEREAS, the City and the University intend for this MOU to be a legally binding contract; and

WHEREAS, the City and the University intend that performance of the University’s obligations contained in this MOU shall satisfy the University’s CEQA and fair share obligations with respect to the FEIR; and

WHEREAS, performance of the University's obligations contained in this MOU will be contingent upon the Board of Trustees' approval and certification of the FEIR and approval of related Board resolutions;

NOW, THEREFORE, the City on the one hand and California State University and San Francisco State University on the other, agree as follows:

I. FAIR SHARE CONTRIBUTION

A. General Principles for Fair Share Contribution for Capital Projects
Memorandum of Understanding
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1. Any contributions to be made by the University as set out herein shall be adjusted according to the California Construction Cost Index at the time the contribution is made to the City.

2. CSU and the University shall make a good faith and timely effort to obtain approval by the Board of Trustees, governor, and legislature of requested capital appropriations for the funding required to perform its obligations under this MOU.

3. The City shall make a good faith effort to notify the University at least twenty-four (24) months in advance of implementation of any capital improvement project for which the University has a fair share contribution as identified in this MOU. Upon receipt of the City’s notification, the University will submit a funding request to the CSU for inclusion in the CSU’s annual capital budget request process for the governor’s and legislature’s approval.

B. Traffic Measures

1. The University shall implement all Transportation Demand Management ("TDM") measures identified in the Board of Trustees-approved FEIR to minimize the daily AM and PM vehicle trips to the campus. The TDM program shall include, at minimum, the following:

   a. The University shall encourage its affiliates, including the students and employees, to follow the City’s Transit First policy and use alternative modes of transportation whenever possible.

   b. Within six months from the certification of the FEIR, in partnership with the City, the University shall establish a formalized TDM program. The TDM program shall include development and implementation of an aggressive TDM work plan for the University campus.

   c. The University shall hire a transportation consultant, or staff employee, specializing in TDM development to prepare a site specific work plan for the University campus. The work plan shall be reviewed with the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") on an annual basis beginning in June 2008. The work plan would be developed to satisfy the goals of the TDM program outlined in this MOU.

   d. The TDM program shall aggressively pursue facilitating the effective use of transit, bicycle, and other modes of transportation, encouraging ridesharing among University affiliates, and employing other practical means to reduce commute travel by single-occupant vehicles.

   e. The TDM program’s objective is to ensure that adequate measures are undertaken and maintained to minimize the transportation impacts of increasing the number of students by 5,000 FTE and expanding the number of employees by 771 as set forth in the Master Plan.

   f. A transportation coordinator shall be designated by the University who shall be responsible for campus-wide coordination of all TDM related services. Said Coordinator shall serve as the liaison to the SFMTA concerning compliance with this TDM program.

2. The University shall work in good faith with the City to mitigate to less-than-significant levels the impacts University traffic growth could have at any affected intersections identified in
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Section (I)(B)(4)(f) while ensuring traffic mitigation measures do not impair or undermine pedestrian, bicycle or transit access.

3. The City and the University agree that for purposes of determining traffic impacts subject to this MOU, the University and its consultants shall utilize the City's standards of significance as set forth by the Planning Department in 3(a) and (b) below, unless the parties mutually agree to use different standards of significance. These standards indicate that the project's traffic impact at a signalized intersection would be considered significant if:

a. The project-related traffic causes the Level of Service (LOS) to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or F; or from LOS E to LOS F; or

b. A signalized intersection operates at LOS E or F under cumulative conditions in 2020 and both of the following conditions occur: (1) project-related traffic contributes 5 percent or more of the total traffic at the intersection, and (2) the project-related traffic contributes 5 percent or more of the cumulative growth in traffic volumes at the affected intersection.

4. The University shall establish a traffic monitoring and mitigation program, as detailed in the Campus Master Plan Final EIR. The program will monitor and determine whether the University's expanded TDM program identified in Section I(B)(1) above is successfully minimizing or avoiding new peak hour trips. The program will provide for mitigation, including additional TDM measures, or if necessary, improvement at affected intersections, if required to address project traffic impacts. The program will include the following elements:

a. The University will conduct a new baseline cordon count and intercept survey (collectively herein "cordon survey") no less than 12 months following the certification of the EIR. This cordon survey shall serve as a baseline against which future growth shall be measured. The cordon survey will cover all entrances to campus used by more than 100 people per day, and will examine the travel behavior of University affiliates. Surveyors may be stationed to cover more than one campus entrance at a single location, such as the south end of the parking garage footbridge, which captures travelers from South State Drive, North State Drive and Lot 25. Surveyors will count all persons entering and leaving the campus. The survey will be conducted during typical days while classes are in session, excluding final examination, national holiday or orientation weeks. The University shall work in good faith with the City to develop a survey methodology that provides reasonable statistical confidence in the number of University affiliates driving motor vehicles and riding Muni to and from the campus in the evening peak hour, including those motorists who park off campus within a ten-minute walk from the campus.

b. In addition, at intervals of no more than every three years, or no later than the addition of each 1,000 students in enrollment by headcount, the University will conduct a statistically significant cordon survey of campus commuters during the PM peak hour. The cordon survey will cover all major entrances to the campus as defined above and will examine the travel behavior of University affiliates. The survey will be conducted during typical
days while classes are in session, excluding final examination, national holiday or orientation weeks.

c. If cordon surveys show that the PM peak period auto trips to and from campus are greater than 5 percent above the baseline to be determined according to section (4)(a), the campus shall conduct the cordon surveys annually until such trips fall below 5 percent above the baseline for 2 years in a row. If and when this occurs, cordon surveys will continue in accordance with section (4)(b) above.

d. If the cordon surveys show an increase in PM peak period auto trips sufficient to result in project impacts at any affected intersections (including those listed in item 4.f below), the campus will increase the level of TDM programs until the project impacts associated with traffic increases are mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Pursuant to Section I (B)(1), above, the University transportation coordinator will report in June 2008 and annually thereafter until 2020 to update the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") on the implementation of TDM programs described herein.

e. The City and the University agree that the University will conduct statistically significant cordon surveys of campus commuters, in accordance with the scheduling criteria identified in Section I (B)(4) above. The University agrees to provide the cordon count raw data and data analysis to the City within three months of collection. The data should include information about campus affiliation, mode choice, and local residence zip code. The City and the University further agree that the City will be given a 30-day opportunity to review and comment on the scope of work for such surveys, but both parties agree that the methodology and approach will be similar to that taken for the previously conducted 2006 surveys.

f. If the campus fails to reduce its traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level for more than two years in a row, it will make payments totaling $175,000 to the City toward co-funding the cost of intersection and roadway improvements on 19th Avenue, Holloway Avenue, Font Boulevard, Lake Merced Boulevard, Winston Drive, and/or Buckingham Way in order to reduce University traffic impacts to less than significant levels. Such improvements may include but are not limited to the intersections of Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive and Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard. Payments shall be made in the following manner:

i. Ten percent of these funds will be provided to the City at the completion of the schematic design process, including CEQA certification and expiration of the 30-day statutory appeal period for legal challenges, and

ii. Fifty percent once construction completion is fifty percent complete; and

iii. The remaining forty percent at the completion of construction.
C. Transit

1. The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency ("SFMTA") and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority ("SFCTA") are currently working to implement improvements to transit services along 19th Avenue via the implementation of SFMTA’s Transit Effectiveness Project and SFCTA’s 19th Avenue Project. Improvements are planned that would reduce travel time along the M-line and 28/28L lines (e.g., bus rapid transit, improved stop spacing, transit prioritization treatments, expanded Proof-of-Payment, in-lane bus stops), re-establishing a "short-run" of the M-line between the Embarcadero and the University stations, etc. Concurrent with that effort, the University agrees to work in good faith with the City to assist with the implementation of those improvements as well to mitigate transit capacity impacts related to campus growth. The University and the City agree to the following:

   a. Transit Data Collection
      i. SFMTA will provide data that establishes the baseline average peak period, peak direction passenger loading at key transit gateways such as Holloway/19th Avenue, 19th/Hensill, Tapia Drive, and Holloway/Arrellano for the following Muni lines: 17, 18, 28, 28L, 29, 88, and M.
      ii. The University will monitor the University peak period transit use as part of the overall access survey by conducting cordon counts as specified in the Traffic section above.

   b. On-Campus Transit Conveniences. The University shall provide the following conveniences to enhance and promote the use of Muni and shuttle services at key locations on Campus to increase trip-making choices and certainty. These locations may include the Holloway/19th Avenue entrance, the bookstore, existing or planned information screens in the Student Center and library, and cafes/dining areas:
      i. Prominent display of NextMuni or comparable Internet-accessible monitors to alert waiting transit/shuttle users to the arrival of all University shuttles and Muni lines 17, 18, 23, 28, 28L, 29, 54, 88 and the M-Oceanview,
      ii. Transit ticket purchase options: Fast Pass/BART ticket sales services and access to automatic vending machines installed and maintained by the City,
      iii. Lighting and shelter from wind/rain at major transit boarding areas as deemed by the University to be practicable.

   c. 19th Avenue Transit
      i. The City agrees to continue the current arrangement to work with BART to provide free transfers for all individuals including the University affiliates between the Daly City BART Station and campus.
      ii. The City and the University agree to work together to advocate that BART improve transit connectivity at the Daly City BART station, including locates 28/28L and campus shuttle stops adjacent to one another, provide NextMuni or comparable
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Internet-accessible “Real Time” transit vehicle arrival information at this location for the campus shuttles and the Muni line 28, and including BART in a universal transit pass program.

iii. The City and the University agree to work together to implement transit prioritization treatments along 19th Avenue to expedite and prioritize high-capacity transit service along this corridor, particularly for the 28/28L Muni bus line and the M Oceanview line.

iv. The City agrees to review with the University and recommend service and route changes to Muni lines serving the University.

v. The University agrees to monitor peak hour utilization of Campus Shuttle buses on an annual basis and if average peak period, peak direction passenger loading exceeds 85 percent of combined seated and standing load capacity for shuttle service between the campus and the Daly City BART station, the campus shall improve services during the peak period(s) until this standard is met.

vi. The City agrees to monitor peak period, peak direction utilization of Muni routes, including the M and 28/28L, and work toward meeting Muni’s adopted reliability and passenger loading standards.

d. M Line Corridor and Platform. The City and University agree to:

i. The University will continue to provide maintenance at the 19th/Holloway M platform as defined in the agreement between the City and the University, signed August 5, 1994, whereby the University provides platform maintenance in exchange for the right to display University-related information and artwork on the platform;

ii. The University will allow the City to locate and maintain automated ticket vending machines at campus locations to be determined by the University to ensure tickets may be purchased where queues do not impair loading of Muni transit vehicles or shuttles. Ticket vending machines should be located at least at one prominent location on campus where tickets may be purchased in the immediate vicinity of the M Platform and 28/28L stops without necessitating the crossing of any part of 19th Avenue;

iii. The City and University agree to work together in good faith to address rider comfort and platform crowding at the 19th/Holloway M-Oceanview platform, including speed, reliability and frequency improvements on the M between Holloway and Embarcadero, and track reconfigurations that facilitate “short-run” service between Holloway and Embarcadero Station. This project will also include measures to improve pedestrian safety and comfort, accommodating a significant increase in pedestrians accessing transit. The University agrees to contribute $1,825,000 towards a project that meets these goals. Ten percent of these funds will be provided to the City at the completion of the schematic design process, including CEQA certification and expiration of the 30-day statutory appeal period.
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for legal challenges. The remainder will be paid to the City in increments at the time the following conditions are met:

1) A project to allow Muni to terminate some or all M-Line service at Holloway, sufficient to achieve the improvements described above, is fully funded, including the University’s contribution, and a construction contract is signed; and

2) The project will allow Muni to increase frequency and capacity on the M-Line between Holloway and Embarcadero.

3) Based on the above conditions, the remaining 90 percent of funds can be invoiced at the following milestone construction completion percentages:
   a) At 30 percent construction completion, 30 percent of the remaining funds.
   b) At 60 percent construction completion, 30 percent of the remaining funds.
   c) At filing of the Notice of Completion, 30 percent of the remaining funds.

iv. If the track reconfiguration project to improve speed, reliability, frequency, and capacity of service on the M line is not implemented, and if Muni reports that M line average peak period, peak direction passenger loading between the campus and West Portal Station exceeds 85 per cent of combined seating and standing load capacity for two years in a row throughout the West Portal/ Holloway corridor, and if the cordon surveys show that peak period transit trips on the M-line between the campus and West Portal Station are greater than 5 percent above the baseline throughout the corridor, the University agrees to extend campus shuttle service between the campus and West Portal Station during the peak period(s). This additional campus shuttle service will be operated with adequate capacity (i.e., it will not exceed an 85 percent combined seated/standing passenger capacity target), but the capacity shall not be greater than 15 percent of the total peak hour net new transit demand in this corridor associated with campus growth. This additional campus shuttle service will be operated until the track reconfigurations described above are implemented, or additional, alternative transit improvements are agreed upon. If, in advance of implementation of the shuttle service, the University and the City devise an alternative shuttle configuration or service that would serve the same goals and ridership at the same or less cost, the parties agree to work toward the implementation of such alternative.

v. When the track reconfiguration project is implemented, the University’s share shall be $1,825,000 in 2007 dollars adjusted for escalation according to the California Construction Cost Index. If the City does not commence construction by January 1, 2015 the University’s share shall be reduced by fifty per cent (50%) of the costs accrued to the University for operating the West Portal shuttle as described above.
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in section (1)(d)(iv) and in EIR mitigation TRA-2B, from the time such mitigation is required to the time the M line project is completed.

II. COOPERATIVE PLANNING

A. Transit

1. Transit Pass Program

a. The University and the City agree to work in good faith to establish a universal transit pass program for the University affiliates. These passes would be made available to all members of a campus affiliation group, such as undergraduate students, graduate students, faculty and/or staff, on a monthly, semester and/or annual basis, and shall be designed to support both current fare structures of BART and Muni and the fare coordination and payment programs incorporated in the proposed Translink program.

b. The City agrees to establish a price for these passes such that the entire program is revenue neutral for the City, including the following factors:

i. Program administration;

ii. Lost FastPass and fare box revenue from existing riders;

iii. Increased capital and operating cost for new transit service to meet increase in transit demand that results from the program;

iv. Savings in capital and operating costs from roadway improvements due to mode shift from driving to transit;

v. Complete fare equity between Muni services and the University shuttle system to maximize choices for access to the University from the Transit Hubs served by both the shuttles and Muni; and

vi. Savings in costs for meeting air quality, water quality, CO2 or other requirements that a universal transit pass program would benefit.

c. The University agrees to work in good faith to encourage its affiliate groups to support a universal transit pass program and to coordinate this pass with the design and projected implementation of Translink. Implementing such a program for students would require a student fee to be voted upon by students.

B. Parking

1. In accordance with State law, new parking construction and parking operations on campus will be funded through parking fees imposed on the users of the parking facilities.

2. The City and the University shall, within 90 days of certification of the EIR, meet and confer regarding parking availability on the City-owned streets surrounding the campus with the intent of cooperatively addressing congestion and parking availability. The City shall endeavor to manage parking on City streets surrounding campus in order to improve parking availability.
3. The City agrees to use its powers to manage commuter parking on residential streets surrounding the campus in accordance with its Residential Parking Permit regulations.

C. Bicycles

1. To the extent permitted by law, the City and the University agree to work together to implement key provisions of the San Francisco Bicycle Plan upon the certification of both the University’s FEIR and FEIR related to the City’s Bicycle Plan to increase connectivity between the University campus and surrounding bicycle routes and network elements, with specific focus on the following:

   a. The University agrees to allow the general public access to its bikeways and pedestrian paths, subject to the same rules as campus affiliates.

   b. The University shall establish a dedicated north-south bike path connecting 20th Avenue at Buckingham to Holloway through campus in order to provide and maintain a direct, lighted, 24-hour bike route across the University. This path shall be completed prior to the enrollment of 1,000 additional students in enrollment by headcount under the Campus Master Plan.

D. Pedestrians

1. The City and the University agree to work together to ensure pedestrian access to the campus is safe, comfortable and convenient from all major entry points, and across such arterials and heavily trafficked roadways bordering the campus such as 19th Avenue and Lake Merced Boulevard, recognizing measures that the University has implemented already, such as its crossing guard program at the intersection of 19th and Holloway Avenues, and the lighting and fencing installations on 19th Avenue between Hensill Hall and Buckingham Way, and on Lake Merced Boulevard between North State Drive and South State Drive.

2. The University agrees to participate in a Task Force to address the serious issue of pedestrian safety and crossing 19th Avenue, along with appropriate government agencies and representatives, and prioritize development of such pedestrian safety improvements.

E. Planning

1. The University shall provide access to a University mitigation monitoring program and reports through a website accessible to the City agencies and members of the public who commented on the DEIR. Posted to the website will be copies of mitigation monitoring reports, required under CEQA, that will identify the campus’s progress in implementing Campus Master Plan EIR and subsequent project-specific mitigation measures.

2. The City and the University agree to work together collaboratively during implementation of Master Plan projects as part of a collaborative planning initiative and shared approach to area improvement. In particular, both parties agree to consult on transportation service planning and right-of-way improvements for optimal design cohesiveness and construction phasing.

3. The City and University agree to provide mutual opportunity for early comment and consultation on significant private, public, and University-initiated planning and building design for the Park Merced area and University campus in accordance with CEQA requirements.
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Included among such projects are those proposals submitted for City review and processing that include or undertake City General Plan and zoning changes, or otherwise contemplate land use changes that may be of concern or interest to the University.

4. The University acknowledges the current survey, in progress, in defining CRHR eligibility criteria of Parkmerced and defining “historical resources” per CEQA 15064.5. If and when the campus pursues development on campus lands formerly part of Parkmerced, the campus shall implement Campus Master Plan EIR Mitigation CULT-2A through-2C, as appropriate.

5. For projects within 200 feet of archaeological site P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25, the University shall conduct subsurface testing in accordance with Campus Master Plan Mitigation CULT-1A. In the event that an archeological resource is encountered during such testing, Mitigation CULT-1B will be implemented, including evaluation of the resource, data recovery, and reporting.

6. The University agrees to pursue historical resource documentation per Campus Master Plan EIR Mitigation CULT-2C. Documentation for significant historic resources shall include still and video photography and a written record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (“HABS”) or Historic American Engineering Record (“HAER”). A copy of the record shall be kept with the University Library. The use of media resources of the University could be utilized, as appropriate, for such documentation efforts. The University will make these resource records available for public educational and interpretive multi-media programs and projects.

7. The City and the University agree to work cooperatively on identifying affordable housing opportunities, including housing sites, programs and sources of private and government funding for development.

F. San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC)

1. In accordance with the Campus Master Plan EIR, as each future building project is proposed, the University will verify that it can achieve a net zero increase in combined wet weather flow to the City’s combined sewer system. If a net increase in such flows would occur campus wide, the University will consult with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission ("SFPUC") Department of Planning and Regulatory Compliance to determine whether such an increase will require downstream system capacity improvements. The University agrees to consult with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Wastewater Enterprise on all projects prior commencement of design development of new buildings.

2. As acknowledged in the Campus Master Plan and EIR, proposed development in the Lake Merced area (i.e., new creek inlet, pedestrian underpass, and pedestrian trail connection) will require subsequent approvals from the SFPUC Water Enterprise. Towards that end, the University agrees to consult with the SFPUC and the Recreational and Park Department Natural Areas Division on project plans for development leading to or affecting East Lake, Lake Merced, or its recreational trail system. The University agrees to begin this consultation before the commencement of design development on such improvements.

3. The City, through SFPUC, and the University agree to work cooperatively on water conservation programs to be more effective.
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4. The University agrees to negotiate and seek funding for its assessment of capital fees pursuant to Government Code 54999 as its “fair share” of the cost of off-campus SFPUC infrastructure improvements, if such improvements are required.

G. Recreation and Parks

1. The University agrees that all wetland or other sensitive habitat in Lake Merced temporarily disturbed/removed during the construction of the bridge underpass, path connection and/or seasonal creek inlet creek shall be replaced and restored in accordance with the SFPUC in consultation with the Recreation and Park Department Natural Areas Division, as set out in the FEIR.

2. The University agrees that construction phase mitigation measures in the Lake Merced Area for the protection of nesting special-status birds shall be developed in consultation with the SFPUC in consultation with the Recreation and Park Department Natural Areas Division to ensure that substantial effects on nesting birds do not occur, as set out in the FEIR.

H. Fire Department

1. As indicated in the FEIR, while no major upgrades to the campus water system are known to be needed at this time, it is possible that if a proposed building has a substantially larger fire flow requirement than existing development, upsizing of existing campus piping may be required. However, given the pressure and flow provided by the existing turbine meters, improvements to the off-campus system to provide for adequate fire flows are not anticipated by the University. While this is the case, the University agrees to consult with the San Francisco Fire Department on water delivery and water pressure on projects prior to commencement of design development of new buildings, to ensure that any needed off-campus improvements are identified and implemented. If such improvements are required, the University would seek funding for its fair share per Section II. (F)(4) above.

III. General Provisions

1. The parties hereto agree that for purposes of litigation concerning performance of this MOU, venue shall be the City and County of San Francisco, California. The rights and obligations of the parties hereto and all interpretation and performance of this MOU shall be governed by the laws of the state of California.

2. Should any dispute arise with respect to this MOU, the terms therein, or with the implementation thereof, the parties agree to do the following: (1) the parties will meet and confer in person and attempt to resolve any disputed issue; (2) if the parties are unable to resolve any dispute informally, they agree to proceed to mediation. The mediator will be jointly selected by the parties, and each party will bear its own costs associated with mediation.

3. All communications and notices required by or given pursuant to this MOU shall be provided as follows:

To the City:

Gavin Newsom, Mayor
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City and County of San Francisco
City Hall
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102

To The University:

Dr. Leroy Morishita, Vice President for Administration & Finance
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

4. Each signatory to this MOU represents that s/he is authorized to enter into this MOU and bind the party to which his or her signature pertains.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, this Memorandum is executed on this 29th, 30th day of October 2007.

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: Nathaniel P. Ford, Sr.
Executive Director & Chief Executive Officer
San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency
Date: 10.30.07

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: Bill Wycko
Acting Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
Date: 10/29/07

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

By: Leroy Morishita
Date: 10/30/07
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Vice President

Approved as to form:

CITY & COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

By: [Signature] Date: 10-29-07

Andrew Garth
Deputy City Attorney

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

By: [Signature] Date: 10/30/07

Patricia Bescoby Bartscher
University Counsel
Changes to Halprin’s Landmark Freeway Park in Seattle

Originally designed by Lawrence Halprin and Associates, the plantings at Seattle’s Freeway Park are currently being updated by Seattle landscape architect and University of Washington professor Iain Robertson, who aims to “not change the character of the park, but to recharge the design.” Executed by Mr. Halprin’s office under the design direction of Angela Danadjieva, Freeway Park is one of the best preserved masterworks of post-war landscape architecture, yet the horticultural requirements of the plants necessitate renewed attention to the original design intent. However, its fate may also be a bellwether for the future of modernist architecture, landscapes and engineering feats associated with the interstate highway system across the country.

After the publication of Halprin’s book Freeways in 1966 and his work with the Federal Highway Administration’s Urban Advisors group, the Seattle Parks Commission sought his assistance in designing a park along the edge of the new interstate gorge. Rather than confining himself to the proposed plot of land, Halprin pushed the ideas in his book into the cityscape by proposing an extensive landscape that scaled down the impact of the freeway for both driver and pedestrian by building right over it. Rather than balking at this audacious plan, the city bundled the proposal into the county-wide open space bond measure...
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Welcome and Happy New Year. Continuing with our recent initiative for theme-based newsletters, this winter issue looks at modern plazas and landscapes. Many of these were created in the context of urban renewal projects in the postwar era as an integral part of the design of housing, civic, office or cultural institutions or simply as stand alone features. Many of these spaces and places have not been maintained and have fallen into disrepair or have been abandoned in their entirety, serving as symbols of urban blight and failed design principles or social views. In recent years, so much has changed and so many alterations have been made to what are important designs and represent work by significant designers of the period that we believe it is important to dedicate a newsletter to this issue. We want to highlight the significance of these landscapes and advocate for their preservation in a meaningful and appreciative way. Too many of these landscapes or spaces have become the victim of unnecessary and insensitive changes, or have been obliterated altogether because of poor or inappropriate maintenance or misbegotten ideas about safety or use.

2007 saw the continued growth of DOCOMOMO US with the addition of Florida as a US chapter and entry of New Orleans and North Carolina for approval. The end of 2007 had its usual array of building preservation challenges. While the emblematic Encounter restaurant at LAX airport was reopened, the Morris A. Mechanic Theater in Baltimore was nominated for designation and the Brutalist Third Church of Christ, Scientist in Washington D.C. was designated. Many others remain uncertain: the fate of Albert Ledner’s O’Toole building in New York City is tied to the expansion plans of St. Vincent’s hospital, and the future of such corporate campuses as Eero Saarinen’s Bell Labs in Holmdel, New Jersey, remains unresolved.

Urban Renewal Renewed: A Makeover for Baltimore’s Center Plaza

In the heart of Baltimore, 1960s-style urban renewal has received a facelift with the completion in October 2007 of a $7.5 million renovation of Center Plaza, the urban plaza at the core of downtown’s complex of office, retail and residential buildings known as Charles Center. In 2002, a national competition was held for the re-design of the unpopular and rundown Center Plaza, originally designed by the Baltimore firm of Rogers, Taliaferro, Kostritsky & Lamb as the focal point of Baltimore’s first urban renewal project and inspired by the great urban plazas of the Italian Renaissance. The local architecture and design firm of Brown & Craig won the competition with their design of extensive greenscaping, a reflecting pool, movable seating and dynamic lighting effects. Brown & Craig had collaborated with Daniel Biederman, the talent behind the successful revitalization of New York City’s Bryant Park in the early 1990s; however, it is too early to tell whether the team’s design will foster the desired transformation of Center Plaza into a hip and inviting urban space.

As originally designed, Charles Center’s open spaces reflected the principles and ideals of the urban renewal movement that swept through American cities beginning in the 1950s, forever transforming the urban landscape. As consulting architects to the Charles Center urban renewal project, which was launched by a public-private partnership in 1957, RTKL’s goal was to make the plazas and open space a “social center for 24-hour citizens of Baltimore.” The 1958 Charles Center promotional report gushed that “Here, open space will be used, loved and economically successful because it will be full of pleasant things: fountains, sculpture, flowers, umbrellas, flags and trees. The open space will be, in its own way, as concentrated as the city around it.”

George Kostritsky of RTKL envisioned an urban landscape along the themes of light, sculpture, and water, for Charles, Center and Hopkins plazas, respectively. The three plazas, located on the interior of the two superblocks comprising the Charles Center urban renewal site, were to be linked through a series of elevated walkways, escalators and skywalks in order to overcome the problem of the site’s steep topography (a 68-foot drop in grade from the northern boundary of the site to the southern boundary) and in order to create a series of “pedestrian islands.” Though futuristic in appearance, this circulation system was a typical component of urban design of the 1950s and 60s and was often promoted as a means of separating pedestrians from the escalating nuisance of auto traffic and congestion. In the case of Charles Center, the exterior circulation system was also intended to provide a venue for extensive retail activity.

Although the Charles Center plan had all the right ingredients for successful place-making, its physical realization made plain many of the shortcomings of modern urban design principles. In the words of Charles Center’s chief urban planner himself, David Wallace, the skywalks at Charles Center were “circuital and hard to find,” and retail was consistently “lackluster.” City government did not end up retaining ownership of the entire system of open spaces and exterior infrastructure (only the three plazas), and so treatment of its various sections—in terms of services, amenities, ambiance and maintenance—was left up to individual building owners and retail tenants. The first skywalks were dismantled in the 1980s, and by the 1990s only two remained.

The introverted nature of the Charles Center plaza was a built-in handicap and prevented the lively, populous atmosphere envisioned by planners. Placement of the two major plazas, Center and Hopkins Plazas, on the interior of the superblocks meant that they were virtually invisible from the street. Fixed seating, copious hardscaping, and insufficient greenery all contributed to the plazas’ underuse. As early as 1962, a member of Baltimore’s Planning Council predicted that the majority of plaza users would be office tenants on their lunch break, and that a mere quarter would be the visitors, shoppers and tourists envisioned. A distinct obstacle to the plazas’ popularity stemmed not from design, but perhaps from the absence of integrated planning:

cont’d on pg. 12
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This year, 2008, the Xth International DOCOMOMO conference will take place in the Netherlands where almost twenty years ago DOCOMOMO was formed. The theme of the conference is “The Challenge of Change”, and the conference will mostly take place in Rotterdam in the restored Van Nelle Factory, reinvigorated as a ‘design factory’. The theme reflects the need for DOCOMOMO International and its members to revisit and reassess the role and goals of the organization.

In more practical terms, we continue to use our website to update you with news on DOCOMOMO events and activities as well as our advocacy efforts. Links to the websites of our chapters where most regional news is reported are also provided. Finally, we have upgraded the site to allow for the on-line payment through PayPal of dues and the purchase of past journals and DOCOMOMO publications.

— Theodore Prudon
President, DOCOMOMO US

Boston City Hall Plaza:
A Modern Space for the City Upon a Hill

Hailed by critic Ada Louise Huxtable as “one of the best urban spaces of the 20th century,” Boston’s often reviled City Hall Plaza faces an uncertain fate. Designed by Kallmann, McKinnell and Wood between 1962 and 1968, the last concerted effort to improve this centerpiece of “the New Boston” fell victim to post-9/11 inter-governmental disputes. In 2006, Mayor Tom Menino announced his intention to sell both the plaza and building to the highest bidder. Over recent months, the monumental City Hall itself has received wide spread support. The Boston Landmarks Commission voted to accept a petition for study (although landmarking is subject to mayoral veto), and a Determination of Eligibility by the far sighted Massachusetts Historical Commission surfaced. In 1991 MHC had determined that City Hall is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, and had commented that “the plaza is a significant component of the building.”

City Hall Plaza is the latest transformation of the slopes of Boston’s colonial city; the succeeding two centuries leveled the hills and filled the coves to form the Boston we know today, including the Plaza’s setting. On the Plaza’s west, tremendous earth-moving shaved 65 feet off a four-acre mount for Pemberton Square, and nearly as much from Beacon Hill just beyond. To the east, Faneuil Hall and Quincy Market were developed on harbor fill in two separate endeavors eight decades apart. Such extraordinary reshaping of the terrain suggests the challenge—and the precedent—for those in the 20th century who planned the new center for the “City Upon a Hill.”

Although it is only a small piece of the 56-acre Government Center, the 9-1/2-acre plaza occupies the key location, identified in Kevin Lynch’s The Image of the City (1960): “Potentially it [the city hall site, historically Scollay Square] could play an even more striking visual role as the central point of the old head of the Boston peninsula, the hub of a whole series of districts…the node of such important paths as Tremont, Cambridge, Court-State, and Sudbury Streets…” The prescriptions for the government center design competition, established by I.M. Pei and Partners’ 1960 master plan, retained these roads and opened unexpected views to major landmarks: Faneuil Hall, Quincy Market, Old North Church and the Old State House.

Pei’s plaza site essentially excised this fragment of the historic city, defined by existing or rebuilt roads and structures and by thin new buildings along two edges. A half-dozen blocks of solid “ground” became an open “figure,” to use the urban design parlance most often applied to

The building was constructed using mainly poured-in-place and precast Portland cement. Boston City Hall, Boston, MA. (photo: Chris Brazee)

View across the plaza at night. Boston City Hall, Boston, MA. (photo: Chris Brazee)

Detail view of the building’s sculptural volume. Boston City Hall, Boston, MA. (photo: Chris Brazee)

Noli’s famous map of Rome. But where the prototypical figural space on that map, the Piazza Navona, recalls the ancient “outdoor room” maintained by the surrounding urban “poche,” in Boston the new Plaza’s boundaries reflect the arbitrariness of the historic urban layout. The north edge spays outward as the former Hanover and Sudbury Streets did; its west side bulges inward in front of the hill; and the 19th-century row to the south sweeps away along old Cornhill Street’s path. The resulting space has a non-sheltering, centrifugal character, opening at its corners. KMW “bulked-up” the new City Hall in order to hold down this space more effectively.

In response to the sloping hillside site, KMW crafted a huge warping terrace of brick. High at Cambridge Street and at both sides, it cascades down 20 feet around the building to Congress Street, stopping partway down for an amphitheater and stage on the north. The Plaza rolls right into and through City Hall, where it wraps down one level and up another, as a transposed, symbolic hill for the city. From Dock Square below, one sees the new City Hall astride this three-tiered mound.

cont’d on pg. 10
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NEW YORK/TRI-STATE

DOCOMOMO New York/Tri-State is part of a working coalition including Preservation New Jersey, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, DOCOMOMO US, the Recent Past Preservation Network, the Cultural Landscape Foundation, and AIA-New Jersey that is currently exploring ways to preserve Eero Saarinen’s 2,000,000 sq. ft. Bell Laboratories on a 472-acre site in Holmdel, NJ. The groups also aim to assist with a direction for the sites future preservation and reuse. The coalition sponsored a talk about Saarinen’s career on October 30th in Holmdel, NJ by Donald Albrecht, co-curator of the traveling exhibition “Eero Saarinen: Shaping the Future.”

—Kathleen Randall

New York/Tri-State Chapter Spotlights the O'Toole Building and its Architect, Albert Ledner

In February 2007, New York/Tri-State chapter members learned that St. Vincent Catholic Medical Centers planned to demolish the O’Toole Building, located on 7th Avenue between 12th and 13th Streets in Manhattan. Originally the Joseph Curran Building, the five-story structure was designed

complex intervention that has become a standard of reference for the transformation of post-industrial landscapes elsewhere, has been achieved in the Ruhr area, located in North Rhine-Westphalia. This has been Europe’s heart of industrialization. Remains of the period are the large population (the region, with 18 million people has the highest population density of all Germany) and a totally artificially transformed landscape.

During the middle of the 20th century as the industrial boom stopped, many heavy industries (predominantly coal and steel) moved away, leaving abandoned industrial plants and a large number of post-industrial sites, including many brownfields. In 1989 the regional government of North Rhine-Westphalia started an integrated development strategy for the former industrial region. The major goal was the creation of a new “regional park” with a length of seventy kilometers along the Emscher River. More than 150 years of industrialization have left their mark on the region: mines, coking plants and winding towers are the impressive relics of the past industrial era.

The range of different arrangements has been broad, combining commercial with recreational spaces, as well as providing educational facilities and sites for urban forestry and urban agriculture that will aid in creating a more sustainable and functional future landscape. All of the new functions are based on the deliberate incorporation of the industrial heritage into the new landscape. The industrial plants remain as landmarks and architectural witnesses narrating the history of the region.

One of the fully completed sections of the new preserved landscape is the Landschaftspark in North Duisburg (1993-2001), designed by Peter Latz. An outstanding example of a park area shaped by its industrial history, the heart of the park is the decommissioned Thyssen Steelworks, converted into a site of industrial heritage and a venue for different leisure facilities. Based on the idea of calling for empirical solutions, Latz has interpreted the parks design. The industrial plants remain as landmarks and architectural witnesses narrating the history of the region.

One of the fully completed sections of the new preserved landscape is the Landschaftspark in North Duisburg (1993-2001), designed by Peter Latz. An outstanding example of a park area shaped by its industrial history, the heart of the park is the decommissioned Thyssen Steelworks, converted into a site of industrial heritage and a venue for different leisure facilities. Based on the idea of calling for empirical solutions, Latz has interpreted the parts of the huge steel structures as bearer of a spontaneous naturalization process. A new landscape has emerged; the park is the manifesto of the re-appropriation of the obsolete industrial features by nature. A botanical garden, where plants suitable to grow among the ruins of steel industries are cultivated, represents a space for discovery and play at the same time.

Equally successful has been the preservation of the Zollverein coalmine industrial complex in the vicinity of Essen, where the main structure is Shaft XII, a technical and architectural masterpiece designed by the architects Fritz Schupp and Martin Kremmer and built in 1932. The design of the plant is based on pure modern aesthetics, with clear lines, reduced forms and an impressive symmetry.
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Parkmerced, a Modern Landscape Masterpiece Under Assault

A 191-acre, 2,500-unit apartment development situated in the southwestern part of San Francisco, adjacent to the campus of San Francisco State University, Parkmerced is close enough to the Pacific Ocean that it is continually under assault from wind and foggy weather. Unfortunately, current plans by the new owner, Parkmerced Investors, LLP, and the University, are creating an assault that threatens to sweep the development off the map. With its Thomas Church landscape, Parkmerced is one of the most significant modern sites in San Francisco and its loss would be a defeat for the city’s modern heritage.

Because St. Vincent’s redevelopment plan—a joint project with the Rudin Management Company—is located in the Greenwich Village Historic District, it will need to be reviewed by the Landmarks Preservation Commission, who will determine its appropriateness. The hospital filed its application in December 2007, while New York/Tri-State is continuing its outreach and preparing formal testimony for the numerous hearings that will attend the St. Vincent/Rudin plan.

—Kathleen Randall

Parkmerced, San Francisco, CA. (Photo courtesy of San Francisco History Center, San Francisco Public Library)

Thomas Church, considered the father of modern landscape architecture in the United States, exerted an especially strong influence over the look of residential landscape architecture in the post-war years. A figure with an international reputation, his ideas for livable, low-maintenance garden design were published in popular magazines and he worked closely with the leading Bay Region architects of his day, William Wurster, Gardner Dailey, John Funk, and others whose regional modern style was characterized by a seamless integration between building and landscape. During the course of his prolific career, Church designed over 1,000 individual landscape projects. Most of these are private gardens and are off-limits to the public, such as the often-photographed Donnell Pool and Garden in Sonoma, California.

Parkmerced, designed by Leonard Schultz Associates, a New York City architect, was developed by Metropolitan Life Insurance Company starting in 1941 as part of a nationwide venture into real estate development. Three similarly scaled developments were built by MetLife at about the same time: Park Labrea in Los Angeles, Parkchester in the Bronx, New York, and Parkfairfax in Alexandria, Virginia. All four planned communities are predominantly low-rise apartments situated on significant amounts of landscaped open space. Parkfairfax is listed on the National Register in recognition of its role in the Post-War housing effort as an early planned community.

At Parkmerced, Schultz laid out a “Garden City” style radiating site plan with interconnected courtyards, parking courts and service courts, and engaged Church to create designs for the 75 unique internal courtyards and landscape throughout the complex. This was Church’s first large-scale commission and allowed him to put into practice his fundamental concepts for residential landscape design. Each courtyard is different, responding to its particular topography and solar conditions, and each provides semi-private terraces adjoining the apartments living rooms, a shared lawn area, sidewalks, and a limited, wind-tolerant plant palette. Curving walks and biomorphic shapes define the central lawns, while raised planters, wide steps, and low-maintenance planting groups give each courtyard its modern feeling. For students of Thomas Church, walking through the interconnected courtyards of Parkmerced provides a primer on the Church residential landscape, offering a rare opportunity to experience firsthand the work of one of the country’s founding modernist landscape architects.

In the last few years, San Francisco State University has purchased several blocks of Parkmerced while releasing a plan to replace at least five of these blocks with new student housing. In addition, the current owner of the remainder of Parkmerced has hired the San Francisco office of Skidmore Owings and Merrill to develop a new master plan. Initial concept drawings shown at a recent public meeting indicate that Parkmerced would be demolished in its entirety and replaced with a completely different grid pattern and higher density housing, while commercial uses would be added along its major green spaces. Local preservation organizations, including the Northern California Chapter of DOCOMOMO US and the Western Regional Office of the National Trust for Historic Preservation are concerned about both initiatives. A joint site tour was conducted on November 2, 2007, which included representatives of the California Preservation Foundation, San Francisco Heritage, and the San Francisco Planning Department, as well as the Parkmerced tenants’ advocacy group.

Understanding the importance of Parkmerced, these organizations are wide awake and looking closely at ways to preserve Parkmerced for the future.

—Chandler McCoy
The Temporality of Being: Conservation Through Subtraction

Henry Klumb bought the 5-acre Cody Ranch in Puerto Rico in October 1947, where it had served as a pineapple, cucumber and citrus-growing farm to the previous owners. Of the ranch’s five original structures, Klumb retained only the large wooden house and garden. Built around 1906, the house was a typical hacienda design: a raised cottage with a large corrugated-metal hipped roof and a wrap-around porch. Klumb’s remodeling of the house, even though its original character was preserved, served as a laboratory for radical tropical solutions that he later used in many of his buildings and manifested his idea that “Man’s work that disregards the existence of nature, and ignores man as the measure has no true meaning, no significance of being.”

The remodeling of the house and garden represented this “significance of being” as for Klumb, being is intrinsically encumbered in nature. It was not surprising, then, that when remodeling the hacienda house the surrounding garden was used as the defining structure of what Klumb considered to be his private space. Opening up the main facade in order to make the most out of living in a garden, he allowed the inside to become the outside, eradicating the hard vertical surfaces by adding arco palmas surrounding the wrap-around porch for a fluid, yet sure protection from rain and wind. Therefore, the elimination of walls allowed for a restructuring of the public areas so that three sides were opened toward the garden. On the other hand, the private rooms, such as his studio and bedrooms, were opened through the use of glass jalousie windows that pivot as doors, allowing for a framed and controlled view of the exterior.

As recycling was one of Klumb’s main intentions in this project, the reutilization of the original shuttered doors can be seen in their conversion to privacy screens. Also recycled were the original garden and farm area transformed into a protective envelope for living. Klumb continuously transformed the garden. He added exotic and rare trees, such as the polygala cowelii—commonly known as the violet tree—almost extinct in Puerto Rico. The garden was also sculpted by the planting of fruit trees that grew into enormous umbrellas and by subtracting existing vegetation which created open lawns or “skylights” that allowed sunshine to penetrate the otherwise dense vegetation. Sunlight became an obsession and Klumb’s design contemplated a structured movement from sun to shade. His wall-less dining room opened to the veranda and to the rear garden. A pivoting table—the room’s centerpiece—was designed to capture the early morning sun, the shade for a noon lunch, or the feeble dusk light for a late dinner.

The construction of a kidney-shaped pond framed by two caimito trees, in front of the main stairs to the house offered a secondary living space within nature: light and ephemeral, this allowed him to view his house from within nature, and inextricably linked the two, making house and garden one. Therefore, Klumb’s house, albeit a romanticized version of life in the tropics, represents an intimate relationship between interior and exterior space that far outdid the Modern Movement’s understanding of architecture as an object in space. In remodeling the Cody Ranch and its gardens, Klumb made space and object inseparable. Moreover, he made one a reflection of the other, each serving to highlight the beauty of its counterpart. Being-in-the-world had for Heidegger both temporal and spatial qualities and Klumb agreed that in that sense, being made reference to a nearness rather than a remoteness. Contrary to many of his contemporaries, Klumb’s vision of space began from the outside-in and not from the inside-out. This reversal of thought evidenced his preference for the natural over the built form, as living in nature was for Klumb a consciously structured process intrinsic to the making of architecture.

— Nadya K. Nenadich & Enrique Vivoni-Farage
Boston’s Christian Science Center

In 1964, the First Church of Christ Scientist presented architects I.M. Pei and Araldo Cossutta with the challenge of providing space, amenity and an intangible presence for the expansion of their Mother Church complex, which had occupied a part of this same site since 1898. With the incipient completion of the adjacent Prudential Center complex, a commercial development that featured a 52-story tower and several apartment slab blocks set off from the street on a large raised plaza, the “High Spine” development concept promulgated by planner Kevin Lynch and the Boston Society of Architects seemed to be taking off. The Prudential was to be the first of a series of skyscrapers that would stretch along Boylston and Huntington Streets, defining Boston’s skyline. It became apparent to Pei and Cossutta that the dome of the 1908 Mother Church would no longer be a commanding presence on the Boston skyline. They responded by persuading the Church to do something out of the financial reach of a commercial developer. They would “command the ground plane” and construct the great plaza around which the new Christian Science Center evolved.

This great gesture was described by Cossutta as the “heart and soul” of the project. The quiet, dignified but unabashedly monumental urban complex of the Christian Science Center (CSC) stretches from Copley Square to Symphony Hall. Featuring a long reflecting pool at the center of the space and a planted terrace to the south, it creates a cohesive and dignified identity for the Christian Science Church, mitigates the insensitive urban boundary of the Prudential Center, and knits together older monumental structures such as the Christian Science Mother Church and Publishing House, and the adjacent Horticultural Hall. Through these moves, the CSC establishes a strong sense of place at the intricate complex urban juncture of the Fenway, Back Bay and South End. The buildings themselves are composed in a classic modernist dynamic asymmetry, with the strong vertical slab of the Administration Tower (the Center’s own small contribution to the High Spine) serving as a counterpoint to the Library or Colonnade, inspired by LeCorbusier’s

High Court at Chandigarh, that defines the north side of the plaza. At the southwest corner, the sweeping curve of the Sunday School redirects the thrust of the space of the reflecting pool out into the reconfigured forecourt of the Mother Church as it is presented to the open space along Massachusetts Avenue. There, it is firmly bounded by the long slab of the Church Park Apartments, designed by The Architects Collaborative (TAC), which were also a component of the original Master Plan.

The CSC is one of the most striking and successful modernist urban complexes in the world. As the Church embarks on a new master plan for the adaptive use of some of the buildings and the development of the Plaza, it will be imperative that the character and dignity of this complex be properly maintained. The Church is well aware of the unique quality of this heritage and has come out in supporting the proposed landmark designation of the complex. Still, it will be important that the City of Boston, advocacy organizations like DOCOMOMO, and everyone concerned with the future of one of Boston’s most distinguished works of mid-twentieth century urbanism be alert to the unique and delicate qualities of this ensemble. With vigilance we can ensure it that it will remain a its future as a great urban complex and a link to the best of Boston’s modernist heritage.

— David Fixler, AIA
One of William Pereira’s most iconic buildings on the campus of the University of California, Irvine, Steinhaus Hall, is poised to receive a disfiguring facelift that will replace its sculptural concrete sunshades with a bland aluminum curtainwall.

Constructed in 1963 by William Pereira & Associates as part of a larger complex of buildings, Steinhaus was originally designed in 1961 as part of the architects’ master plan. Known for his sculptural brutalist work in concrete, Pereira is most famous for the design of the Los Angeles International Airport with its “Theme” building control tower, and the pyramidal high rise for the Transamerica Corporation in San Francisco.

Steinhaus Hall, along with the other Pereira designs at UC Irvine, created a signature look for the campus with volumetric buildings lifted off the ground on pilotis, open pavilions marking the topmost floor, and the organic quality of precast concrete sunshades that cast strong shadows in the hot southern California sun. These signature Pereira elements are all present at Steinhaus Hall.

Working extensively with experimental technologies, William Pereira strove to achieve the thinnest concrete possible in order to give a sharply defined shape to his buildings’ façades. However, Steinhaus Hall’s pre-cast concrete technology is approaching the end of its serviceable life with the sunshades exhibiting signs of deterioration. The University is currently starting design work on a major exterior renovation, including plans to remove the sunshades from the building’s middle three stories, while maintaining the sculptural concrete elements at the lowest and uppermost floors of the buildings. The possibility of repairing, restoring in kind, or replacing the sunshades with a compatible and sympathetic replacement shade has been rejected and the University’s current plan is to completely strip the precast sunshades and replace them with an aluminum curtain wall with exterior metal louvers. The resulting design will remove the building’s strongest character-defining features, and futilely mix the new façade with the few original elements that will remain.

Unfortunately, although the Pereira buildings successfully create a strong visual style on the campus, the modification of Steinhaus Hall is likely to be the first of many renovations to the Pereira buildings. This will result in the loss of the best features on a campus not otherwise known for significant architecture.

— Deirdre Gould

Chapter News

Designed by Clarence Mayhew
In 1964, a well-regarded Bay Area architect, the swoopy roofline of the Manning’s Cafeteria Building in Seattle’s Ballard neighborhood stands as one of the last surviving examples of Googie style restaurants in the city. Threatened with demolition in 1983 after Manning’s closed, the community galvanized and saved the building and it reopened as a Denny’s. The building currently faces the wrecking ball again with plans for an eight-story retail/condo development.

As part of the Master Use Permit process the project’s proponents submitted a landmark nomination for review and consideration by the Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board. At its January 2, 2008 hearing, the Board voted 8 to 1 to nominate the Manning’s Cafeteria Building. The Board heard public comments supporting the nomination and received numerous letters of support prior to the meeting. The Seattle Landmarks Preservation Board will next consider the building for designation as a landmark at its February 6, 2008 hearing. DOCOMOMO WEWA will continue working with a group of active citizens, Ballard residents, architects, and preservationists to save the Manning’s Cafeteria Building and promote consideration of the potential for re-use and rehabilitation.

— Andrew Phillips

NEW ENGLAND

DOCOMOMO NE continues its advocacy efforts for Boston City Hall, cooperating with the Preservation Alliance who are presenting on The Government Center’s history and its preservation issues at the Traditional Building (Renovation/Restoration) conference in Boston in March. The chapter also continues to keep a watchful eye on Paul Rudolph’s former Blue Cross Blue Shield building, now 133 Federal Street, which is slated for demolition to make way for a 1,000 ft. tower.

— Hélène Lipstadt

UC Irvine Strips Off Pereira Façades

Detail of the building’s signature elements—pilotis and concrete sunshades.
Steinhaus Hall, UC Irvine, Irvine, CA.
(photo: DOCOMOMO NOCA)

Detail of the shadows created by the precast sunshades.
Steinhaus Hall, UC Irvine, Irvine, CA.
(photo: DOCOMOMO NOCA)

Detail of sculptural concrete sunshades on Steinhaus Hall, University of California at Irvine. Steinhaus Hall, UC Irvine, Irvine, CA.
(photo: DOCOMOMO NOCA)
Louisiana Supreme Court Building Faces Demolition

The Louisiana Supreme Court Building (currently the State Office Building Annex) in New Orleans, LA—part of the Duncan Plaza Civic Complex—is facing imminent demolition to make way for new construction. The State Office Building and the Annex in question, integral components to the mid-century Civic Complex tout ensemble, are being razed to make way for a single new building of approximately 342,000 sf. The Annex, noted as having elegant, “expensive” finishes and stylized elements, is sheathed in granite panels and placed as a jewel box in the Duncan Plaza plan, which is surrounded by City Hall, the State Office Building and the New Orleans Public Library. The building itself is an architecturally significant example of Modern Movement design as well as a major component of the Duncan Plaza Civic Complex master plan, which at the time of construction was envisioned as the architectural embodiment of New Orleans as a city looking towards a more open and efficient government. It is one of the most important post-WWII initiatives in New Orleans, garnering participation from all of the pre-eminent New Orleans architects and civic leaders of the time in its development.

While some say that the LA Supreme Court Building, along with the adjacent State Office Building, suffered damage from Hurricane Katrina that makes its unfeasible to restore, the main problems cited are basement flooding and damage to the mechanical and electrical systems that service both buildings. The applicant for the building’s demolition stated that retrofitting the building for other uses was found to be “difficult” and that they did not feel that it would be possible to “move back and look at alternatives to demolition.” An architect has already been selected for the new construction.

FEMA, along with the SHPO, has determined that the LA Supreme Court Building is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, and that its demolition “has the potential to affect historic buildings located in the area.” New Orleans is a city with a limited roster of Modernist buildings and the Supreme Court building an important part of the city’s historic fabric, and while it is essential to rebuild and improve the city after Hurricane Katrina, more consideration should be given to rehabilitation when major historically significant built fabric is threatened with irreversible decisions such as demolition.

—Toni DiMaggio

Announcements

WINTER SHOWS AND EXHIBITS

Marcel Breuer:
Design and Architecture
National Building Museum
Washington, D.C.
November 3, 2007 to February 17, 2008

1973: Sorry, Out of Gas
Canadian Centre for Architecture
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
November 7, 2007 to April 20, 2008

Eero Saarinen:
Shaping the Future
Cranbrook Art Museum
Bloomfield Hills, MI
November 17, 2007 to March 30, 2008

Minneapolis Institute of Arts
Minneapolis, MN
September 14, 2007 to January 4, 2009

Cold War:
Modern Art & Design in a Divided World, 1945-1975
Victoria & Albert Museum
London, United Kingdom
September 4, 2007 to January 4, 2009

SAVE Riverview Competition
SAF—The Sarasota Architectural Foundation
Sarasota, FL
Now to March 31, 2008
Rehabilitation of Bunshaft Designed LBJ Library in Austin

The 2007 rehabilitation of the University of Texas-Austin’s Lyndon Baines Johnson Library designed by Gordon Bunshaft aims to balance conservation with material replacement and new landscape design. Completed in 1971, the library’s travertine and terrazzo base has been plagued with material and design performance issues that began shortly after construction. Moisture penetration due to the porous stone and thin building envelope was exacerbated by the intense sun exposure in Austin, which regularly heats the stone to temperatures above 140 degrees. The heavy loads on the plaza also contributed to systematic structural failure which caused the interior spaces of the base to close.

Overland Partners’ rehabilitation includes the completed restoration of the tower and ongoing plaza renovations. The tower’s travertine required cleaning due to staining from the failure of the sealants, crack repairs, and armature replacement. The stone panels were in good condition overall and only a handful were replaced in kind.

In conjunction with the rehabilitation of the interior spaces of the base, the plaza is being removed to install new waterproofing and larger drains and to reslope the surface. The proposal has evolved over the last two years from the intrusive introduction of an amphitheater to a design by Hargreaves Associates that replaces the three reflecting pools on the east side of the library with small knolls of native plants and trees. All of the original travertine and green terrazzo pavers will be replaced with granite pavers approved by the Texas Historical Commission. Preservationists in Austin note this as a compromise that generally retains the integrity of the original design despite the loss of original material and the single plane of the plaza. The project is scheduled for completion in the summer of 2008 in time to commemorate the legacy of Lady Bird Johnson as well as the centennial anniversary of former President Johnson’s birth.

— Catherine Gavin

Boston City Hall Plaza (cont’d from page 3)

The Plaza is at its best hosting ice cream and chowder fests, political protests, concerts and sports celebrations. It accommodates tens of thousands, drawn from throughout the region for gatherings that number among the country’s most memorable urban events.

It is at the everyday level that the Plaza falls short. Critics observe its inadequate response to the climate, the absence of mid-scale structures and spaces, too little nature, and an overall lack of activity. While design improvements can address such faults, city and federal policies must be supportive and coordinated, which has not always been the case. For instance, KMW’s proposed rathskeller was rejected. The subway station was kept in a distant corner. Commercial vendors were banned; a new hotel, nixed. The recessed fountain was shut off, then covered over. Maintenance has been insufficiently funded. A City Hall designed to welcome the public is now barricaded for security.

Nevertheless, with improvements such as those proposed by the Trust for City Hall Plaza, the Plaza could find continued validity as a great modern space. It opened a crowded, once failing city with a powerful new symbolic center. It became a grand civic forum. It exposes vistas in a city that was characterized by a lack of visible connections. And it symbolically re-creates Boston’s defining topographic feature, the hillsides that greeted the first settlers and became the raw material forming the “City Upon a Hill.”

— Gary Wolf
called Forward Thrust, and in 1969 approved local funds were combined with state, federal and private monies to allow the park plan to move forward.

Perched above Interstate 5 in downtown Seattle and using 5.5 acres of interstate air rights, the linked spaces of the park evocatively and imaginatively engage the three major preoccupations of post-war landscape design as described by Elizabeth K. Meyer: the car, the garden and the growing awareness of ecology. The space is defined by a series of linked plazas that are intertwined and enclosed by rough, board-formed concrete planting containers and walls. Major spaces known as the Central Plaza, East Plaza, and West Plaza develop a consistency and cohesion through a shared materials palette of concrete, broadleaf evergreen plantings and site furnishings. The spaces are differentiated through the dynamism of the water features that occupy the spaces and the attendant differentiation of moods.

A rolling precipice of water dominates the Central Plaza, where 28,000 gallons per minute of water tumble over 30-foot tall formed concrete blocks. The effect is at once rugged and decidedly urban, creating a space that is consciously of the city yet inspired by the lithography of the Cascade and Olympic Mountains. By placing the water feature over the freeway, the "natural" cascade was able to drown out-or at least mitigate-the roaring sound of the artificial, automotive canyon below.

Like an idyllic mountain stream, the fountain was filled with children and parents when it opened on July 4, 1976 as part of Seattle's bicentennial celebrations. Though there were no guardrails protecting visitors from the water, the design intent heightens an explicit sense of danger so that people are confronted by risk, prima facie and are therefore cautious. This place is not soft, safe or "feminine." Perhaps nowhere is this more apparent than near the base of the canyon where a heavy-gauge glass window allows visitors to see cars driving by, creating a dynamic visual dialogue between nature (water) and the city (the cars of the freeway).

The framework for these original elements still exists, but the experience of the canyon today is significantly degraded. A steel screen now covers the canyon's window, obscuring the connection to the freeway, and the falls themselves are tragically underserved. While there were three pumps that originally fed water to the canyon (using two at a time, cycling through the third), today only two pumps remain, with only one pumping water at a time. The capacity of this one pump has since been reduced by 30 percent such that the 28,000 gallons per minute of the original design is now reduced to a relative trickle near 9,500 gallons per minute when running. Most of the time, however, the canyon water feature is not even active. Again, due to increased safety standards and reduced maintenance budgets, parks officials are not easily able to access all of the basins and traps within the fountain to clean out debris before starting the pumps.

Throughout the park, the role of vegetation is not limited to aesthetic or architectonic purposes, rather plants were also chosen for their ability to reduce pollution and baffle sound coming from the freeway below. As in Halprin's open space sequence at Lovejoy and Ira Keller fountains in Portland, the original planting plans reveal a placement strategy that develops an analog to the larger landscape surrounding Seattle. Lower levels are heavy with azaleas and birch; higher levels are dominated by dogwood and other upland tree species. Although the park appeared sparsely planted at its onset, the vegetation has grown dense and has required limbing up for maintenance and security reasons. Despite its overall integrity, the park has also seen the continual, creeping erosion of other original design elements. The jagged paving pattern has been filled in with small, inconsistent concrete pads that have been poured to dissuade large gatherings of transients. Many of the original lighting elements have been replaced with smaller standards. Entire planter boxes have been denuded of vegetation due to drainage problems in some of the beds. Other plantings have been replaced with species that tried, with varying success, to echo the spirit of the original design, including witch hazel, ornamental raspberry and snowbell.

Other additions have occurred with the construction of the Washington State Convention Center and the intrusion of the Lester Piggott Memorial Corridor. Though the Convention Center's formal vocabularies and plantings echo the original palette of Freeway Park—which is not surprising since they were primarily designed by Ms. Danadjieva—the Convention Center's landscape necessitated demolition of some of the walls and plantings of Halprin's original design.

In 2004, the City of Seattle allocated funds to conduct a study on how to revitalize Freeway Park. Working with the New York City-based Project for Public Spaces (PPS), the City of Seattle staff unveiled draft recommendations that included some strong programmatic recommendations, but that also recommended a significant reworking of the original Halprin plan. Of particular concern are plans for demolishing some of the concrete retaining walls, redesigning or removing at least two of the original fountains, and installing a series of exercise stations. Since that time, most of the radical proposals have been moved off of the table and a more modest and sensitive revitalization has occurred. Ms. Danadjieva was commissioned to re-design the original planting scheme, which is in obvious need of rehabilitation. However, the Seattle Parks Department found the plan unworkable and commissioned Mr. Robertson to provide
Changes to Halprin’s Freeway Park

(cont’d from previous page)

another vision for the park. Mr. Robertson understands the gravity of his position as a link between the past and future of the park, and it was his appreciation for this responsibility that sent him to Marin County in the early fall to speak with Mr. Halprin. In addition to speaking with Mr. Halprin, Mr. Robertson discussed his ideas with himself and two of Halprin’s previous collaborators and employees: Stephen Koch and Dai Williams. Together, the four men discussed the various design and horticultural constraints of the current state of Freeway Park. Mr. Halprin confirmed that the plants were subservient to the other elements of the design, like the water features in the foreground and the city in the background, and also talked about how the revised planting palette—including larch, pine, oak, maple, and hemlock—should be, as Robertson phrased it, “robust and masculine,” to reflect the original design intent.

While the future of Halprin and Danadjieva’s design legacy continues to improve with increased awareness of the import of this design and urban planning landmark, permanent protections remain elusive. A Seattle landmarks nomination submitted in 2005 continues to remain in limbo despite the desire of the Landmarks Preservation Board to formally embrace this unique legacy. The central sticking point is also what makes Freeway Park so unique. The Washington State Department of Transportation and the City of Seattle have been trying to establish who has jurisdiction over landmarking properties within the leased air rights over Interstate 5. With so many historic properties that are within the leased air rights over Interstate 5, several of the Charles Center office buildings offered subsidized cafeterias, thus keeping office workers inside for lunch. Ultimately, the sheer scale of Charles Center, the fact of separate building ownership, and the overall decline in downtown retail activity were major factors working against the visual and spatial cohesion of the entire site, and likely prevented the plazas from assuming the status of clearly defined destinations within the city, regardless of the aesthetic merit of their individual design schemes.

In many ways, the emphasis on movement and variety as a visual theme has stayed the same from the original design to the new one; it is perhaps only in the execution of this theme that Brown & Craig’s design seeks to differentiate itself from the original and announce Center Plaza as a 21st century urban destination. Bryce Turner of Brown & Craig describes Center Plaza’s intended transformation, saying that “As [designers] developed their version of plazas in the 1950s and 1960s, there was a ‘Jetsonian’ view that incorporated lots of hardscape. Now we have found it is important to have more soft spaces”. Their design incorporates the ten key principles that made Bryant Park a resounding success, most notably monumental sculpture as a focal point, movable seating and outdoor cafes, greenscaping (as opposed to hardscaping), and ambient nighttime lighting.

There is undoubtedly increased attention to the urban spaces of Charles Center, with the opening in 2001 of Johns Hopkins University’s Downtown Center at the southeast corner of the site, and with the imminent redevelopment of the 1967 Morris Mechanic Theater, located on Hopkins Plaza. With enough retail investment—an important prescription in Brown & Craig’s plan and the focus of the Mechanic’s redevelopment—Center Plaza will benefit from the most important ingredient of any public space: people.

—Brice Maryman

Portions of this article were previously published on The Cultural Landscape Foundation’s website written by Brice Maryman and Liz Birkholz.

Urban Renewal Renewed

(cont’d from page 2)

Landscapes of Industrial Archeology

(cont’d from page 4)

In 2001 UNESCO had inscribed the whole colliery and coking plant ensemble of Zollverein into the World Heritage List, because “it constitutes remarkable material evidence of the evolution and decline of the coal industry over the past 150 years.” The whole area has been converted into an anchor point along the European route of industrial heritage. The last completed conversion of an industrial plant is the transformation of the coal refinery building into a museum and visitors center, designed by the joint venture OMA/Heinrich Böll. The project was awarded the Deutscher Architekturpreis 2007.

After the German results of creative conversion of decommissioned plants, brownfields and mine sites in order to establish new post-industrial landscapes, similar experiments have found a certain diffusion all around Europe. One of the most amazing new proposals comes from France. In 2003, the Louvre announced a competition to create a regional branch of the museum in Lens (northern region of Pas de Calais), on a site of over twenty hectares that was a former mine yard. The decision to build the new museum in the former mine yard is highly symbolic for a region that has suffered much in the past, from both war and from intensive coal-mining followed by the closing of the last pit in 1986. The international architecture competition to design the future Musée du Louvre-Lens was launched in early 2005. The winning team was the Japanese architectural practice Sanaa (Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa), together with the American museum architects Celia Imrey and Tim Culbert, and the French landscape designer Catherine Mosbach. The design of the museum and the new public spaces that will be opened in 2010 consists of nine pavilions in glass and steel, partly set into the ground with roof glazing. The group of buildings blends in with the surrounding post-industrial environment, creating a totally new perspective for a future based on the binomial culture-open spaces, without losing sight of the glorious industrial heritage.

—Maristella Casciato

Hopkins Plaza after renovation, April 2007. Charles Center, Baltimore, MD. (photo: Olivia Klose)

Utilization of recreational space. Landschaftspark, North-Duisburg, Germany. (photo: Franco Panzini)
D.C.’s Only Brutalist Church Designated

In December, Washington D.C.'s Historic Preservation Office unanimously conferred landmark status on the Third Church of Christ Scientist at 16th and I Streets, NW, along with its accompanying Christian Science Reading Room and office tower. Completed in 1971, the church was designed by Araldo Cossutta of the firm I.M. Pei & Partners. The Third Church complex—a Brutalist ensemble in poured concrete comprising an octagonal sanctuary building and seven-story office tower facing each other across a brick plaza—had been embroiled in controversy as the church’s congregation fought the city’s landmark proposal.

Representatives of the church contended that the building no longer served the needs of the shrinking congregation because it is too large (at 400 seats) and the open plan makes group activities difficult. Maintenance costs have also been cited as burdensome, for example the claim made by opponents of the complex that changing a light bulb in the sanctuary requires the erection of scaffolding. The congregation had planned to demolish the sanctuary and plaza to make way for a smaller sanctuary building and some form of commercial property that could generate income for the congregation.

Preservationists and architects defended the complex as an example of I.M. Pei’s religious architecture and, more importantly, the only Brutalist church in the city. DOCOMOMO US strongly supported the designation as the complex is of exceptional historic significance and internationally recognized architectural merit. From a historical perspective (notwithstanding the relative youth of the complex), it is interesting to note that the Third Church of Christ Scientist chose to establish such a strong architectural and institutional presence in downtown D.C. during the early 1970s, an era of severe urban disinvestment.

As controversy over the proposed designation developed over the last few months, preservationists and architects defended the church as a stellar example of the city’s modern architecture. D.C.’s Historic Preservation Review Board has begun to pay more attention to the city’s modernist landmarks, including the recently designated Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial Library (Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, 1972) and the Watergate residential and retail complex (Luigi Moretti, Principal Architect; Coming, Moore, Elmore & Fischer, Associate Architects; Boris Timchenko, Landscape Architect 1964-1971) overlooking the Potomac and next door to the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (Edward Durrell Stone, completed 1971).

The Board wrote in its designation statement that the Third Church of Christ Scientist is “one of the best examples of Brutalism in the Washington area and one of the most important Modernist churches.” The Third Church of Christ Scientist is currently considering whether to challenge the landmark designation under the First Amendment.

—Olivia Klose

Saarinen Bell Labs Update

Thanks to the termination in November 2007 of the sales agreement between Preferred Real Estate Investments (PREI), a private developer, and Alcatel-Lucent, the present owner of Eero Saarinen’s Bell Laboratories complex (1959 to 1962, expanded 1966 and 1985) and its 472-acre site in Holmdel, New Jersey, this landmark in the history of modern architecture, landscape design and technology is no longer under immediate threat of development. PREI had announced several options for the Saarinen building, from total to partial demolition, of which all options projected the construction of expensive housing.

Bell Labs is an important early example of a corporate campus; the site of the first use of mirror glass, a material developed for the building; a historic modernist landscape designed by Sasaki Walker and Associates; and one of Saarinen’s masterworks. Holmdel was also home to many scientific innovations and technological inventions, from the creation of radio astronomy in 1932 to the invention of the transistor and the cell phone.

The importance of the threatened site was never in doubt, however, Bell Labs’ future preservation is not assured. A coalition consisting of DOCOMOMO US (represented by Hélène Lipstadt), its NY TriState chapter (represented by Nina Rappaport), the American Institute of Architect’s New Jersey Chapter, Preservation New Jersey, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Recent Past Preservation Network and the Cultural Landscape Foundation formed to work toward that goal and will therefore continue to advocate for the site. Among the many important recent events for which the Coalition or its members were responsible are the successful request for designation of the complex’s eligibility for the National Register of Historic Places, its listing as one of Preservation New Jersey’s 10 Endangered Historic Sites, the issuance of a support letter by the National Trust, and the organization of an extremely well attended lecture in Holmdel by Saarinen scholar and curator, Donald Albrecht. The Coalition is cooperating with Citizens for Informed Land Use, a non-partisan, not-for-profit organization that promotes informed and thoughtful land use decisions in Holmdel. CILU is working toward a reuse of the Bell Labs site that is appropriate not only for the site and the town, but also for the surrounding watershed.

The Coalition campaign will continue in the next months, with several significant events planned. Announcements of its efforts will appear on the DOCOMOMO US website, www.docomomo-us.org.

—Hélène Lipstadt

Modern Talk: Northwest Mid-Century Architects Oral History Project

DOCOMOMO WEWA is embarking on an ambitious oral history project that documents the work and lives of those who created a Northwest Regional Modern aesthetic in the mid-twentieth century. The architects who designed in the Modern vein in Western Washington state were on the cutting edge of architectural design during the 1950s. Many of them received national acclaim for designing some of the finest modern buildings in the country. During the height of the Modern Movement (1950s and 1960s), many of the designers were either beginning their careers or were at the apex of their profession. Some continued to practice well into the 1970s, 1980s, or 1990s.

We are thrilled to have the following architects participate in this project: Ralph Anderson, Fred Bassetti, Wendell Lovett, and Gene Zema. These men have left their mark on the Puget Sound region’s built environment. Their work and design philosophy have greatly influenced subsequent generations of architects.

Jack Straw Productions and architectural photographer John Starnes are important partners in this project. Audio interviews will be streamed onto our website. Photo essays of each architect will include a portrait and examples of their finest work. Project

cont’d on next page
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Modern Talk (cont’d from previous page)
products will be donated to the University of Washington Special Collections where they will be publicly accessible.

The project is funded by the generosity of individual and corporate donors and grants. DOCOMOMO WEWA is the recipient of a $5,000 Heritage Special Projects grant from 4Culture and a $4,000 Preservation Fund grant from the National Trust for Historic Preservation, Western Office.

— Eugenia Woo

Maintaining the Modern: Glass House
Window Replacement

On Wednesday November 7, the Philip Johnson Glass House saw the replacement of its last original glass panel. Damaged during a storm in October, a small vertical crack was found in the pane. At 1/4 inch thick, the original glass was thinner than the current and recently replaced glass panels. The replacement process, which lasted about five hours, was fully documented by the Glass House staff and hopefully will be useful to future conservation projects of this and other Modern Movement houses. The removed panel will be stored in the archives of the museum and is part of the museum’s mission to be a center of information for the conservation of modern architecture.

— Deirdre Gould

Protecting Beijing’s Modern Architecture

In December 2007, the Beijing Municipal Commission of Urban Planning and the Beijing Administration of Cultural Heritage released a joint list of structures that designated 188 sites in the city of Beijing as worthy of protection from demolition and inappropriate renovations. All the listed architectural structures were built from the 1950’s to the late 1970’s, and most are located in the city’s Haidian District. The designation guarantees a further level of protection for these structures as the city increases its urbanization and prepares for the 2008 Olympics. The designation also ensures that if they are renovated, their historical authenticity will be preserved.

— Deirdre Gould

Albert Ledner House Tour

Modern preservation activists in the New Orleans area were treated to a tour of Albert Ledner’s Galatoire House, guided by Ledner himself, as part of an ongoing series planned by the chapter of DOCOMOMO NOLA in formation. Located on Park Island, a small man-made island on Bayou St. John where two more Ledner residences are located, the Galatoire House blends a strong, elegant formal parti with Ledner’s unique detailing innovations. Current owner Greg DiLeo graciously opened the house for the tour, giving visitors the rare opportunity to view the residence sans furniture (due to renovations starting at the end of December 2007). During the tour, Ledner discussed the design process, relayed stories from the construction phase, and fielded questions from the group. Ledner and DiLeo discussed the renovation strategy (which will be completed by architect John Crestia) as well as the positive and negative alterations and additions that the house has experienced over the decades. The chapter in formation plans to continue the series of modern movement building tours led by original architects throughout 2008.

— Toni DiMaggio

Replacing the damaged pane at Johnson’s Glass House. The Glass House, New Canaan, CT. (photo: Deirdre Gould)

On Wednesday November 7, the Philip Johnson Glass House saw the replacement of its last original glass panel. Damaged during a storm in October, a small vertical crack was found in the pane. At 1/4 inch thick, the original glass was thinner than the current and recently replaced glass panels. The replacement process, which lasted about five hours, was fully documented by the Glass House staff and hopefully will be useful to future conservation projects of this and other Modern Movement houses. The removed panel will be stored in the archives of the museum and is part of the museum’s mission to be a center of information for the conservation of modern architecture.

— Deirdre Gould

Albert Ledner guiding the tour of his Park Island residence, the Galatoire House, Park Island, LA. (photo: Tracie Ashe)

Interior, Galatoire House by Albert Ledner, Park Island, LA. (photo: Toni DiMaggio)
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Book Review: Louis I. Kahn: Beyond Time and Style, A Life in Architecture

By Carter Wiseman
(New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2007)

Carter Wiseman’s biography of Louis I. Kahn (1901-1974), published in March of 2007, presents a comprehensive and engaging narrative of the life and works of one of the 20th century’s most revered architects. Arranged in loose chronological order, the book begins by providing a substantive history of Kahn’s childhood as the son of poor Eastern European immigrants who settled in Philadelphia, of his early interest in drawing and painting, and his fledgling career as an architect trained in the Beaux-Arts classicism of the University of Pennsylvania’s School of Fine Arts.

Wiseman’s interest in uncovering the personality behind Kahn’s architectural genius is apparent in the illustrative titles he has chosen for the chapters devoted to Kahn’s major works, beginning with the Yale University Art Gallery (“Academia and Emergence”), and closing with the Yale Center for British Art (“The Moth and the Butterfly”). In the intervening chapters, Wiseman takes the reader through Kahn’s personal struggles and professional achievements as they evolved through his work on the Richards Medical Research Building at Yale (1957-64); the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla, California (1959-65); the Indian Institute of Management in Ahmedabad, India (1962-74) and the government center at Dhaka, East Pakistan (1962-83); the Phillips Exeter Academy Library in Exeter, New Hampshire (1965-72); and the Kimbell Art Museum in Fort Worth, Texas (1966-72).

Wiseman participates in the familiar dialogue about Kahn’s personal flaws—notably his ongoing relationships with several women and his “unorthodox approach to design” that resulted in severe delays to many of his projects—but only to the extent that the evidence, solidly based on archival documents and interviews with those who knew and worked with the architect, brings out deeper themes in the examination of Kahn’s projects. Wiseman is understandably reticent to draw conclusions based on the historical record about what emotions and ideas ultimately motivated Kahn’s architectural vocation, but there are a few instances where the author offers what feel like flimsy suppositions based on circumstantial information. For example, his interpretation of the unified spiritual vision characterizing Kahn’s successful collaboration with the scientist Jonas Salk on the conception and execution of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies feels somewhat contrived.

Louis I. Kahn: Beyond Time and Style is lavishly illustrated (with many more photographs than plans), and contributes the most comprehensive analysis of the architect’s life and works to date. Carter Wiseman teaches a seminar on Kahn at Yale University, and is also the author of I.M. Pei: A Profile in American Architecture (New York: H.N. Abrams, 1990) and Twentieth-Century American Architecture (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1998).

—Olivia Klose

New Resources at the Environmental Design Archives

Founded by William W. Wurster in 1953, The Environmental Design Archives (EDA) at the University of California has become Northern California’s premiere collection of historic architecture and landscape architecture records and is one of the world’s largest collections of landscape architecture documents. These include the drawings and papers of Thomas Church, Garrett Eckbo, and Robert Royston, in addition to those of pre-Modernists such as Gertrude Jekyll and Beatrix Farrand. As such it is a valuable resource for the preservation and restoration of modern landscapes. Although centered on California in general, and northern California in particular, the nature of landscape architectural practice in the past half-century has fostered a distribution of projects across the nation and even internationally.

Continuing their commitment to documenting architecture and landscape history and design, The College of Environmental Design has recently published three volumes of the Berkeley/DesignBooks series in collaboration with William Stout Publishers of San Francisco. The first volume of this series (which draws on the holdings of the EDA), Maybeck’s Landscapes: Drawing in Nature, was written by Dianne Harris of The University of Illinois. The Donnell and Eckbo Gardens: Modern Californian Masterworks, authored by Marc Treib, is a more detailed investigation of subjects introduced in his earlier Thomas Church Landscape Architect: Designing a Modern Californian Landscape, Noguchi in Paris: Isamu Noguchi and The Unesco Garden (both also published by William Stout) and Garrett Eckbo: Modern Landscapes for Living, co-authored with Dorothée Imbert and published by the University of California Press.


All the books are available from William Stout Publishers: www.stoutpublishers.com

The Environmental Design Archives website can be found at: http://www.ced.berkeley.edu/cedarchives/

—Marc Treib
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NOTICE OF PREPARATION

TIERED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT FOR THE
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
CREATIVE ARTS & HOLLOWAY MIXED-USE PROJECT

DATE: July 6, 2016

TO: Agencies, Organizations, and Interested Parties

PROJECT TITLE: Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project

LEAD AGENCY: The Board of Trustees of the California State University
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132

SUBJECT: Notice of Preparation of a Tiered Environmental Impact Report for the San Francisco State University Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project

The Board of Trustees of the California State University (Trustees) is the lead agency for the preparation of a focused and tiered environmental impact report (EIR) in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.), and the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.). The EIR will be tiered to the Campus Master Plan (CMP) EIR (SCH #2006102050), certified as a Program EIR under CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, by the California State University Board of Trustees in November 2007. Under CEQA Guidelines Section 15152, tiering refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR, such as the CMP EIR, with later EIRs and negative declarations on later, site-specific projects, such as the proposed Project.

The Trustees have prepared this Notice of Preparation (NOP) in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082(a) and 15375. The EIR will address the environmental effects of the proposed Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project (Project) at San Francisco State University (SF State). The Project would include construction of the Creative Arts replacement building; an associated 800-seat concert hall; and a mixed-use development to include student housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and student support services.
The CMP, adopted by the Trustees 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. The adopted CMP accommodates a building program of 0.9 million gross square feet of new and replacement non-residential building space, and development or conversion of approximately 1,198 additional units of housing for faculty, staff, and students. The proposed Project is consistent with the CMP building program; however, a revision to the Master Plan map is required to allow for the proposed uses on the identified sites.

**Agencies:** The Trustees request agencies’ views on the scope and content of the environmental information that is germane to an agency’s statutory responsibilities in connection with the Project, in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082(b) and 15103. Agencies may need to use the EIR to consider permits or other approvals.

**Organizations and Interested Parties:** The Trustees request comments and concerns regarding the scope and evaluation of potential environmental issues associated with the proposed Project.

**Project Location:** The approximately 3.6-acre Project site is located in the southern part of the SF State 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. Most of the existing units are occupied by SF State students and affiliates. See attached figures for the regional and project site location and setting.

**Project Description:** The Project would include demolition of existing housing and construction of new student housing, neighborhood-serving retail, and student support services on Block 6 on the south side of Holloway Avenue. The proposed residences would include apartment-style student housing. Redevelopment of the block would allow for a more compact configuration to increase the supply of on-campus housing in conformance with the CMP’s objectives. This development pattern is also in alignment with Parkmerced’s redevelopment plans. The retail and support services space would include uses such as neighborhood-serving retail, student support services, bike storage, study rooms, a copy center, and retail dining, and a modest amount of underground parking to replace parking being removed elsewhere on campus in the vicinity of the Project site. The retail and student support services space would be intended to serve SF State and neighbors in the immediate vicinity of the campus. Proposed retail would not have a regional draw that would attract people from outside of the Project vicinity.

The Project would also include demolition of existing housing and construction of the Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall on Block 1 on the north side of Font Boulevard and Holloway Avenue. This development assumes relocation of the existing Department of Broadcast & Electronic Communication Arts (BECA) program from the existing Creative Arts building, but does not include an increase in enrollment or full-time employees beyond the total campus enrollment cap of 25,000 FTE students analyzed in the 2007 CMP EIR. A concert hall would be located adjacent to the Creative Arts replacement building. The concert hall would
have recording and broadcast capabilities that would provide hands-on learning for BECA students and would serve as a performance venue and state-of-the-art recording studio for chamber orchestras, choral/vocal music, instrumental ensembles, and music groups. It also could host and simulcast lecture series, film festivals, and debates. Events may be open to the campus community only or to the neighborhood and larger community, similar to SF State’s current program of performing arts and lectures housed in the McKenna and Knuth Theaters.

Parking would be provided in the basement of the new residential building on Holloway Avenue to serve neighborhood retail, concert hall events, and visitors to campus. Student residential parking would be limited to accessible spaces. Consistent with the 2007 CMP, parking on Holloway Avenue would relocate a portion of the campus parking supply to the perimeter of campus, removing existing parking along Tapia Drive, and would constitute no net increase in the overall campus parking supply. Table 1 provides a summary of the key elements of the Project.

### TABLE 1. PROJECT SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Existing Site Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Site Conditions</th>
<th>Net Change with Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student housing (Block 6)</td>
<td>168 beds (Blocks 1 &amp; 6) 8 units (Block 1)¹</td>
<td>550 beds</td>
<td>360 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood-serving retail/student support services (Block 6)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25,000 gross square feet (GSF)</td>
<td>25,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>53 auto spaces² 9 motorcycle spaces²</td>
<td>70 parking spaces</td>
<td>0 parking spaces³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts replacement building (Block 1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>75,000 GSF</td>
<td>75,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert hall seats (Block 1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>60,000 GSF 800 seats</td>
<td>60,000 GSF 800 seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

1. The eight units are occupied by approximately 2.75 people per unit, which is equivalent to 22 beds.
2. Parking located on Tapia Drive.
3. Parking would be removed elsewhere on campus to provide for no net increase in parking with the Project.

The Project would also include preparation and implementation of urban design and sustainability guidelines, and the target of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Platinum and Net Zero Energy in support of the campus’ Climate Action Plan and core value of resiliency. Transportation improvements would include secured bicycle parking, loading and emergency access, streetscape improvements to benefit pedestrians, and vacating (removing) Tapia Drive to integrate Tapia Triangle into the campus academic core. The Project would connect to existing water and combined sewer services adjacent the site. Stormwater measures would be implemented such that the post-Project site would reduce by 25% the storm flow discharge for a 2-year, 24-hour event compared to pre-Project conditions.

**Potential Environmental Effects:** Based on the preliminary scope of the Project and the attached Initial Study (IS), the Trustees have determined that the Project could have a potentially significant environmental effect in the following areas: Aesthetics, Air Quality, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Historic Resources, and Transportation/Traffic. A focused tiered
EIR will be prepared to evaluate the Project’s potential impacts on the environment related to these environmental issues, present feasible mitigation, and analyze potential alternatives.

Public Review Period: The Trustees have issued this NOP for public review and comment pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Sections 15082(a) and 15375. The Trustees have established a 30-day public review and scoping period from July 7, 2016 to August 8, 2016, in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15082). During this period, the NOP/IS will be available for review online at the following website: http://cpdc.sfsu.edu/plan

The NOP/IS will also be available for review at the following locations during regular business hours for the locations:

- J. Paul Leonard Library at SFSU
  1600 Holloway Avenue
  San Francisco, California 94132

- Merced Branch Library
  155 Winston Drive
  San Francisco, California 94132

- Ocean View Branch Library
  345 Randolph Street
  San Francisco, California 94132

Scoping Comments: At this time, the Trustees are soliciting comments on the scope and content of the EIR. Comments may be submitted by mail, email, or fax, or by attending the Public Scoping Meeting (see details below) and submitting a written comment. All comments should indicate a contact person for your agency or organization, if applicable. All comments should be sent to the following address, to arrive no later than 5 p.m. on August 8, 2016:

Wendy Bloom
Campus Planner
Capital Planning, Design & Construction
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132
T: 415.338.3838
F: 415.338.2960
wbloom@sfsu.edu
Public Scoping Meeting: The Trustees will hold a scoping meeting to give the public an opportunity to receive more information on the proposed Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project, and to provide comments and suggestions on the scope of the EIR. All members of the public and interested persons are welcome to attend and provide comments. The details of this meeting are as follows:

Date:    July 27, 2016
Time:    6:00pm to 8:00pm
Place:   J Paul Leonard Library, Events Room (LIB 121)
Visitor & Travel Information:  http://parking.sfsu.edu/visitor-information
Campus Map:  http://www.sfsu.edu/~sfsumap/

FURTHER INFORMATION: For environmental review information or questions about the Project, please contact Wendy Bloom by phone at 415.338.3838 or by email at wbloom@sfsu.edu.

Thomas E. Lollini, FAIA
Senior Associate Vice President
Physical Planning & Development
San Francisco State University

July 6, 2016
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INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
FIGURE 1
Regional Location
FIGURE 3
Project Setting

Creative Arts & Holloway-Mixed Use Project

SOURCE: Bing Maps (Accessed 2016)
Tiered Initial Study

Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project

San Francisco State University

July 6, 2016
Tiered Initial Study

Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project

San Francisco State University

July 6, 2016

Lead Agency:
California State University Board of Trustees
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California 90802-4210

San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94131

Prepared by:
Dudek
725 Front Street, Suite 400
Santa Cruz, California 95060
**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1</strong> INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Project Overview</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Public Review Process</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Project Location and Setting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2</strong> PROJECT DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Project Background</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Project Objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.1 Campus Master Plan Objectives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2.2 Project-Specific Objectives</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Project Components</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.1 Housing</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.2 Retail and Student Support Services</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.3 Creative Arts Replacement Building and Concert Hall</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.4 Design and Design Guidelines</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.5 Transportation Improvements</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.6 Utilities and Energy Use</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3.7 Landscaping</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Demolition and Construction</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Project Approvals</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3</strong> FINDINGS &amp; ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4</strong> INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Aesthetics</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Air Quality</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Biological Resources</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Cultural Resources</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Geology and Soils</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Land Use and Planning</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 Mineral Resources</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE OF CONTENTS (CONTINUED)

4.12 Noise ..................................................................................................................................... 48
4.13 Population and Housing .................................................................................................... 50
4.14 Public Services ..................................................................................................................... 52
4.15 Recreation ............................................................................................................................ 53
4.16 Transportation and Traffic ............................................................................................... 54
4.17 Utilities and Service Systems ............................................................................................ 56
4.18 Mandatory Findings of Significance ................................................................................. 58

5 REFERENCES AND PREPARERS ......................................................................................... 61
5.1 References Cited ................................................................................................................ 61
5.2 List of Preparers .................................................................................................................. 62
  5.2.1 Lead Agency ........................................................................................................... 62
  5.2.2 San Francisco State University ........................................................................... 62
  5.2.3 Dudek – CEQA Consultant Team .................................................................... 63

APPENDIX

A 2007 Campus Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measures That Apply to the Project

FIGURES

  1 Regional Map ....................................................................................................................... 65
  2 Project Location .................................................................................................................... 67
  3 Project Setting ....................................................................................................................... 69

TABLES

  1 Project Summary ................................................................................................................ 9
  2 Project Approvals .............................................................................................................. 18
# ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym/Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAAQMD</td>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BECA</td>
<td>Department of Broadcast &amp; Electronic Communication Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCR</td>
<td>California Code of Regulations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEQA</td>
<td>California Environmental Quality Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMP</td>
<td>Campus Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU</td>
<td>California State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIR</td>
<td>Environmental Impact Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>full-time equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gpd</td>
<td>gallons per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHG</td>
<td>greenhouse gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
<td>gross square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IS</td>
<td>Initial Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEED</td>
<td>Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LUST</td>
<td>leaking underground storage tank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOP</td>
<td>Notice of Preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;2.5&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>fine particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&lt;sub&gt;10&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>coarse particulate matter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed-Use Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF State</td>
<td>San Francisco State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWPPP</td>
<td>Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TDM</td>
<td>transportation demand management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trustees</td>
<td>California State University Board of Trustees</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Project Overview

San Francisco State University (SF State) proposes to develop the Creative Arts and Holloway Mixed-Use Project (Project) in the southern portion of the SF State campus. The Project would include 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.

1.2 California Environmental Quality Act Compliance

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) serves as the main framework of environmental law and policy in California. CEQA emphasizes the need for public disclosure and identifying and preventing environmental damage associated with proposed projects. Unless the project is deemed categorically exempt, CEQA is applicable to any project that must be approved by a public agency in order to be processed and established. This Project does not fall under any of the statutory or categorical exemptions listed in the 2013 CEQA Statute and Guidelines (California Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.; 14 California Code of Regulations (CCR) 15000 et seq.), and, therefore, must meet CEQA requirements.

The California State University Board of Trustees (Trustees) certified the SF State Campus Master Plan Environmental Impact Report (CMP EIR) (SCH No. 2006102050) in 2007. The Project conforms to the CMP building program and, therefore, the CEQA analysis for the Project will be tiered to the 2007 CMP EIR. Tiering refers to using the analysis of general matters contained in a broader EIR, such as the CMP EIR, with later EIRs or Negative Declarations on narrower projects, incorporating by reference the general discussions from the broader EIR, and concentrating the later EIR or Negative Declaration solely on the issues specific to the project (14 CCR 15152(a)). A later EIR is required when the Initial Study (IS) or other analysis finds that the later project may cause a significant effect on the environment that was not adequately addressed in the prior EIR (14 CCR 15152(f)). As indicated in Section 2, a focused, tiered EIR will be prepared for the Project, based on the results of this tiered Initial Study.

The 2007 CMP EIR is hereby incorporated by reference and referred to throughout this tiered Initial Study. The CMP EIR and related documents (e.g., Board of Trustees Approval, Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, Findings of Fact, Notice of Determination) are available to the general public at http://cpdc.sfsu.edu/plan.
1.3 Public Review Process

Scoping

The intent of this IS is to provide an overview of the environmental impacts associated with the Project and to identify those issues that will be further evaluated in the pending EIR. This IS is attached to the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for the Project, which provides notice to involved agencies and the public that an EIR will be prepared for the Project. The NOP/IS is being distributed directly to numerous agencies, organizations, and interested groups and persons during the scoping period. During the 30-day scoping period, the Trustees are soliciting comments on the scope and content of the EIR. The NOP provides the web and library locations where the NOP/IS can be downloaded and/or reviewed, the SF State contact where comments can be submitted, and the dates of the scoping period. Once the scoping period closes, SF State will consider the comments received in the scope and contents of the Draft EIR that will be prepared.

Public Review of Draft EIR

The Draft EIR will be distributed for a 45-day public review period. During the public review period, written comments on the adequacy of the Draft EIR can be submitted. Following the close of the public review period on the Draft EIR, written responses will be prepared for all significant environmental issues raised in the comments received. The comments, responses, and changes to the Draft EIR document as a result of comments and responses will be published in the Final EIR. The Draft EIR and Final EIR volumes will constitute the Final EIR. As required by CEQA, written response to comments submitted by public agencies will be provided to those agencies for review at least 10 days prior to the Trustees’ consideration of certification of the Final EIR. The Final EIR will also be available to the public in advance of the Trustees’ consideration of EIR certification.

1.4 Project Location and Setting

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 (see Figure 1, Regional Map). The SF State campus is generally bounded by Lake Merced Boulevard and the lake and its associated open spaces, including Harding Park, public and private golf courses, Fort Funston, and the San Francisco Zoo, on the west; 19th Avenue (State Route 1) and residential development in the Ingleside neighborhood on the east; the Stonestown Galleria shopping center, Lowell High School, and Lakeshore Alternative Elementary School to the north; and Parkmerced and other residential development to the south (see Figure 2, Project Location). The Pacific Ocean lies to the west of the campus, beyond Lake Merced.
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 (see Figure 3, Project Setting). 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. Block 1 and Block 6 are composed primarily of two-story housing around the perimeter of the block, with an interior courtyard. Of the 46 housing units in Block 1 and Block 6, most are occupied by SF State students and are licensed by the bed space.
2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2.1 Project Background

The CMP, adopted by the Trustees 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 2007). 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. The land use map maintains the current general configuration of land uses on the campus, which consist of a concentrated academic core surrounded by residential and other campus uses. 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.

The 2007 CMP included a new Creative Arts complex located on Lot 41, at the intersection of Font and Lake Merced Boulevards. The current Master Plan map was recently revised and approved in May 2014 to allow for relocation of the planned Mashouf Wellness Center on Lot 41 and relocation of the planned Creative Arts replacement buildings from Lot 41 to two adjacent sites located closer to the academic core. Based on the May 2014 approved map, the Creative Arts complex would consist of four replacement buildings, with an 800-seat auditorium and a building housing the Theatre Arts program located on the West Campus Green, and two buildings to house the Department of Broadcast & Electronic Communication Arts (BECA) and Music & Dance programs located on the Tapia Triangle. Since approval of the Master Plan map revision in 2014, the programs have reorganized into the School of Theatre and Dance and the School of Music.

The 2007 CMP proposed redeveloping the University Park South block on the south side of Holloway Avenue between Cardenas and Arellano Avenues with denser housing and ground-floor retail, and assumed that Block 6 to the east would remain in its current use through the CMP development window (2020).
The proposed Project is consistent with the 2007 CMP building program; however, a Master Plan map revision is required to allow for the proposed uses on the identified sites, as described below. The map revision is required to (1) repurpose the planned auditorium as an 800-seat concert hall, (2) co-locate the 800-seat concert hall on the Tapia Triangle with the building that would house BECA, (3) rename and co-locate the Music building on the West Campus Green with the renamed building for Theatre and Dance, and (4) relocate planned future housing from its current location to Block 6 and re-designate the site for housing/mixed-use development.

2.2 Project Objectives

CEQA indicates that the statement of project 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 the project for approval. The objectives of the adopted 2007 CMP originate in the obligation SF State has to meet its educational mission as defined by the California Education Code. The Project objectives that are drawn from the CMP are based on the physical planning principles derived from the long-term vision for the SF State campus, consistent with SF State’s strategic plan. The CMP objectives and Project-specific objectives are provided below.

2.2.1 Campus Master Plan Objectives

1. Provide facilities for expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the proposed [now adopted] enrollment ceiling increase to 25,000 FTEs, required by the CSU [California State University] and California Education Code.

2. Provide student, faculty, and staff housing to aid in recruitment and retention.

3. Implement the planning principles provided in the proposed Campus Master Plan, as follows:

   • A vibrant on-campus community:
     o Reinforce the academic core and extend it westward.
     o Integrate residential properties to create a unified campus.
     o Provide more close-in, affordable housing that enables faculty, staff, and students to walk to school and work.
     o Redefine Holloway and Buckingham as “college main streets” offering neighborhood retail and services.
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- Strong connections to the surrounding city:
  - Strengthen the University’s connections to Lake Merced and the surrounding neighborhoods.
  - Work with neighbors, the City of San Francisco, and other entities to improve public transportation and other services that benefit the entire district.

- Emphasis on the pedestrian and alternative transportation:
  - Cluster development around high-frequency transit connections to encourage transit use.
  - Establish bicycle and pedestrian networks that provide safe, direct and attractive connections to work and school.
  - Develop the 19th Avenue edge as a transit-, bicycle-, and pedestrian-friendly parkway.
  - Implement Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce parking demand.
  - Decentralize campus parking over time from the current central garage to a series of smaller perimeter parking facilities to disperse traffic and parking impacts, claim the campus core for pedestrians and bicycles, and allow for the eventual removal of the central parking garage from the valley.

- Recognition in the city and region:
  - Position semi-public uses at the corners of campus, creating icons that redefine the University’s external identity and engage the larger community.
  - Create an identifiable and inviting campus perimeter.

- A continuous greenbelt between 19th Avenue and Lake Merced:
  - Establish the valley as the central open space of campus.
  - Provide expanded recreational fields.
  - Restore ecological landscapes in the valley.

- Universal design and access:
  - Ensure that all aspects of the campus physical environment—notably primary circulation routes and main building entrances—are comfortably usable by and inviting to the widest group of people possible.
  - Organize and design primary pathways and graphic signage to facilitate wayfinding, using a combination of visual, tactile, and auditory cues.
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- Establish strong north/south connections across the valley and Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue that link the University to its residential districts and to the surrounding neighborhoods.
- Establish clear east/west functional and visual connections across campus and to the surrounding district.

- A campus that models sustainability:
  - Develop transportation and land use patterns that encourage greater use of transit, walking, and bicycle commuting and reduce dependence on automobiles.
  - Make efficient use of redevelopment sites.
  - Promote sustainability through green building and site design, native landscape, natural stormwater management, alternative transportation, higher-density housing, and walkable neighborhood retail.

2.2.2 Project-Specific Objectives

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 students and support University 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 be located at 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 the University’s external identity and engage the larger community.

4. 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.

5. Begin to integrate and make efficient use of more recently acquired residential properties located along the southern edge of the campus.

6. Locate new student housing 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.
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7. Locate higher-density student housing with ground-floor neighborhood retail and services along Holloway to redefine Holloway as “college main street.”

8. Ensure that new construction achieves at least Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold or equivalent performance and energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements. LEED Platinum and zero net energy should be targeted, and the Project should meet other CMP and Climate Action Plan (SF State 2010) sustainability objectives.

2.3 Project Components

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, and lighting. As described in Section 2.1, a revision to the existing Master Plan map would be required to allow for the proposed uses on the identified sites. All elements of the Project are further described below and summarized in Table 1.

**TABLE 1. PROJECT SUMMARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Element</th>
<th>Existing Site Conditions</th>
<th>Proposed Site Conditions</th>
<th>Net Change with Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student housing (Block 6)</td>
<td>168 beds (Blocks 1 &amp; 6)</td>
<td>550 beds</td>
<td>360 beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 units (Block 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood-serving retail/student support services (Block 6)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>25,000 gross square feet (GSF)</td>
<td>25,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking facilities</td>
<td>53 auto spaces</td>
<td>70 parking spaces</td>
<td>0 parking spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 motorcycle spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts replacement building (Block 1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>75,000 GSF</td>
<td>75,000 GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concert hall seats (Block 1)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>60,000 GSF 800 seats</td>
<td>60,000 GSF 800 seats</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data compiled by SF State in 2016.

1. The eight units are occupied by approximately 2.75 people per unit, which is equivalent to 22 beds.
2. Parking located on Tapia Drive.
3. Parking would be removed elsewhere on campus to provide for no net increase in parking with the Project.

2.3.1 Housing

The existing residential block on the south side of Holloway Avenue between Varela and Cardenas Avenues (Block 6) contains 27 residential units, which would be demolished and
replaced with a multiple-story, mixed-use building with a maximum height of 90 feet. The proposed building would include apartment-style student housing. Redevelopment of the block would allow for a more compact configuration to increase the supply of on-campus housing in conformance with the 2007 CMP’s objectives. This development pattern is also in alignment with the Parkmerced redevelopment plan.

The existing residential block at Tapia Triangle (Block 1) contains 27 residential units, which would be demolished and replaced with the Creative Arts replacement building and the concert hall (see Section 2.3.3). As listed in Table 1, accounting for the loss of existing housing units on the two parcels, the net increase in housing would be 360 beds. Most of the 54 units in Block 1 and Block 6 are currently occupied by students and licensed as bed space; however, approximately eight units are currently licensed as apartments to SF State affiliates and non-affiliates.

Given that the Project would involve demolition of existing housing, SF State will comply with the California Relocation Assistance Act (California Government Code 7260 et seq.), which applies to state entities that may displace residents and businesses. This act generally requires that public entities provide relocation assistance to persons who are displaced as the result of the acquisition of property for a public use. Since the acquisition of University Park South by SF State, the number of legacy tenants has declined substantially. Any remaining legacy tenants would be offered relocation assistance, as required by law. SF State would provide displaced non-University affiliates with the option to relocate to units in other campus housing.

2.3.2 Retail and Student Support Services

Up to 25,000 square feet of neighborhood-serving retail and student support services space would be provided with the Project. The area of retail would be primarily confined to building frontages accessible from the Holloway Avenue and Varela Avenue and linked to the future retail corridor along Crespi Drive, described in the future Parkmerced vision (Maximus Real Estate Partners 2016). This space would provide for uses such as neighborhood-serving retail, student support services, bike storage, study rooms, a copy center, and retail dining. The retail and student support services would be intended to serve SF State and neighbors in the immediate vicinity. Proposed retail would not have a regional draw that would attract people from outside the Project vicinity.

The 2007 CMP envisioned Holloway Avenue as a campus main street; the proposed Project would be designed to contribute to main street character. Project design would include a gateway presence, including a street that prioritizes pedestrians and bicycles. Where possible, “green” infrastructure would be incorporated in the streetscape design to manage stormwater.
runoff. The new campus main street character would be reinforced by including retail and/or student support services along Holloway and Varela Avenues.

2.3.3 Creative Arts Replacement Building and Concert Hall

The 2007 CMP included a new Creative Arts complex located on Lot 41, at the intersection of Font and Lake Merced Boulevards. A Master Plan revision approved by the Trustees in 2014 relocated the Creative Arts complex, consisting of four replacement buildings housing academic and performance space, to the West Campus Green on Font Boulevard and the Tapia Triangle. This 1.7-acre site, located on the north side of Font Boulevard and Holloway Avenue, currently contains 27 residential units. This development assumes relocation of the existing BECA program from the existing Creative Arts building, but does not include an increase in enrollment or full-time employees beyond the total campus enrollment increase to 25,000 FTE students analyzed in the 2007 CMP EIR. A concert hall would be located adjacent to the Creative Arts replacement building. These two buildings are further described below.

Creative Arts Replacement Building

The Creative Arts replacement building would be approximately 51,000 assignable square feet/75,000 GSF, and would include instructional and support space and faculty office space. It would be located on the north side of the Tapia Triangle site, across from the existing Humanities Building. The new Creative Arts replacement building would be two to three stories over a basement, with a maximum height of 90 feet. The building would house two full-height television studios; a television newsroom; a radio station; video post-production space; audio recording, production, and post-production space; and related classroom space for the BECA program. The building would also house interdisciplinary lecture classrooms.

The building would likely be steel-frame construction with concrete, glass, and exterior cladding. Exterior circulation located on the north side of the building would reinforce east/west circulation between the academic core and the new Mashouf Wellness Center at Font Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard, and future academic buildings planned to the west.

Concert Hall

An 800-seat concert hall would be located adjacent to the Creative Arts replacement building on the southeast portion of the Tapia Triangle. The concert hall would have recording and broadcast capabilities that would provide hands-on learning for BECA students, and would serve as a performance venue and state-of-the-art recording studio for chamber orchestras, choral/vocal music, instrumental ensembles, and music groups. It also could host and simulcast lecture series, film festivals, and debates. Events may be open only to the campus community or
to the neighborhood and larger community, similar to SF State’s current program of performing arts and lectures housed in McKenna and Knuth Theaters.

The concert hall would be approximately 40,000 assignable square feet/60,000 GSF, and would have a maximum height of 90 feet. The building would be steel-frame construction with concrete, glass, and exterior cladding, using materials complementary to the Creative Arts replacement building. Glass would provide views into the building’s lobby and gathering spaces. Located at the intersection of Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard, the concert hall with its south-facing glass lobby would clearly identify an important entry into the campus from these two major streets.

2.3.4 Design and Design Guidelines

The Project includes design standards and guidelines that would apply to development on Block 6 to ensure compatibility with the adjacent Parkmerced complex, as specified in CMP EIR Mitigation AES-3 (SF State 2007). These guidelines were prepared for consistency, where relevant, to the Parkmerced Design Standards and Guidelines (SOM 2010), and include building massing, design, exterior treatments and design details, and building heights as specified by CMP EIR Mitigation AES-3.

The student housing (Block 6) site is the first in a series of mixed-use development projects along the Holloway Avenue corridor that would define the southern edge of the campus, as envisioned in the 2007 CMP. As the farthest east site, it would also provide a gateway presence at the southern end of the campus near the busy 19th Avenue and Holloway San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency Metro stop.

**Height Limits**

After adoption of the 2007 CMP, Parkmerced’s development plan received City and County of San Francisco (City) approval. The Parkmerced plan includes significantly higher density and height limits than the conditions that existed when SF State’s CMP and EIR were approved. Given the anticipated changes at Parkmerced and SF State’s interest in providing student housing responsive to demand, the proposed building heights would be greater than the 50-foot height limit referenced in the 2007 CMP, but would not exceed 90 feet. This additional height would also allow for the possibility of a rooftop-mounted solar array to support the goals of zero net energy.

**Building Design**

Building placement and orientation is critical to enhancing a development’s character and promoting pedestrian activity. Adherence to build-to lines creates a consistent but permeable
edge that defines and shapes the streets. The build-to lines should determine each new building’s configuration and major frontages. As envisioned in the 2007 CMP, the intention is to develop Holloway Avenue as a mixed-use corridor with sufficient frontage to form the street space. Thus, at a minimum, the building would abut the property line along at least half of the length of the block on Holloway Avenue. Recessed plazas may mark points of entry or activity. Bay windows may project above and beyond this street wall in classic San Francisco patterns to take advantage of views up and down the street. Arcades may be employed to hold the street wall but expand the public realm to create opportunities for outdoor seating or merchandise displays, or protection from the elements. Along side streets and Serrano Drive, the building line may vary.

Arcades, porches, balconies, portals, and courtyards would be used to encourage pedestrian activity and to provide shade, natural ventilation, and day-lighting to interior spaces. Building entrances would be bright, glazed, and easy to find.

Roof spaces would be usable roof terraces, providing additional open space; planted as green roofs, allowing the roof to reduce heating and cooling loads and reduce stormwater runoff; and/or used for the placement of solar arrays, which would also reduce heating and cooling loads. These strategies can be used in combination.

**Lighting and Ventilation**

Natural ventilation would be used for all spaces wherever possible. Where code requires mechanical ventilation, it would be provided. Because of SF State’s benign ocean-side climate and wind patterns, natural ventilation is easily achieved through operable windows, louvers, and the use of skylights and clerestories.

Interior corridors would be naturally lit and could provide exterior views or vistas at changes in direction. “Racetrack” corridors are strongly discouraged. Vertical circulation would be near the edges of the floor plates to allow long-term flexibility in use, reduce the amount of conditioned space, and provide legibility to the building plan. Common areas would be located adjacent to amenities or along primary vertical circulation paths, and be naturally lit and ventilated.

Daylight would be used as the primary means of lighting the interiors of new buildings. Because of the ambient light and frequent occasions when the campus is shrouded in fog, the majority of building elevations may be transparent. Exterior lighting would adhere to LEED–New Construction (NC) guidelines for light pollution reduction and energy efficiency, per CMP EIR Mitigation AES-4 (SF State 2007).
Building Materials

Concrete paving, including poured-in-place and unit pavers, would be used, reserving distinctive visual and tactile effects to highlight areas of importance and help with wayfinding. Permeable paving options would be explored and used, if effective.

Construction of the Project would use locally sourced materials with recycled content when possible, whether raw materials or manufactured items, and maximize their use as a means of limiting the environmental impacts of transporting goods. Construction of the Project would explore the possibility of reused construction and demolition materials and maximize their use as a means of limiting the environmental impacts of extracting and manufacturing new materials.

2.3.5 Transportation Improvements

Closure of Tapia Drive

SF State is applying to the City to “vacate” Tapia Drive. This would allow SF State to incorporate the street right-of-way into the Project site and to integrate the site into the campus, specifically the academic core. SF State owns the property on both sides of Tapia Drive, and closing the street is consistent with the 2007 CMP, which envisioned a major east/west walkway connecting the central academic core with sites to the west, including the Mashouf Wellness Center. Some vehicular access would be required for loading at the existing Creative Arts and Humanities buildings, but the area currently occupied by the street right-of-way would be developed as part of the site for the proposed Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall, and would be used primarily by pedestrians.

Automobile Parking

The addition of housing and neighborhood retail services supports SF State’s goal to minimize drive-alone auto trips to reduce traffic congestion and GHG emissions. Consistent with the SF State transportation demand management (TDM) plan (Nelson/Nygaard 2009), new residential and retail development should use strategies that minimize the need for parking, such as car sharing, bike facilities, and access to transit.

Parking would be provided in the basement of the proposed student housing/mixed-use building on Block 6 to serve neighborhood retail, concert hall events, and visitors to campus. Student residential parking would be limited to accessible spaces. Consistent with the 2007 CMP, parking in the new student housing/mixed-use building on Holloway Avenue would relocate a portion of the campus parking supply to the perimeter of campus, removing existing parking along Tapia Drive and from elsewhere on campus, such that the Project would result in no net increase in the overall campus parking supply, as shown in Table 1.
The absence of available parking spaces, the available alternatives to vehicular travel (transit, bicycling, and walking), and the dense pattern of urban development would induce many drivers to seek other modes of travel or change their overall travel behavior. Any such resulting shifts to transit service in particular would be in keeping with the City’s “Transit First” policy. The City’s Transit First Policy (CCSF 2007) provides that parking policies for areas well-served by public transit, such as the SF State campus, be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation.

**Bicycle Parking**

The new student housing building at the southeast corner of Holloway Avenue and Varela Avenue would include secure, covered bicycle storage on the first floor of the building. Bicycle parking would also be provided in the vicinity of the Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall.

**Loading Facilities**

The loading and service area for the Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall would likely be accessed from the vacated Tapia Drive adjacent to the existing Creative Arts building, and would be located internal to the Project site, where possible, to avoid conflicts with perimeter pedestrian circulation. The loading and service area for the student housing building would be along Cardenas Avenue, preserving continuous, ground-level retail frontage along Holloway and Varela Avenues.

**Emergency and Accessible Access**

Emergency and accessible access would be provided via the main building entrances at street level. Emergency access could also be provided via the loading and service areas identified above.

**2.3.6 Utilities and Energy Use**

**Water**

The Project would include installation of new potable water infrastructure to support the new buildings. Several 2-inch-diameter lateral pipes would be installed to connect to the existing 8-inch-diameter line north of Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard; 3- to 4-inch-diameter fire service lateral pipes would also be installed to provide fire water services to the buildings. The Project would include installation of recycled water infrastructure and other water reuse strategies. Targeted strategies could include ultra-water-efficient bathroom fixtures, dual
plumbing to allow use of recycled water for toilet and urinal flushing, and recycled water infrastructure for irrigation.

**Wastewater**

The Project would involve installation of new 8-inch-diameter wastewater infrastructure to support the new buildings. A connection to the existing wastewater pipeline located on the north side of Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard would be installed.

**Stormwater**

The Project would be located in a City combined sewer area. To minimize impacts of the Project on the combined sewer system, SF State would implement a stormwater management approach compatible with the City’s Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines (CCSF 2016). The Project site has an impervious area greater than 50%. Accordingly, the Project would implement a stormwater management approach that reduces the existing stormwater runoff flow rate and volume by 25% for a 2-year, 24-hour design storm. The Project would minimize disruption of natural hydrology by implementing low-impact design approaches such as reduced impervious cover, reuse of stormwater, or increased infiltration. The actual design of the stormwater management system would be developed as the design process proceeds, but it is expected that the following types of features would be incorporated into the design to achieve the above criteria: infiltration zones/dry wells, use of permeable materials for walking surfaces, and bio-retention zones.

By implementing these design criteria, the Project would exceed the requirements of the 2007 CMP, calling for no net increase in storm flow discharge from the campus to the combined sewer system. The stormwater management plan for the Project would be designed consistent with LEED credit SS 6.1 (as described by the U.S. Green Building Council) and would be compatible with the City’s Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines (CCSF 2016).

**Energy**

Project buildings would be connected to the existing electrical and natural gas system on campus. New buildings would be designed to achieve at least LEED Gold or equivalent performance, and energy efficiency beyond Title 24 requirements. LEED Platinum and zero net energy would be targeted using a combination of advanced green building and energy efficiency measures, on-site renewable energy, district energy strategies, and/or renewable energy credits. On-site renewable energy could include roof-mounted solar arrays. The efficiency measures to
be incorporated could include above-code enclosures and heating, ventilation, and air-conditioning equipment; daylighting; and similar strategies.

The only emergency generator planned is required by the California Building Code to power the elevators and emergency lighting in the case of a power outage. No optional standby power is planned for the Project.

**Solid Waste**

All proposed buildings would be provided with traditional trash and recycling services and associated receptacles.

**2.3.7 Landscaping**

The Project would incorporate water-efficient landscape. The selected plant species would require zero or minimal irrigation after plants are established, and would reflect the ecological zones outlined in the 2007 CMP and the specific function and character of adjacent uses and landscapes. In low areas and natural collection points, stormwater management zones would capture, convey, and detain stormwater runoff within vegetated bio-detention “meadow” landscape elements.

**2.4 Demolition and Construction**

Demolition of the existing housing on the Tapia Triangle would be anticipated to occur in late summer 2017. Demolition of existing housing at the southeast corner of Holloway Avenue and Varela Avenue would likely occur somewhat later than the demolition on the Tapia Triangle.

Construction staging would occur on the Project site in areas not proposed to support the new buildings. Construction workers would access the construction site primarily via Holloway Avenue and Font Boulevard.

Construction of the Creative Arts replacement building and concert hall would take approximately 24 months to complete, beginning in fall 2017, with completion in fall 2019. Construction of the student housing building would take approximately 24 months, beginning somewhat later than the Creative Arts buildings, with completion in 2019/2020. There could be up to a 24-month overlap in the construction schedules for the Creative Arts buildings and the student housing building.

Construction would be performed by qualified contractors. Plans and specifications would incorporate stipulations regarding standard California State University (CSU) requirements and acceptable construction practices, including grading and demolition, safety measures, vehicle operation and maintenance, excavation stability, erosion control, drainage alteration, groundwater disposal, traffic circulation, public safety, dust control, and noise generation.
2.5 Project Approvals

This section describes actions required for Project approval by state and regional agencies. Discretionary approvals include certification of the EIR under CEQA; approval and adoption of the proposed revision to the Master Plan map; and approval of schematic plans for the Creative Arts replacement building, concert hall, and student housing/mixed-use building by the Trustees, as summarized in Table 2. Other approvals would also be necessary.

### TABLE 2. PROJECT APPROVALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authorizing Jurisdiction or Agency</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California State University Board of Trustees</td>
<td>Final EIR Certification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco State University Master Plan Map Revision</td>
<td>Approval and Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amendment to the Self-Support Capital Outlay Program</td>
<td>Approval and Adoption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schematic Plans for the Creative Arts Replacement Building, Concert Hall, and Student Housing/Mixed-Use Building</td>
<td>Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Division of the State Architect</td>
<td>Facility Fire and Life Safety Compliance Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Fire Marshal</td>
<td>Regional Water Quality Control Board Approval/Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit (NPDES) – Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Notice of Intent to Comply with NPDES Construction Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bay Area Air Quality Management District</td>
<td>Authority to Construct and/or Permits to Operate Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hazardous Materials Removal and Asbestos Demolition Rule Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County of San Francisco</td>
<td>Fire Flow and Hydrants – San Francisco Fire Department Review/Verification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tapia Drive Vacation and Street/Sidewalk Improvements – Department of Public Works Bureau of Street-Use and Mapping in coordination with other City departments, including San Francisco Metropolitan Transportation Agency (SFMTA), Bureau of Urban Forestry, and others Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water and Sewer Connections/Services/Encroachment – Department of Public Works and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stormwater Management Compatibility with Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines – San Francisco Public Utilities Commission Review</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 FINDINGS & ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION

The Trustees find that the Project could have a “potentially significant impact” or “potentially significant unless mitigated” impact 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 on Section 4, Initial Study Checklist. An EIR is required to analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed. The Project could result in a potentially significant new or increased impact over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR based on the results of the Initial Study Checklist. The Trustees have decided to prepare a focused, tiered EIR to address the following potential impacts:

1. **Aesthetics:** The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout on scenic vistas and scenic resources would be less than significant. The impacts related to visual character and light and glare were determined to be less than significant with identified mitigation measures. The tiered focused EIR will evaluate potential aesthetic impacts to determine whether there may be new or increased impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.1, Aesthetics, for additional information.

2. **Air Quality:** The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout related to potential conflicts with the applicable air plan and construction emissions of coarse particulate matter (PM$_{10}$) and fine particulate matter (PM$_{2.5}$) would be less than significant with identified mitigation measures. Impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and objectionable odors were determined to be less than significant. The focused tiered EIR will evaluate potential air quality impacts to determine whether there may be new or increased impacts compared to those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.3, Air Quality, for additional information.

3. **Greenhouse Gas Emissions:** The CMP EIR approved in 2007 did not analyze potential campus-wide impacts related to GHG emissions, as Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines at that time did not address GHG emissions and there were no established thresholds. The tiered EIR will quantify the net increase in GHG emissions with the Project; determine whether those emissions could have a significant impact on the environment; and determine whether the Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions.

4. **Historic Resources:** The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout related to historic resources could be significant and unavoidable if CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C, requiring documentation of historical resources, would not fully mitigate the effects of demolition of those resources to less than significant. Since the certification of
the CMP EIR in 2007, more is now known about the eligibility of the Parkmerced area as a Historic District. The existing housing on the Project site, which consists of former Parkmerced properties, is proposed to be demolished as part of the Project. The tiered EIR will evaluate potential historic resource impacts of the Project on the former Parkmerced properties to determine whether there may be new or increased impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.

5. Transportation and Traffic: The 2007 CMP EIR indicated that the combined effect of the TDM, parking, transit, and housing programs of the CMP would likely be to maintain campus-related auto traffic levels at their then-current (2006) rates through 2020. The 2007 CMP EIR considered this no-net-increase in vehicle trips scenario in a traffic analysis that also provided a more conservative traffic scenario that estimated trip generation from proposed campus growth more traditionally. The more conservative analysis indicated that campus growth would potentially result in significant traffic-related impacts on vicinity roadways. The tiered EIR will estimate trip generation associated with Project vehicle and transit trips, and evaluate transportation hazards, emergency access, and conflicts with adopted transportation policies to determine whether the Project could result in new or increased impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.

6. Mandatory Findings of Significance/Cumulative Impacts: The 2007 CMP EIR evaluated the cumulative effects associated with growth and development contemplated under the CMP. In general, the cumulative effects associated with the Project have already been analyzed and assessed as part of the 2007 CMP EIR, and no new or increased impacts are anticipated with the Project in most impact categories. However, cumulative impacts associated with reasonably foreseeable cumulative development will be updated and reassessed, as relevant and necessary, for the topics that will be carried into the forthcoming EIR, including for the topics listed above, to determine whether new or increased cumulative impacts would result with the Project.
4 INITIAL STUDY CHECKLIST

The evaluation of potential environmental impacts provided in Section 4 of this IS determined that the Project would not result in new or increased environmental impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR for the topics that are not checked below. Topics with a check mark below warrant further analysis and will be examined in an EIR to determine whether the Project would have a significant new or increased impact that was not previously addressed in the 2007 CMP EIR.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED

| ☒ Aesthetics | ☐ Agriculture and Forestry Resources | ☒ Air Quality |
| ☐ Biological Resources | ☒ Cultural Resources | ☐ Geology and Soils |
| ☒ Greenhouse Gas Emissions | ☐ Hazards and Hazardous Materials | ☐ Hydrology and Water Quality |
| ☐ Land Use and Planning | ☐ Mineral Resources | ☐ Noise |
| ☐ Population and Housing | ☐ Public Services | ☐ Recreation |
| ☒ Transportation and Traffic | ☐ Utilities and Service Systems | ☒ Mandatory Findings of Significance |
Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed Project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the Project have been made by or agreed to by the Project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☒ I find that the proposed Project could have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed Project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed Project, nothing further is required.

Thomas E. Lollini, FAIA
Senior Associate Vice President
Physical Planning & Development
San Francisco State University

July 6, 2016
TIERED EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

1) The purpose of evaluating the Project’s potential environmental impacts is to determine whether the Project could result in new significant impacts not identified in the 2007 CMP EIR (SCH No. 2006102050), or a substantial increase in the impacts identified in the EIR. If the Project would result in a significant unavoidable impact that was already identified in the EIR, no additional environmental evaluation is required and the “No New Impact” box is checked in the following Environmental Checklist. Where the Project would result in a significant impact that was already identified in the prior EIR and where mitigation identified in the EIR will still be implemented as part of the Project to reduce the impact to less than significant, no additional environmental evaluation is needed or required, and the “No New Impact” box is checked in the Environmental Checklist. However, some explanation is provided so that it is clear to the reader why “No New Impacts” would be anticipated for the Project. The Checklist issues not evaluated in the prior EIR, such as GHG emissions, are evaluated herein.

2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.

3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant new or increased impact, less than significant new or increased impact with mitigation, less than significant new or increased impact, or no new or increased impact. “Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact” is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more “Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact” entries when the determination is made, a tiered EIR is required to address those impacts.

4) “Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact With Mitigation Incorporated” applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from “Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact” to a “Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact.” The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from “Earlier Analyses,” as described in (5) below, may be cross-referenced).

5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration (see Item 1 above). Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:

a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.

c) Mitigation Measures. Describe the mitigation measures, which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the Project.

6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.

7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.

8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats; however, lead agencies should normally address the questions from this checklist that are relevant to a project's environmental effects in whatever format is selected.

9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
   a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
   b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance.
4.1 Aesthetics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Substantially damage scenic resources including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The evaluation below reflects the aesthetics analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.1 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of aesthetic impacts associated with the CMP.

**a–d)** *Potentially significant new or increased impact.* The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout on scenic vistas and scenic resources would be less than significant. The impacts related to visual character and light and glare were determined to be less than significant with identified mitigation measures.

The Project would involve construction of three buildings on two sites in the southern portion of the SF State campus: the Creative Arts replacement building and the concert hall on Block 1, also referred to as the Tapia Triangle, and the student housing/mixed use building on Block 6, located on the south side of Holloway Avenue. Although the proposed uses are included in the CMP building program, the buildings would be substantially taller than contemplated in the 2007 CMP and CMP EIR. Additionally, there is information in the Parkmerced Project EIR (SCH No. 2009052073) (CCSF 2010) about the scenic characteristics of Parkmerced buildings that was not previously available during preparation of the 2007 CMP EIR. Given the above, the pending EIR will evaluate potential aesthetic impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic resources, visual character, and light and glare to determine whether there may be new or increased impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.
4.2 Agriculture and Forestry Resources

II. AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES – In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code section 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

DISCUSSION

The evaluation below reflects the agricultural analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.13 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of agricultural impacts associated with the CMP.

a–e) No new or increased impact. The campus, which includes the Project site, is in a highly developed urban setting. There are no Williamson Act contracts or land zoned for agricultural purposes on the SF State campus. Additionally, there is no prime farmland or other agricultural land of importance on the SF State campus. No
agricultural land, forest, or timber lands are present in the vicinity of the SF State campus. Therefore, no impacts were identified in the 2007 CMP EIR and no new or increased impacts are anticipated with the Project.

### 4.3 Air Quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Description</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION

The evaluation below reflects the air quality analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.2 of the CMP Draft EIR and Section 3.6 of the CMP Final EIR for the analysis of air quality impacts associated with the CMP.

a–e) **Potentially significant new or increased impact.** The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout related to potential conflicts with the applicable air plan and construction emissions of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ would be less than significant with identified mitigation measures. The impacts related to the exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations and objectionable odors were determined to be less than significant.
The Project would involve construction of three buildings on two sites in the southern portion of the SF State campus: the Creative Arts replacement building and the concert hall on Block 1, also referred to as the Tapia Triangle, and the student housing/mixed use building on Block 6, located on the south side of Holloway Avenue. Since the certification of the CMP EIR in 2007, the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) has updated its Clean Air Plan and CEQA Guidelines and associated emissions-based thresholds (BAAQMD 2010, 2012). Additionally, the California Emissions Estimator Model is the land use and air quality model now in use to estimate construction and operational emissions of proposed projects. Given the above, the pending EIR will evaluate potential air quality impacts of the Project related to conflicts with the current Clean Air Plan, contributions to air quality violations, exposure of sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and creation of objectionable odors to determine whether there may be new or increased impacts compared to those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.

4.4 Biological Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on or adjacent to the Project site. The following project-level evaluation of biological resources impacts of the Project reflects the campus-wide biological resources analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.3 of the CMP Draft EIR and Section 3.7 of the Final EIR for the analysis of biological impacts associated with the CMP. At the time the 2007 CMP EIR was prepared, potential impacts to biological resources on the SF State campus were evaluated based on a review of the available literature regarding the status and known distribution of the special-status species or their habitats on the campus and in the surrounding areas. Additionally, a qualified biologist conducted a survey of the entire campus in 2006 and no special-status species or sensitive habitats were identified.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in biological resource impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.

**a) No new or increased impact.** Based on the results of the literature review and biological survey of the campus conducted in 2006, development anticipated under the 2007 CMP EIR was not expected to result in impacts to special-status plants. No special-status plant species or their habitats were present on the SF State campus in 2006. The Project site is developed with existing housing. Landscaping includes street trees and lawn around the periphery of the site, and landscaped trees, shrubs, and lawn in interior courtyards. No native vegetation or habitats exist on the Project site. Given its developed nature, no special-status plant species or their habitats exist on the Project site. Therefore, no impacts to special-status plant species would occur as a
result of the Project, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. No new or increased impacts on special-status plants would occur.

Based on the results of the literature review and biological survey of the campus conducted in 2006, there were no known occurrences of special-status birds or wildlife species, and no evidence of bird nests or nesting activities were observed on the campus. However, Impact BIO-2 in the 2007 CMP EIR indicated that there is low potential that the landscaped habitats on campus provide suitable nesting habitat for special-status birds, and, therefore, such nesting may be occurring on the campus, or may occur in the future. Accordingly, development under the CMP could potentially result in the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds as a result of tree removal or construction-related noise and disturbance, a potentially significant impact. CMP EIR Mitigation BIO-2A would be implemented in conjunction with the Project, which requires preconstruction nesting bird surveys and other measures, if construction occurs during the typical avian nesting season.

Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce this potentially significant impact related to construction activities to less than significant, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts on special-status wildlife would result with implementation of the Project.

b–d) **No new or increased impact.** As indicated in Impact BIO-1 of the 2007 CMP EIR, there were no sensitive habitats or wetlands present on the campus, based on the 2006 biological survey done in support of that EIR. Therefore, development on campus under the CMP would not result in any impacts on wetlands or other sensitive habitats. The Project site is developed, and the only vegetation consists of landscape trees and shrubs. Further, there is no evidence of any wetland features on the Project site, including wetland hydrology or other vegetation typical of wetland features. Therefore, the Project site does not contain wetlands or other sensitive habitats under federal or state regulations, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. No new or increased impacts to sensitive habitats or wetlands would result with implementation of the Project.

e) **No new or increased impact.** There are no local ordinances or policies of the City that would apply to projects on the SF State campus, as the City does not have jurisdiction over campus lands. The City does have tree protection legislation (CCSF 2012), but it would not apply to the state-owned property on the SF State campus. If the Project would result in tree removal in the City’s right-of-way, SF State would comply with the permitting requirements of the tree protection legislation. Therefore, the Project would not conflict with policies contained in that legislation. Construction of the Project would likely include the removal of all existing on-site trees, but the Project
would replace some trees and provide other planting on the site using native and drought-tolerant species. Therefore, no new or increased impacts related to policies for the protection of biological resources would result with implementation of the Project.

f) **No new or increased impact.** According to the 2007 CMP EIR Impact BIO-3, implementation of the CMP would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, National Community Conservation Plan, or other applicable Habitat Conservation Plan. The campus does not fall within the boundaries of a Habitat Conservation Plan or Natural Communities Conservation Plan, nor is it adjacent to any properties that have an adopted plan. Therefore, no new or increased impact related to conflicts with an adopted plan would result with implementation of the Project.

### 4.5 Cultural Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on or adjacent to the Project site. The project-level evaluation of cultural resource impacts of the Project reflects the campus-wide cultural resources analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.4 of the Campus Master Plan Draft EIR and Section 3.8 of the Final EIR for the analysis of cultural resources impacts associated with the CMP. A historic resources evaluation is underway for the former Parkmerced buildings located on the Project site, and the results will be included in the forthcoming EIR.
Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in cultural resource impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.

a) **Potentially significant new or increased impact.** The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout related to historic resources could be significant and unavoidable if CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C, requiring documentation of historical resources, would not fully mitigate the effects of demolition of those resources to less than significant. In such cases, CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C would reduce the impact to the extent feasible; however, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

The Project would involve construction of three buildings on Block 1 and Block 6 in the southern portion of the SF State campus. The existing housing on the two sites, which are former Parkmerced properties, are proposed to be demolished as part of the Project. Since the certification of the CMP EIR in 2007, more is now known about the eligibility of the Parkmerced area as a Historic District. The Parkmerced area is eligible as a Historic District, based on a Historical Resource Evaluation prepared for the Parkmerced area (Page & Turnbull 2009), which included the former Parkmerced properties located on the SF State campus.

Given the above, the pending EIR will evaluate potential historic resource impacts of the Project on the former Parkmerced properties on the campus to determine whether there may be new or increased impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.

b, d) **No new or increased impact.** The Project would include demolition of existing residential buildings on Block 1 and Block 6 in the southern portion of the SF State campus. Demolition and construction activities would occur on land that has been previously disturbed in some fashion. Although the Project site is primarily disturbed, portions of the site (e.g., the courtyards) may have received only surficial disturbance. Impacts of the Project include demolition of buildings on these blocks and construction of three new buildings and related facilities. Impacts to archaeological resources and human remains most often occur as a result of excavating or grading on undisturbed land and native soils. Traffic, erosion, vibration, and other activities can also affect the physical integrity of archaeological deposits. Demolition and construction activities would be located mostly on previously disturbed land; however, grading and excavating has some potential for extending into undisturbed native soils. Therefore, there is some potential that such activities could result in the inadvertent...
discovery of archaeological resources and human remains. CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-1A, CULT-1B, and CULT-3A through CULT-3D will be implemented to ensure that impacts related to inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources and human remains would be reduced to less than significant (see CMP EIR Impacts CULT-1 and CULT-3), as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would result with implementation of the Project.

c) **No new or increased impact.** The Project would result in demolition of existing residential buildings on Block 1 and Block 6, and the excavation of potentially undisturbed sediments during construction of the buildings and related facilities. As a result, the Project could result in adverse impacts to paleontological resources (see 2007 CMP EIR Impact CULT-4). Potential paleontological resources could exist in the Colma Formation that underlies the SF State campus. The Colma Formation underlies the Project site, according to the geotechnical investigation for the Project (Langan Treadwell Rollo 2016).

Implementation of 2007 CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-4A through CULT-4C will ensure that any excavation in undisturbed sediments of the Colma Formation is adequately monitored, and that any discovery of fossils is appropriately evaluated, documented, and curated. Incorporation of these measures would reduce potential impacts to less than significant, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, there would be no new or increased impacts related to paleontological resources with the Project.

The campus does not contain unique geologic resources, according to 2007 CMP EIR, and the Project would not impact such resources. Therefore, there would be no new or increased impacts related to unique geologic resources.

### 4.6 Geology and Soils

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii)</td>
<td>Strong seismic ground shaking?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iii)</td>
<td>Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iv)</td>
<td>Landslides?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered constructing buildings and related facilities on or adjacent the Project site. The project-level evaluation of geology and soils impacts of the Project reflects the campus-wide geology and soils analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.5 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of geology and soils impacts. Additionally, a Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation was prepared for Block 1 (Langan Treadwell Rollo 2016).

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in geology and soils impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.
a.i) No new or increased impact. Based on the analysis presented in the 2007 CMP EIR (Impact GEO-1) and in the Preliminary Geotechnical Report for Block 1, there are no active or potentially active faults identified on or near the SF State campus. The potential for fault rupture on the campus and Project site is very low. There is no potential for adverse effects related to fault rupture on the campus or Project site, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts related to fault rupture would result with the Project.

a.ii–a.iv, c) No new or increased impact. According to the 2007 CMP EIR (Impact GEO-1), severe seismic ground shaking and related ground failure is a possibility on the campus and on the Project site. Proximity to the San Andreas, San Gregorio, and Hayward Faults could subject the Project site to strong ground shaking from moderate to large earthquakes. Therefore, the potential for strong ground shaking is high. Strong ground shaking during an earthquake can result in ground failure such as that associated with soil liquefaction, lateral spreading, or differential compaction.

To address these concerns, the SF State campus routinely performs geotechnical investigations to evaluate the potential for liquefaction, settlement, and other types of ground failure at each building site. These reports include recommendations applicable to foundation design, earthwork, and site preparation to minimize or avoid the potential for building damage and injury. The preparation of site-specific geotechnical investigations is in accordance with 2007 CMP EIR Mitigation GEO-1. Implementation of this measure has already been initiated with preparation of a Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Block 1. A similar investigation will be prepared for Block 6. The recommendations of these investigations would be implemented during design and construction of the Project. Moreover, design of the Project and all future projects would comply with the California Building Code, which includes specific provisions for structural seismic safety. The Project and all projects on CSU campuses would also be subject to review by the CSU Seismic Review Board. With the continued implementation of Mitigation GEO-1, impacts related to seismic hazards would be less than significant, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur.

b) No new or increased impact. Based on the 2007 CMP EIR (Impact GEO-2), development under the CMP would not result in substantial erosion of soils during construction. Activities that would increase erosion include cut and fill, grading, trenching, boring, and removing trees and other vegetation. Demolition of the existing structures on site would include grading and removing trees and other vegetation. Construction of the Project would result in short-term soil-disturbing activities that
could lead to increased erosion due to cut and fill, grading, trenching, boring, and removing trees and other vegetation. However, because the Project is greater than 1 acre, it would be subject to the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements for construction site stormwater discharges, and would comply with those requirements. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required to be prepared and implemented under these requirements, which includes appropriate erosion-control and water-quality-control measures during site preparation, grading, construction, and post-construction. Implementation of the SWPPP for the Project would minimize short-term erosion impacts. Long-term impacts of the Project would not result in substantial erosion, as the soils would be covered by buildings, pavement, vegetation, and landscaping. Overall, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to soil erosion, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would result with implementation of the Project.

d) **No new or increased impact.** Expansive soils are those that possess “shrink/swell” characteristics, and are usually fine-grained clay sediments that expand and contract due to moisture and desiccation. As indicated in the 2007 CMP EIR, the soils beneath the SF State campus are well-drained loams and sandy loams formed on soft sandstone. These types of soils are typically not expansive. As expansive soils have not been identified on the SF State campus in previous geotechnical investigations, no impacts related to expansive soils were identified in the 2007 CMP EIR. Similarly, the Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation for Block 1 revealed no evidence of expansive soils on that site (Langan Treadwell Rollo 2016). Therefore, no new or increased impacts related to expansive soils would result with implementation of the Project.

e) **No new or increased impact.** The Project would not include installation of septic tanks, as the buildings would connect to sewer services. Therefore, the capability of the soils to support the operation of such tanks does not need to be evaluated.

### 4.7 Greenhouse Gas Emissions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The CMP EIR, certified in 2007, did not analyze potential campus-wide impacts related to GHG emissions, as Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines at that time did not address GHG emissions and there were no established thresholds.

a–b) Potentially significant new or increased impact. The Project would involve construction of three buildings on two sites in the southern portion of the SF State campus. The Project would likely result in a net increase in GHG emissions. Therefore, the pending EIR will quantify the net increase in GHG emissions with the Project and determine whether those emissions could have a significant impact on the environment and whether the Project would conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing GHG emissions. The pending EIR will determine whether there may be new impacts related to GHG emissions that were not identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.

4.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

<p>| Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact | No New or Increased Impact |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c)</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Be located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on or adjacent to the Project site. The project-level evaluation below reflects the campus-wide hazards and hazardous materials analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.6 of the CMP Draft EIR and Section 3.9 of the CMP Final EIR for the analysis of hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with the CMP. The evaluation below reflects updated 2016 conditions on the campus and Project site, based on the following:

- A new Environmental Data Resources Radius Map Report prepared for the Project site.
- Review of the list of Hazardous Waste and Substances sites from Department of Toxic Substances Control Envirostor database.
• Review of the list of leaking underground storage tank (LUST) sites by county and fiscal year from the State Water Resources Control Board GeoTracker database.

• Review of the list of solid waste disposal sites identified by the State Water Resources Control Board with waste constituents above hazardous waste levels outside the waste management unit.

• Review of the list of “active” Cease and Desist Orders and Cleanup and Abatement Orders from the State Water Resources Control Board.

• Review of the list of hazardous waste facilities subject to corrective action pursuant to Section 25187.5 of the Health and Safety Code, identified by the Department of Toxic Substances Control.

Dudek reviewed the sites identified in these databases to determine whether the Project site is included on the California Environmental Protection Agency’s hazardous waste and substances sites list (Cortese List). Per question VIII(d), above, sites identified in one of the regulatory databases compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5 could potentially present a significant impact. California Government Code Section 65962.5 requires the California Environmental Protection Agency to compile and update the Cortese List. The results of this updated review are presented below.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in hazards and hazardous materials impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.

a–d) No new or increased impact. Based on the 2007 CMP EIR, the Project would not increase the routine use of hazardous materials, generation of hazardous wastes, or transport of such materials. This impact would be less than significant, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, the Project would not create any new or increased hazards to the public, adjacent schools, or the environment (see CMP EIR Impact HAZ-2).

Based on the information reviewed from the above sources, there were several closed LUST cases on the SF State property. It does not appear that the releases were located within the Project area; however, two of the LUST case tanks could not be specifically

---

1 Closed files are those that have been determined to be remediated to the satisfaction of the lead public agency. Satisfactory remediation usually involves removal of the underground tanks and any contaminated soil.
located with available information. Although it is unlikely that a diesel underground storage tank was located on the Project site since it has been developed with housing since the 1950s, this cannot be confirmed without additional information.

Although it is possible that the Project site is included on the Cortese List compiled pursuant to California Government Code Section 65962.5, the LUST cases potentially located within the Project area were closed by the lead regulatory agency and are, therefore, unlikely to impact the environmental conditions of the Project area. The site is also not identified on the “Expanded Maher Area” map dated October 2013, which is prepared and updated under Article 22A of the San Francisco Health Code, the Maher Ordinance\(^2\) (CCSF 2014). As a result of the above, the Project would not expose construction workers or campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater, and the impact would be less than significant, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, the Project would not create any new or increased hazards related to soil or groundwater contamination (see CMP EIR Impact HAZ-3).

The Project would involve demolition of two-story residential buildings on Block 1 and Block 6, none of which are or have been used as a laboratory (see CMP EIR Impact HAZ-4). However, buildings may contain asbestos building materials, lead-based paint, and/or other regulated materials such as fluorescent lights and electrical ballasts. As indicated in the 2007 CMP EIR, the removal of asbestos-containing building materials is subject to the limitations of the BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2: Hazardous Materials; Asbestos Demolition, Renovation and Manufacturing. Additionally, Section 2.5, Project Approvals, of this document acknowledges the requirements under this Rule.

As indicated in the 2007 CMP EIR, the California OSHA lead standard for construction activities is implemented under Title 8 of the California Code of Regulations. The standard applies to any construction activity that may release lead dust or fumes, including manual scraping, manual sanding, heat gun applications, power tool cleaning, rivet busting, abrasive blasting, welding, cutting, or torch burning of lead-based coatings. Additionally, under California law, fluorescent lamps cannot be disposed of as municipal waste. Fluorescent tubes and bulbs may be managed as universal wastes under Title 22, Chapter 23 of the California Code of Regulations and are typically recycled. The campus would be required to conform

\(^2\) The Maher Ordinance covers areas with current or historical industrial use or zoning, areas within 100 feet of current or historical underground tanks or filled former San Francisco Bay or creek areas, and areas within 150 feet of a current or former elevated highway. Sites and areas covered per the Maher Ordinance are shown as shaded areas on the map at this location: http://www.sfplanning.org/ftp/files/publications_reports/library_of_cartography/Maher%20Map.pdf.
with all applicable regulations related to the removal of asbestos-containing building materials, lead-based paint, and fluorescent lamps. With implementation of these regulations, impacts would be less than significant, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts related to the removal and disposal of these materials would result with implementation of the Project.

e-f) **No new or increased impact.** The campus, which includes the Project site, is not located within 2 miles or within the vicinity of an airport. Therefore, the Project would not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project area.

f)  **No new or increased impact.** The campus, which includes the Project site, is not located within 2 miles or within the vicinity of an airport. Therefore, the Project would not result in safety hazards for people residing or working in the Project area.

g) **No new or increased impact.** According to the 2007 CMP EIR, the Project could impact implementation of the campus’s Emergency Operations Plan (SF State 2014). The Emergency Operations Plan provides guidance for campus activities in case of an emergency. Under current campus policy, contractors must complete work with the least possible obstruction to traffic, and must keep fire hydrants accessible at all times. To ensure that the demolition of buildings on Block 1 and Block 6 and Project construction would not interfere physically with the campus’ Emergency Operations Plan, the Project would be required to implement CMP EIR Mitigation HAZ-5A. Additionally, to ensure that new Project buildings have an adequate Emergency Operations Plan, the Project would be required to implement CMP EIR Mitigation HAZ-5B. Implementation of these mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to interference with emergency response plans to less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would result with implementation of the Project.

h) **No new or increased impact.** The SF State campus, including the Project site, is not on or adjacent to wildlands. Therefore, no impacts would result related to exposure to wildland fire hazards.
## Hydrology and Water Quality

### IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td>Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td>Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td>Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td>Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td>Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td>Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td>Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on or adjacent to the Project site. The project-level evaluation below reflects the campus-wide hydrology and water quality analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.7 of the CMP Draft EIR and Section 3.10 of the CMP Final EIR for the analysis of hydrology and water quality impacts associated with the CMP. The evaluation below also reflects site-specific conditions on the Project site.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in hydrology or water quality impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.

a) **No new or increased impact.** The Project would result in an increase in the discharge of wastewater from on-site restrooms and showers, but would not have an effect on wastewater quality. Therefore, Project-related wastewater flows would not have an adverse effect on the City’s Wastewater Treatment Facility or the waste discharge requirements under which the City’s Wastewater Treatment Facility currently operates, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR (Impact HYDRO-3). Therefore, no new or increased impacts would result with the Project.

b) **No new or increased impact.** According to 2007 CMP EIR Impact HYDRO-2, development under the CMP would not adversely affect groundwater. There are no operating or abandoned groundwater wells on campus. The campus does not directly draw groundwater from the Westside Groundwater Basin and does not plan to in the future. Therefore, the Project would not affect the groundwater basin through withdrawal of groundwater.

The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission is proposing the San Francisco Groundwater Supply Project to provide an average of up to 4 million gallons per day of groundwater to augment San Francisco’s municipal water supply. The Groundwater Supply Project, which involves construction of six groundwater production wells and related facilities in two phases, is expected to be completed in fall 2017. One of the proposed well sites is at the Lake Merced Pump Station, which is on Lake Merced Boulevard near Higuera Avenue, less than 0.25 mile from the Project site.

The Project would connect to existing water and combined sewer services adjacent the site. Compatibility with the City’s Stormwater Management Requirements and Design
Guidelines (CCSF 2016) would result in implementation of stormwater measures such that the post-Project site would reduce the existing stormwater runoff flow rate and volume by 25% for a 2-year, 24-hour event, as compared to pre-Project conditions. To achieve this design standard, the Project would implement and install appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff on site, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site discharges. Using these design standards and implementing such measures would provide for continued infiltration of stormwater into the groundwater basin. Therefore, no new or increased impacts related to groundwater would result with implementation of the Project.

c–f) **No new or increased impact.** As the campus contains no surface water bodies, the CMP, including the Project, would not have the potential to directly alter or otherwise affect any surface water features in the Project area; therefore, the Project would not result in erosion, siltation, flooding, or exceedance of storm drainage capacity associated with such alterations (Impacts HYDRO-1 and HYDRO-3).

**Construction.** Construction of the Project would result in short-term soil-disturbing activities that could lead to increased erosion and sedimentation. However, the Project would comply with the NPDES requirements for construction site stormwater discharges because the Project site is greater than 1 acre. A SWPPP is required to be prepared and implemented under these requirements, which includes appropriate erosion-control and water-quality-control measures during site preparation, grading, construction, and post-construction. Implementation of the SWPPP for the Project would minimize erosion and related impacts on water quality to less than significant, as was concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur with implementation of the Project.

**Operation.** The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission wastewater collection system collects both sewage and stormwater runoff in a combined system. At the time that the 2007 CMP EIR was prepared, the City indicated that, although sewer lines adjacent to the campus may be able to accommodate the CMP’s increase in dry-weather flows, these sewer lines may not be able to accommodate potential increases in wet-weather flows, which could cause flooding of the combined system on campus or in nearby neighborhoods (URS 2007). To assess the potential for impacts on the combined system due to the Project, site-specific stormwater and sewer discharge were evaluated, as further described below.

The Project would be located in a City combined stormwater and sewer area. To minimize impacts of the Project on the combined sewer system, SF State would implement a stormwater management approach compatible with the City’s Stormwater
Management Requirements and Design Guidelines (CCSF 2016). The Project site has an impervious area greater than 50%. Accordingly, the Project would implement a stormwater management approach that reduces the existing stormwater runoff flow rate and volume by 25% for a 2-year, 24-hour design storm. To achieve this design standard, the Project would implement and install appropriate stormwater management systems that retain runoff on site, promote stormwater reuse, and limit site discharges entering the combined sewer collection system. This, in turn, would limit the incremental demand on the collection system and wastewater facilities resulting from stormwater discharges, and minimize the need for upsizing or constructing new facilities.

By using these design criteria, the Project would exceed the requirements of the 2007 CMP, which called for no-net-increase in storm flow discharge from the campus to the combined sewer system. The stormwater management plan for the Project would be designed consistent with LEED credit SS 6.1 (as described by the U.S. Green Building Council), and would be compatible with the City’s Stormwater Management Requirements and Design Guidelines (CCSF 2016), as noted above.

In general, the City’s combined sewer lines are sized based on stormwater runoff because these flows greatly exceed sanitary waste flows. Based on Project stormwater discharges being reduced by 25% compared to existing conditions, and the minimal increase in Project sanitary sewer discharge, the Project would not have a significant impact on the capacity of the City’s combined sewer system. The impact is, therefore, less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur with the Project. The Parkmerced Project EIR also concluded that, with all the cumulative projects considered in that document, including the SF State 2007 CMP, impacts related to wastewater conveyance and treatment would be less than significant (CCSF 2010).

Additionally, given the use of low-impact-design approaches for the stormwater management system, and the anticipated increased infiltration, operation of the proposed Project would not substantially degrade water quality.

g–j) **No new or increased impact.** The Project site is located in an area that is not within a 100-year flood zone or in an area that would be inundated in the event of a dam failure. The campus is also located outside the area that is projected to experience inundation during a tsunami event (see CMP EIR Impact HYDRO-3). No impacts are anticipated, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR.
4.10 Land Use and Planning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X. LAND USE AND PLANNING – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Physically divide an established community?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on or adjacent to the Project site. The Project-level evaluation below reflects the campus-wide land use and planning analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.8 of the CMP Draft EIR and Section 3.11 of the CMP Final EIR for the analysis of land use impacts associated with the CMP. The evaluation below also reflects site-specific conditions on the Project site.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in land use impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.

a) **No new or increased impact.** Based on the 2007 CMP EIR Impact LU-1, implementation of the CMP would not physically divide an established community, as planned growth and development would occur on the existing campus, which is already developed. The Project, located on existing campus lands, would not physically divide an established community, and the impact would be less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. No new or increased impact would occur with the Project.

b–c) **No new or increased impact.** The CSU system is the only agency with land use jurisdiction over campus projects and campus development. The adopted CMP is the applicable campus land use plan. Thus, campus development that is consistent with the
adopted CMP would not have land use impacts (see CMP EIR Impact LU-2). The Project, including the Master Plan revision, contributes to the CMP vision to create a prominent gateway and main street atmosphere for the campus on Holloway Avenue. Moreover, it combines several similar academic uses to achieve the objectives of the campus. Upon consideration and approval of the Project by the Trustees and the approval of revisions to the Master Plan map by the Trustees, the Project would fully conform with the adopted CMP. Additionally, there are no habitat conservation plans that apply to the campus or the Project site. Therefore, no new or increased impacts related to conflicts with adopted plans or policies would occur.

4.11 Mineral Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XI. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The evaluation below reflects the mineral resources analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.13 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of mineral resources impacts associated with the CMP.

a–b) **No new or increased impact.** The Project would not result in the loss of availability of mineral resources, because CMP development, including the Project, would occur within a developed urban area. There are no available mineral resources in the Project area. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would result from the Project.
4.12 Noise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XII. NOISE – Would the project result in:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on the Project site. The evaluation below reflects the campus-wide noise analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.9 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of noise impacts associated with the CMP. The evaluation below also reflects site-specific conditions on and adjacent to Project site.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in noise impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.
a, c) **No new or increased impact.** The 2007 CMP EIR concluded that the increase in vehicular traffic due to campus growth would not result in a noticeable increase in permanent ambient noise levels (Impact NOIS-2). Operation of the concert hall, Creative Arts replacement building, and student housing/mixed-use building would not be expected to substantially increase campus-related traffic, and, therefore, would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise along vicinity roadways.

Operation of the Creative Arts replacement building, concert hall, and student housing/mixed-use building would result in typical noise levels associated with routine activities such as use of landscape maintenance equipment, mechanical equipment, vehicle and bicycle parking activities, and pedestrian activity. Most of these activities currently exist on and adjacent to the Project site associated with current site uses. The new concert hall may result in an increase in event activity, but the activities would be similar to those existing elsewhere on campus at other theater venues. Events involving indoor public address systems would be temporary and short-term, and would be held inside buildings. This type of indoor noise is anticipated to be attenuated within the buildings. No outdoor public address systems would be installed with the Project. Overall, permanent operational noise would not result in a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the Project vicinity. The impact is less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur with implementation of the Project.

b) **No new or increased impact.** According to 2007 CMP EIR Impact NOIS-1, typical construction activities using conventional construction techniques and equipment would not generate excessive ground vibration or groundborne noise. Pile driving, blasting, and other special construction techniques, which typically cause ground vibration and groundborne noise, would not be used for demolition or construction of facilities identified under the CMP. Impacts related to ground vibration and groundborne noise during construction are anticipated to be less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur.

d) **No new or increased impact.** According to CMP EIR Impact NOIS-1, construction of campus facilities under the CMP could expose nearby sensitive receptors to substantial noise. At distances of 100 feet or more from the construction activity, noise from on-campus construction is predicted to be below the identified significance criterion of 80 A-weighted decibels maximum measured sound level during daytime hours (between 7 a.m. and 8 p.m.). However, if a construction site were less than 100 feet from a nearby receptor, the noise levels from certain construction activities could exceed the identified significance criterion.
There are sensitive receptors located within 100 feet of both Block 1 and Block 6, the distance at which construction noise could be potentially significant. These receptors include on-campus academic buildings north and east of Block 1 and north of Block 6, and on- and off-campus residential uses in University Park South and in the adjacent Parkmerced.

Implementation of CMP EIR Mitigation NOIS-1 would control construction noise and reduce the potential impacts to less than significant at most locations and under most conditions. Mitigation NOIS-1 would be implemented in conjunction with Project construction and would control construction noise at sensitive receptor locations surrounding the Project site to the extent practicable and feasible, and would reduce the potential impact at most locations to less than significant. However, there could potentially be some Project construction activities where the noise levels would not be reduced to levels below the thresholds, even with the recommended mitigation. Therefore, conservatively, the impact would be significant and unavoidable, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR, and no new or increased impacts would occur. As part of the Trustees’ certification of the CMP EIR in November 2007, Findings of Fact were adopted that provide a statement of overriding considerations for this impact, as required under CEQA.

e–f) **No new or increased impact.** The SF State campus is not located within an airport land use plan or within 2 miles of a public airport or private airstrip. No impact would occur.

### 4.13 Population and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impact</th>
<th>Mitigation Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING</strong> – Would the project:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?</td>
<td></td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The evaluation below reflects the population analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.10 of the CMP Draft EIR and Section 3.12 of the CMP Final EIR for the analysis of population and housing impacts associated with the CMP.

a) **No new or increased impact.** The Project would not directly or indirectly induce substantial population growth. Although the Project would include new academic space, SF State is at or near the adopted enrollment cap of 25,000 FTE for the campus and, therefore, cannot add new students with the Project (SF State 2015). The Project also would not result in the hiring of substantial new employees (see CMP EIR Impact POP-1). The impact is less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur with the Project.

b–c) **No new or increased impact.** The existing residential block on the south side of Holloway Avenue between Varela and Cardenas Avenues (Block 6) contains 27 residential units that would be demolished and replaced with a multi-story building. The existing residential block at Tapia Triangle (Block 1) contains 27 residential units that would be demolished and replaced with the Creative Arts replacement building and the concert hall. As illustrated in Table 1, accounting for the loss of existing housing units on the two parcels, the net increase in housing would be 360 beds.

All 27 units in Block 6 are currently occupied by students and licensed as bed space during the academic year. Of the 27 apartments in Block 1, 19 are currently licensed to students as bed space during the academic year. Approximately eight units are currently licensed as apartments to SF State affiliates and non-affiliates. Because the number of displaced units occupied by non-University affiliates is small compared to the projected increase in housing in San Francisco and the Bay Area, this displacement would not necessitate construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and the impact would be less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur with the Project.

Additionally, given that the Project would demolish existing housing, SF State would comply with the California Relocation Assistance Act (California Government Code 7260 et seq.), which applies to state entities that may displace residents and businesses. This act generally requires that public entities provide relocation assistance to people who are displaced as the result of the acquisition of property for a public use. Since the acquisition of University Park South by SF State, the number of legacy tenants has declined substantially. Any remaining legacy tenants would be offered relocation assistance, as required by law. SF State would provide displaced non-University affiliates
with the option to relocate to units in other campus housing. Given the option to relocate to housing elsewhere on campus, the proposed demolition of existing housing with the Project would not result in the displacement of substantial numbers of people.

4.14 Public Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives for any of the public services:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police protection?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other public facilities?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on or adjacent to the Project site. The evaluation below reflects the public services analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.12 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of public services impacts associated with the CMP. The evaluation also reflects site-specific conditions on and adjacent to the Project site, as relevant.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in public services impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.

a) No new or increased impact. The 2007 CMP EIR did not identify any significant impacts related to public services associated with growth and development of the campus. According to CMP EIR Impact UTL-4, construction of new or physically altered fire protection facilities would not be required to serve buildout under the CMP. Although a new, expanded SF State Police Station may be required with buildout under the CMP, the
impacts of construction of the new facility would be reduced to less than significant with implementation of mitigation measures identified in the 2007 CMP EIR. The Project would not result in substantial school, park, or other public facilities impacts (see CMP EIR Impact UTL-5). There are no Project-specific conditions that would modify these conclusions. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would result with implementation of the Project.

### 4.15 Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Impacts</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Significant Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>XV. RECREATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DISCUSSION**

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on and adjacent to the Project site. The evaluation below reflects the recreation analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.12 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of recreational services impacts associated with the CMP. The evaluation below also reflects site-specific conditions on and adjacent to the Project site, as relevant.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in recreation impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.

a–b) **No new or increased impact.** Implementation of the CMP would not result in a significant use of off-campus parks or recreational facilities, given the presence of existing and planned recreational facilities on campus (see CMP EIR Impact UTL-5).
Thus, no new or increased impacts on off-campus parks and recreational facilities would result with the Project.

### 4.16 Transportation and Traffic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC – Would the project:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program, including, but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? |
| Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact | No New or Increased Impact |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? |
| Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact | No New or Increased Impact |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? |
| Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact | No New or Increased Impact |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? |
| Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact | No New or Increased Impact |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

| f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities? |
| Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact | No New or Increased Impact |
| ☒ | ☐ | ☐ | ☐ |

### DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on and adjacent to the Project site. The evaluation below reflects the campus-wide transportation analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.11 of the CMP Draft EIR and Section 3.13 of the CMP Final EIR for the analysis of traffic, circulation, and parking impacts associated with the CMP.
transportation analysis is being prepared for the Project, and the results of this analysis will be included in the forthcoming EIR.

a–e) Potentially new or increased impact. The 2007 CMP and the subsequent adopted TDM Program (Nelson/Nygard 2009) indicates that it is the campus's objective to continue to grow and develop, as proposed under the CMP, while minimizing the transportation impacts of the increase in enrolled students and employees. More specifically, the TDM plan outlines a program that would minimize the daily AM and PM peak-period vehicle trips to the campus. The 2007 CMP EIR indicated that the combined effect of the baseline TDM, parking, transit, and housing programs of the CMP would likely be to maintain campus-related auto traffic levels at their then-current (2006) rates through 2020. The 2007 CMP EIR considered this no-net-increase in vehicle trips scenario in a traffic analysis that also provided a more conservative traffic scenario that estimated trip generation from proposed campus growth more traditionally. The more conservative analysis indicated that campus growth could potentially result in significant traffic-related impacts on vicinity roadways. To address these potential impacts, the campus is implementing CMP EIR Mitigation TRA-1, which required the campus to conduct a new baseline cordon survey, completed in 2008. Subsequent cordon surveys are required every 3 years and no later than the addition of each 1,000 students in head count enrollment. If vehicle trips increase over the base year, various measures, including increasing the frequency of cordon surveys and increasing TDM programs, are called for. The most recent cordon survey, conducted in 2016, revealed that daily and peak-hour campus-related vehicle trips have decreased since the 2008 base year (Nelson/Nygard 2016).

The Project would involve construction of three buildings on two sites in the southern portion of the SF State campus: the Creative Arts replacement building and the concert hall on Block 1, also referred to as the Tapia Triangle, and the student housing/mixed-use building on Block 6, located on the south side of Holloway Avenue. The forthcoming EIR will estimate trip generation associated with Project vehicle and transit trips, and evaluate transportation hazards, emergency access, and conflicts with adopted transportation policies to determine whether the Project could result in new or increased impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.
4.17 Utilities and Service Systems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider, which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

The 2007 CMP EIR considered building and related facility construction on and adjacent to the Project site. The evaluation below reflects the campus-wide utilities analysis provided in the 2007 CMP EIR. See Section 4.12 of the CMP Draft EIR for the analysis of utilities and impacts associated with the CMP. The evaluation below also reflects site-specific conditions where relevant.

The Master Plan revision described in Section 2, resulting in the renaming and/or relocation of Project elements, would not result in utilities impacts over those previously described in the 2007 CMP EIR. Project-level analysis of future projects on the adjacent West Campus Green, which are considered in the Master Plan map revision, would be conducted at the time that future projects on that site are proposed for development.
a) **No new or increased impact.** Refer to Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality.

b–e) **No new or increased impact.** The Project would not result in any new significant utility impacts (see CMP EIR Impact UTL-1 and CMP EIR Impact UTL-2). The uses proposed on the Project site would incrementally increase the campus’s demand for water and generation of wastewater. The use of bathrooms and other fixtures would require water and would generate wastewater. The Project would result in a net increase in potable water demand and wastewater generation over current residential uses on the Project site. The Project would result in an increase in potable water use of approximately 32,100 gallons per day (gpd) on typical days, and up to approximately 44,100 gpd on performance days when the concert hall would be in use. The Project would generate approximately 30,500 gpd of wastewater on typical days and up to approximately 41,900 gpd on performance days. The Project’s water use would not result in the need for off-campus water supply distribution system improvements or new water entitlements. The Project wastewater generation would not require off-campus improvements to the combined sewer system (see Section 4.9, Hydrology and Water Quality, for additional information). The impacts would be less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur.

g–f) **No new or increased impact.** The 2007 CMP EIR evaluated construction of the Project and demolition of existing buildings that are at or beyond their useful life. CMP EIR Impact UTL-5 concluded that the demolition of existing structures would not result in solid waste impacts. According to Impact UTL-5, solid waste from the campus would be directed to a landfill that has remaining capacity beyond the planning horizon for the CMP, and the impact was identified as less than significant. Therefore, as the Project would comply with applicable regulations related to solid waste and would be served by a landfill with sufficient remaining capacity, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts related to solid waste, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Further, the residual concrete from the demolition would be recycled to minimize solid waste directed to the landfill. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would result with implementation of the Project.
XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?

c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant New or Increased Impact</th>
<th>No New or Increased Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DISCUSSION

a) Potentially significant new or increased impact. The Project would not substantially reduce habitat of fish or wildlife species or other special-status species, as the SF State campus constitutes a built environment. There are no sensitive habitats or wetlands located on campus, and no special-status species are known to occupy the campus. However, special-status birds could potentially nest in trees on campus. Because some or all of the landscape trees on the Project site would be removed, the Project would implement CMP EIR Mitigation BIO-2A, which requires preconstruction nesting bird surveys and other measures if demolition or construction occurs during the typical avian nesting season (see CMP EIR Impact BIO-2). Implementation of this mitigation measure would reduce the potential impact on nesting habitats of special-status birds to less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts would occur.
Although it is not anticipated that new archaeological resources or human remains would be encountered, CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-1A, CULT-1B, and CULT-3A through CULT-3D would be implemented to ensure that impacts related to inadvertent discovery of archaeological resources and human remains would be reduced to less than significant, as concluded in the 2007 CMP EIR. Therefore, no new or increased impacts related to archaeological resources would occur.

The 2007 CMP EIR determined that the impacts of CMP buildout related to historic resources could be significant and unavoidable if CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C, requiring documentation of historical resources, would not fully mitigate the effects of demolition of those resources to less than significant. In such cases, CMP EIR Mitigation CULT-2C would reduce the impact to the extent feasible; however, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. Since the certification of the CMP EIR in 2007, more is now known about the eligibility of the Parkmerced area as a Historic District, which included the former Parkmerced properties located on the SF State campus. The forthcoming EIR will evaluate potential historic resource impacts of the Project and reasonably foreseeable cumulative development on the former Parkmerced properties on and adjacent to the campus to determine whether there may be new or increased historic resource impacts over and above those identified in the 2007 CMP EIR.

b) \textbf{Potentially significant new or increased impact.} The 2007 CMP EIR evaluated the cumulative effects associated with growth and development under the CMP. See Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures, of the 2007 CMP EIR for the evaluation of cumulative impacts. In general, the cumulative effects associated with the Project have already been analyzed and assessed as part of the 2007 CMP EIR, and no new or increased impacts are anticipated with the Project in most impact categories. However, cumulative impacts associated with reasonably foreseeable cumulative development will be updated and reassessed, as relevant and necessary, for the topics that will be carried into the forthcoming EIR, including aesthetics, air quality, GHG emissions, historical resources, and transportation/traffic, to determine whether new or increased cumulative impacts would result with the Project.

c) \textbf{Potentially significant new or increased impact.} The Project would not result in new or increased hazards to humans related to exposure to contaminated soils or groundwater, emergency response, or proximity to airport activities. The forthcoming EIR will determine whether new or increased impacts to humans would result with the Project as a result of construction emissions and/or transportation hazards.
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APPENDIX A

2007 Campus Master Plan EIR Mitigation Measures that Apply to the Project
### APPENDIX A

**2007 CMP EIR Mitigation Measures That Apply to the Project**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1 Biological Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO-2A</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5 Cultural Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>CULT-1A</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A (Continued)

**CULT-1B:** For an archaeological site that is encountered during the subsurface testing or during construction, the campus shall:

- Retain a qualified archaeologist to determine whether the resource qualifies as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource.
- If the resource is determined to be a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource, the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the campus, shall prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the recovery that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, and implement the data recovery plan prior to or during development of the site. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials.

**CULT-2C:** For a structure or building that has been determined by a qualified architectural historian to qualify as a historical resource, and where avoidance is not feasible, documentation and treatment shall be carried out as described below:

- If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).
- If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the SF State Library. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.
- If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.
If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment.

**CULT-3A:** The campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1 to minimize the potential for disturbance or destruction of human remains in an archaeological context and to preserve them in place, if feasible.

**CULT-3B:** The campus shall provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor any excavation (including archaeological excavation) within the boundaries of a known Native American archaeological site.

**CULT-3C:** In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the County of San Francisco Medical Examiner of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the campus will ensure that the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

**CULT-3D:** If human remains cannot be left in place, the campus shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided an opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinternment. The campus shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As stipulated by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the campus shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.
### CULT-4A:
Prior to construction, a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted regarding the likelihood of encountering significant fossils on a given construction site. If the paleontologist determines fossils may be present, a paleontologic monitor shall be present at each excavation that penetrates potentially fossiliferous undisturbed native soil of the Colma Formation that has been identified by the paleontologist as moderately to highly sensitive.

### CULT-4B:
If a monitor is not required, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential paleontological resources and must notify the campus if paleontological resources are found.

### CULT-4C:
If paleontological resources are discovered, all soil disturbing work shall cease within 100 feet of the location. The resources shall be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist who will determine the resource’s potential scientific significance. If the find is determined to be significant, or potentially significant, a qualified paleontologist shall design and carry out data recovery consistent with the Standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists. Adequate recordation and recovery would include, at a minimum, the following:

- Development of site-specific environment and contextual information regarding the particular resource.
- Archival research and review of other studies in the area.
- Accurate recordation and excavation of the noted resources.
- In the event that a major significant find is uncovered, prior to excavating the significant resource, the campus shall ensure that an appropriate museum or scientific repository is selected for curation of the recovered materials.

### 3.6 Geological Resources

**GEO-1:** Where existing geotechnical information is not adequate, detailed geotechnical investigations shall be performed for areas that will support buildings or foundations. Such investigations for building or foundation projects located in the valley portion of the SF State campus will comply with the California Geological Survey’s Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (Special Publication 117), which specifically address the mitigation of liquefaction and landslide hazards in designated Seismic Hazard Zones (CGS, 1997). All recommendations of the geotechnical investigations will be incorporated into Project designs.

### 3.8 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

**HAZ-5B:** New building and/or department-specific Emergency Operations Plans shall be developed for any new development project.
## 3.12 Noise

The campus shall include the following noise control measures in all construction contracts for construction projects that are within 100 feet of a sensitive receptor:

- Construction equipment used on campus is properly maintained and has been outfitted with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.
- Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.
- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses.
- Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise will be informed in writing at least a week before the start of each construction project.
- Loud construction activity (i.e., construction activity such as jackhammering, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall not be scheduled during finals week.
- Loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic use shall, to the extent feasible, be scheduled during weekends, holidays, Thanksgiving break, Christmas break, Spring break, or Summer break.
- Loud construction activity within 500 feet of a residential building shall be restricted to the hours between 7:30 AM and 7:30 PM, Monday through Saturday.
January 28, 2011

Mr. Ron Miguel, President
San Francisco Planning Commission
Attn: Jonas Ionin, Acting Commission Secretary
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Submitted via email: jonas.ionin@sfgov.org

Re: Parkmerced Project (SFPD File No. 2008.0021E)

Dear Commissioner Miguel,

As the San Francisco Planning Commission meets to consider the environmental and planning impacts of the proposed Parkmerced Project, the historic preservation community remains deeply concerned about the destructive impact of the Project on the Parkmerced Historic District.

Parkmerced was determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historical Resources as a significant example of planned residential development in San Francisco and the work of master landscape architect Thomas Dollier Church and his celebrated colleague Robert Royston. According to the Cultural Landscape Foundation, Parkmerced is one of only four remaining examples of large-scale, pre- and post-World War II residential developments in the country and is without question of national significance. The Foundation has identified Parkmerced as a potential National Historic Landmark candidate—an elite group of less than 2,600 such properties in America. As one of Thomas Church’s largest and most publicly accessible works, Parkmerced is also an important community resource.

The six undersigned local, state, regional, and national historic preservation organizations urge the City of San Francisco to adopt Project alternatives or components of alternatives that maximize preservation of the Parkmerced Historic District and retain its eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources and the National Register of Historic Places. We question the consistency of the proposed Project with San Francisco’s Planning Code Priority Policies and urge the City to require additional, more substantive mitigation measures for the severe impact to historic resources that could result from the Parkmerced Project.

Requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act

CEQA reflects the statewide policy that projects with significant environmental impacts, including impacts to the State’s historic environment, should not be approved “if there are
feasible alternatives ... available which would substantially lessen the significant environmental effects ...” (Pub. Resources Code § 21002.) CEQA thus requires that alternatives be analyzed that would “feasibly obtain most of the basic objectives of the project.” (Guideline § 15126.6 subd.(a).)¹ Findings supporting the infeasibility of an alternative must be supported by “substantial evidence” based on an independent analysis by the lead agency. (Pub. Resources Code § 21081.5; Preservation Action Council v. City of San Jose (2001) 141 Cal. App.4th 1336.) An alternative need not accomplish every project objective, or maximize profitability, to be considered feasible under CEQA.²

Any project that would demolish a historic resource necessarily has a significant effect on the environment, requiring a lead agency to study and adopt feasible alternatives such as rehabilitation, if available and practical. (See Pub. Resources Code § 21081; 21084.1.) CEQA’s requirements to identify and analyze feasible alternatives in an EIR are manifest when a project threatens historic resources, as is its substantive mandate that the lead agency not approve a project if a feasible alternative exists.

The Project Alternative Analysis Indicates that an Environmentally Superior Alternative is Feasible

As noted in the DEIR, Project alternatives proposing retention of portions of the Parkmerced Historic District result in substantially fewer impacts to historic resources and a range of other environmental qualities. Under Alternative C, Retention of the Historic District Central Core Alternative, the Parkmerced Historic District would retain eligibility for the California and National Registers while allowing for new development and densification on other parts of the Project site. The DEIR further identifies Alternative C as the environmentally superior option. This alternative is preferable not only because it would preserve an important part of San Francisco’s history, but because the reuse of existing infrastructure would result in substantially fewer emissions of greenhouse gases, making Alternative C the truly sustainable alternative (see DEIR VII.32). Finally, Alternative C would provide cost savings by maintaining the existing stream of rental revenue and significantly reducing the scope of new construction.

To date, the City has provided no information to justify the rejection of environmentally superior alternatives based on “economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (Guideline § 15126.6(b).) The City acknowledges that all of the proposed alternatives are “potentially feasible in that they would attain most of the basic objectives identified in Chapter III, Project Description, all are within boundaries of the property under the control of the Project sponsor and all are capable of being constructed on the Project Site.” (Comments and Responses, Master Response A.4, emphasis added.)

---
¹ “Feasible” is defined as “capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, social, and technological factors.” (Pub. Resources Code § 21061.1.)
CEQA requires that the EIR provide sufficient information about each alternative “to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project.” (Guideline at § 15126.6(d).) The reasons and facts for which the sponsor or City has rejected alternatives is essential information that must be provided to the public in the EIR. 3 In contrast, the DEIR and Comments and Responses documents for the Project contain no discussion of why various alternatives may be considered infeasible. Contrary to the public disclosure function of the EIR, the City maintains that this information need not be presented in the EIR documents, but can be held back until the CEQA findings are released just prior to project approval. 4

The Proposed Project is Inconsistent with the City’s Planning Priority Policies

The undersigned organizations take exception to the statements in the DEIR and the Comments and Responses document that the Parkmerced Project is consistent with the City’s Planning Priority Policies, particularly Priority Policy 7, which states “that landmarks and historic buildings be preserved” (Planning Code at § 101(b)(7).). The DEIR stated that the Parkmerced Historic District does not qualify for such protection, because it “is not currently included in any federal, state or local register.” (DEIR IV.1 fn1). Nothing in the Planning Code, however, indicates that protection of the City’s landmarks and historic structures is limited to formally listed sites on a register. This narrow interpretation of City policy also runs counter to CEQA, which makes no distinction between eligible and listed resources in determining what is historic. 5

In the Comments and Responses volume of the Project EIR, the City again posits that the project is consistent with Priority Policy 7 because the policy specifically references “historic buildings,” and the buildings at Parkmerced are not individually significant. (Response TR.34.1). Parkmerced is a historic district composed of individual elements that lack individual distinction, however, the contributing elements of the district—both buildings and landscape elements—have historic value. There is also a clear distinction between demolishing individual contributing resources in a historic district and demolition of nearly the entirety of a historic district. The conclusion that this degree of destruction is consistent with the City’s policy to protect its architectural and cultural heritage is nonsensical. We maintain that the Parkmerced Project is not consistent with Priority Policy 7.

---

3 See Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of the University of California (1988) 47 Cal.3d. 376, requiring preparation of a new EIR because the lead agency had failed to “explain in meaningful detail...a range of alternatives to the proposed project and, if [it] finds them to be infeasible, the reasons and facts that [it] claims support its conclusion.” Id. at 406.
4 Comments and Responses, Master Response A.5.
5 Cal. Pub. Res. Code § 21084.1; “For purposes of this section, an historical resource is a resource listed in, or determined to be eligible for listing in, the California Register of Historical Resources” (emphasis added.)
Proposed Mitigation Measures Remain Grossly Inadequate

While the undersigned are opposed to any demolition of the existing resource, in the event it occurs, the mitigation measures must be much stronger than those proposed in the EIR. Although it is undisputed that the Parkmerced Project would cause significant and unavoidable impacts to historic resources, the Project sponsors continue to offer insufficient mitigation or compensation for this potential loss. The proposed project would result in the near total destruction of a historic district spanning over 192 acres, including demolition of 170 contributing resources and the majority of Thomas Church’s designed landscape. The proposed mitigation measures outlined in the DEIR and the Comments and Responses document, consisting of HABS, HAER, and HALS documentation, donation of archival materials, and permanent public interpretation, are tokenisms of little benefit to preservation of historic resources in San Francisco. Given the sheer enormity of the loss at stake, we believe much more should be required.

In its review of the Project DEIR, the California Office of Historic Preservation (OHP) stated that the mitigation measures proposed in the DEIR, specifically HABS/HAER documentation, “does not... in any way mitigate such a devastating alteration to a historic district.” The OHP further stated that “the proposed demolition of the Parkmerced resources is indeed a circumstance in which HABS/HAER documentation is clearly insufficient mitigation in relation to the significant adverse effect that wholesale demolition would have on Parkmerced’s historic resources...” (Comments and Responses, Letter 3, page 2.)

Indeed, it is a well-established precedent under CEQA that documentation and interpretation do not meaningfully compensate for the destruction of historic resources. As recognized by the court in League for Protection of Oakland’s Architectural and Historic Resources v. City of Oakland (1997) 52 Cal.App.4th 896: “Documentation of the historical features of the building and exhibition of a plaque do not reasonably begin to alleviate the impacts of its destruction. A large historical structure, once demolished, normally cannot be adequately replaced by reports and commemorative markers.” (Id. at 909.)

Echoing this point, the court in Architectural Heritage Association v. County of Monterey (2004) 122 Cal.App.4th 1095 proclaimed: "As drawing a chalk mark around a dead body is not mitigation, so archival documentation cannot normally reduce destruction of an historic resource to an insignificant level." (Id. at 1119.)

The severity of the historic resource impacts at Parkmerced demands proportional mitigation measures with an appropriate nexus to the project impacts. Alternative or additional mitigation measures may include:
• Funding to complete a cultural resource survey of historic landscape resources in San Francisco, including development of landscape-specific survey methods and tools;
• Funding to complete a comprehensive, professional cultural resource survey of the southwest quadrant of the City of San Francisco; and/or
• Funding to complete a context study and survey of Modern and post-World War II historic and architectural resources in the City of San Francisco.

Certainly, Planning Department staff with expertise and experience in conducting and managing historic resource survey projects in San Francisco can advise the Commission and sponsor on the likely costs associated with these mitigation measures.

Mitigation could also include funding for the established San Francisco Historic Preservation Fund, administered by the Historic Preservation Fund Committee and the Mayor’s Office of Economic and Workforce Development. Contributing to publicly administered funds supporting historic preservation activities as a form of mitigation has several precedents in California, including the Long Beach Navy Memorial Heritage Fund established in association with demolition of the Long Beach Naval Complex in Long Beach, CA; the Historic Schools Investment Fund established in connection with demolition of the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles; and the San Francisco Historic Preservation Fund itself, established following illegal demolition work on the Emporium Department Store.

In addition to the mitigation measures proposed here, the undersigned organizations request that the City adopt protections in the Project Development Agreement and CEQA findings prohibiting preemptive demolition of any contributing elements or alteration of character-defining features of the Parkmerced Historic District, including spatial organization, circulation, topography, buildings and structures, vegetation, landscape features, and views. Specifically, the City should impose a mitigation measure barring issuance of demolition permits until a permanent replacement project is pending and the sponsor has demonstrated the financial resources necessary to complete the proposed replacement project within a reasonable timeframe (i.e. construction to commence within six months of receipt of all necessary City approvals). We understand that the Planning Code already includes similar requirements, but feel it is important to codify and reinforce these protections in Project-specific documents.

Conclusion

Parkmerced is a nationally significant example of landscape design and World War II-era heritage in the San Francisco Bay Area, as well as one of the largest, and few publicly accessible, works by master landscape architect Thomas Church. The undersigned organizations strongly urge the City to adopt Project alternatives or components of Project alternatives maximizing preservation of the Parkmerced Historic District and
retaining its eligibility for the California Register of Historical Resources and National Register of Historic Places. In addition, we believe that the proposed project is patently inconsistent with the City’s Priority Policies. Finally, while we remain opposed to any demolition of the existing resource, in the event the Project is approved, additional mitigation measures are necessary to meaningfully compensate for the severe impacts on the City’s irreplaceable heritage.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Parkmerced Project. Please do not hesitate to contact our organizations with regard to any questions related to these comments.

Sincerely,

Anthea M. Hartig, Ph.D.
Director, Western Office
National Trust for Historic Preservation

Cindy Heitzman
Executive Director
California Preservation Foundation

Mike Buhler
Executive Director
San Francisco Architectural Heritage

Charles A. Birnbaum
President
The Cultural Landscape Foundation

Bob Pullum
Director of Advocacy
Northern California Chapter, DOCOMOMO-US

Janet Gracyk
President
Northern California Chapter, Historic American Landscape Survey

cc: Rick Cooper, Major Environmental Analyses, San Francisco Planning Department
M. Wayne Donaldson, California State Historic Preservation Officer
San Francisco Historic Preservation Commission
San Francisco Preservation Consortium
Gabriel Metcalf, Executive Director, SPUR
Since Stellar Management has yet to produce any significant proof of Parkmerced’s deterioration, I am submitting evidence, and images of the current dry-rot repair images I have taken during the 5 years on site when SFSU-CSU and Parkmerced’s (Stellar Management) worked on portions of the site during renovations. This is only a basic rudimentary “non-professional” review of deterioration and soundness yet it gives a strong indication of the lack of proof to date by the owner on the issues and cost/analysis on the actual costs and deterioration levels of the garden units vs. the tower units, and the viability of demolition vs. sustainable preservation. The photo above is of 55 Chumasero which sustained significant structural damage during the 1989 Quake, the tower sits on a sloping hillside, which has had trees removed, and is in an area of liquifaction per US Geological Seismic Maps. The existing towers have notable leaks on the upper floors, as the walls taper, and were the first to utilize lift-slab technology and sika-flex a concrete enhancement formula in the 1940’s and 50’s. These towers are the ONLY towers west of twin peaks un-retrofitted. The towers received “face-lift” and cosmetic work by stellar, inclusive of fire-alarm safety system and elevator upgrades. The majority of the work on the garden units has been focused on cosmetic appearance and “flipping” of the garden unit interiors to a more “luxury” based model, often ignoring low-tech sustainable implementation of water retention, solar, and energy efficiency efforts during renovations Stellar focused primarily on a quick transformation of the site including spending a large amount on trim work on the exteriors and other systems upgrades like trash/recycling/composting that engendered complaints to the SF Civil Rights Committee and concerns on the accessibility, and purchasing of large amounts of new equipment and vehicles to service Parkmerced, while having unskilled labor handle trash issues instead of the local trash city services.

June 6, 2011
By
Aaron Goodman
Parkmerced has a fully mature landscape, that is lush, green, and open. The majority of interior courtyards per Charles Birnbaum of the Cultural Landscape Foundation have great integrity to the original design and concepts of Thomas Dolliver Church the father of modern landscape design. What is missing in the discussion on the proposal is any “proof of deterioration”. As I have witnessed the construction ongoing for the University Park South Blocks and some of the Parkmerced blocks, I have assembled a few photos to exhibit the extent of damage and repairs typical of the current site buildings. The image below right shows rooftops many of which were renovated by Stellar management during the last two years, with new flashing and roofing systems.
The main issue of the garden unit “water intrusion” and claims on flashing come from the eave edge, and gutter system and the intrusion of water inside the stucco finishes due to rust and wear. The solution by SFSU-CSU was to remove the gutter from the wall and redo the detailing at the exterior with new flashing and roofing. Parkmerced’s (Stellar’s) renovation work consisted of paint and trim work, with zero renovation of the existing scuppers and downspouts (bottom left). The majority of SFSU-CSU’s work included removing the internal downspouts and providing new gutters and scuppers along with flashing and re-roofing. The two images at the right are of work done by SFSU-CSU on similar blocks. The two top left images show minor rust, and deterioration at the scupper of existing units.
SFSU-CSU blocks were completed renovated, including new roofing, recycling of tile roofs, white roofs installed for insulation, and new flashing, canopy awnings replacement and stucco repair and painting along all facades. There was only minimal plywood decking repair during the roofing work. It should be noted that Stellar utilized water-pressure sprayers to hose off the algae on the roofs, spraying UP under the shingles, possibly causing additional damage during repairs.
The majority of the cracking stucco and plaster work on existing windows stems from window replacement that was done without bituthene and proper flashing, seals and building paper in the 1940's vs. today's installation of building weatherproofing membranes. The existing stucco repair was notably basic chiseling out of cracks, sealing and painting over the openings on the SFSU-CSU blocks. Only minimal work was done on the Parkmerced garden units. Additional flashing was placed on some entry areas due to a lack of flashing at the top connection points along the shingles. Only minor dry-rot repair was noted on a minimal number of canopies and entrances.
Dry-rot repair even on the more ornate entrance features was minimal, and was only occasionally requiring a canopy to be removed to replace it with a new cover and seals. The dry-rot repair on the garden units rarely required any full opening of wall areas, canopies, entrances, ceilings, roofs, or any other major intrusive repair efforts. The majority of Parkmerced's (Stellar's) repair work was done quickly and shifted around the site rapidly transforming the site colors, but ignoring the impacts that multi-colored facades have on the eye, and scale of the prior community. Light fixtures and trim work were added repeatedly in an effort to transform the character of the site. The original lights are noted below right small and un-obtrusive. The new ones at left bottom show new board, fixtures, numbers, and finishes.
As shown below left the majority of Parkmerced’s (Stellar’s) renovations of the garden units focused on trim, and repainting, along with re-roofing. The unsimilar approach between Stellar and SFSU-CSU seems to indicate a more rushed job on the efforts by Stellar, and one that emphasizes speed, and lack of concern sustainability wise on materials being used, since they than proposed demolishing all finishes and fixtures installed, including signage, door numbers, mailbox slots, door hardware and many renovated interiors of units in 2007 when units were repeatedly flipped during the student move out after stellar’s initial purchase.
To date SFSU-CSU has completed renovating the blocks purchased from Parkmerced prior. The work was done to renovate the units, and has been a very successful effort to date. It would be worthwhile to review the costs by the university, and change-orders for dry-rot repair or cost increases on roofing, flashing and basic remodeling expenses. Although there was no access to internal areas during construction, additional efforts were made to repair interiors as well. Without adequate proof of the soundness of the existing units how are we to decide whether they should be spared, renovated, restored, preserved, or rehabilitated to a basic level vs. demolition. In what ways has stellar management proven or shown proof of deterioration to support their claims that these units are “beyond” their lifespan and requiring a TOTAL tear-down. I have seen and worked on 5 large scale apartment complexes locally on the peninsula, and reviewed reports and drawn up details and worked on construction administration for another local architecture firm in the south bay. I have yet to see major repair on the Parkmerced blocks indicative of a total tear-down. The only other item of concern was when I witnessed employees of stellar caulking large cracks in the basement of 405 Serrano and than painting over them. This is my report, and although not a formal analysis it shows clearly that there is concern on the statements of the current owner’s on the deterioration levels at Parkmerced. Without independent analysis and a full soundness report of the site, including the garden units, and towers, there is no indication of which units are sound and which may require serious or lighter remediation. Per the SF General Plan, the onus on proof lies on the side of the developer when proposing to demolish sound existing rental housing stock. It does not appear like they have shown any semblance of truth to date.
February 4, 2002

This is not at all the same physical campus it was 18 months or even a year ago. The new cafes that have sprung up around campus - on 19th Avenue, behind Burk Hall, and near the Lakeview Center; the new student apartment complex that truly is a Village; the long-wished-for center that brings all student services together in one building; an on-campus credit union that offers free ATM services and free checking for students; an upcoming Internet Cafe; the acquisition of housing for students, faculty and staff on the border of campus; and the first expansion beyond the seemingly inflexible boundaries of our 19th Avenue campus since 1954 all are making this a better community in which to live, work and learn.

These projects - and more like them - are all the work of an organization that in recent years has generated and carried out numerous projects that will benefit the campus far into the future: the University Foundation.

Yet despite its very visible record of fine work, the Foundation is far less well understood and appreciated than I believe it should be. Many on campus are unclear about the Foundation's relationship to the University, its distinct difference from foundations on other CSU campuses, and what it actually does.

The Foundation is a CSU auxiliary, a 501(c)(3) charitable foundation (formally known as the SFSU Foundation Inc.) that supports itself and, in fact, generates funds that can be used for the University's benefit. While it is not legally a part of the University, it exists to serve SFSU - "to promote, assist and enhance the educational mission," in the words of its official charter.

Our Foundation differs in a key respect from those of our sister campuses. While they focus on grants and contracts administration, we run almost all awards and projects through the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs (ORSP). Until 1990, our Foundation was like others in the CSU. That year, we made a fundamental change. In response to a widely perceived faculty need for stronger and more integrated support of our whole research and sponsored programs effort, we expanded the staff in ORSP and moved responsibility for handling externally funded grants and contracts to the University. Three years later, a task force chaired by Professor Julien Wade endorsed that decision and proposed a number of refinements, which were accepted. The effectiveness of moving grants administration from the Foundation into the University shows in the dramatic rise in research awards to SFSU faculty since then, from about $9 million in 1990 to almost $43 million last year.
At this point, the Foundation began to reinvent itself to meet a new main mission: to engage in entrepreneurial ventures, particularly those that the University, as a state agency, could not undertake, and to do this for the benefit of students, faculty and staff. The Foundation Board, once, appropriately, majority faculty, began to recruit community members. In the mid-90s, we hired our first-ever Vice President for University Advancement, Jim Collier, and made serving as executive director of the Foundation part of his portfolio. He has been assisted ably by Larry Ware in his role as the Foundation's director of administration. The Foundation Board commissioned a study, which led, in 1996, to adoption of a strategic plan. As then-Foundation Planning Committee Chair (now Board Chair) John Jacobs said, the SFSU Foundation was "about to...become something unique within the CSU system."

What does the SFSU Foundation do?

It maintains some familiar functions: It administers a small number of grants - far fewer than the 450-plus currently running through ORSP - some of them holdovers from the old days, others there because the grantor (the Ford Foundation, for one) requires they be handled through a non-profit. The Foundation also manages the University's endowment and handles funds for special events such as conferences and institutes.

In its new role, the Foundation is the major provider of food services on campus - all food outside the Student Center, in fact. It saw - and met - the need for more campus gathering spots and food services, hence the new cafes. It operates all campus vending machines outside the Student Center. It hired and oversees Chartwell's, the company that provides the meals for our residence hall students and caters many campus events.

The Foundation identifies other services the campus could use and brings them to us: an on-site car rental site, Enterprise; a new mini-mart (to be run by the Bookstore) Internet cafe, and high-end printing service, all opening soon in the Village.

These ventures, after statutory reserve requirements for foundations are met, generate seed money for future projects and also allow the Foundation to make donations to the University, to help support special programs such as the Presidential Scholars and the new University magazine. These revenue-producing ventures also help us carry out many of the "user-friendly" recommendations that emerged from CUSP I.

It is important to note that any income, such as interest, generated by faculty grants the Foundation administers is never used for entrepreneurial activities.

Nowhere has the redesigned SFSU Foundation been more markedly successful than in the area of housing. With a private partner, the Foundation developed the funding package that brought our spectacular Village at Centennial Square into being. If, in the present fiscal climate, we had pursued a student housing project through the traditional CSU route, we would have had to get in line, and the wait would necessarily have been long. (Consider the Library project.) Rather than the five-year - or longer - process we could have expected, the Foundation brought us 760 new student beds in about 21 months. The Foundation owns the Village, not to mention 180 apartments in Parkmerced (more about this in a moment).

And as part of the Village project, the Foundation negotiated an exceptional add-on: the Student Services Building, a real enhancement for SFSU students.
The Foundation also has done the seemingly impossible: It found ways to expand a campus that we have long thought was "land-locked," surrounded by neighbors who left us no room to gain much-needed land. And in the process, it is helping us to address campus housing needs. Two years ago, the Foundation succeeded in acquiring the "Tapia Triangle," from Parkmerced - 27 units right on the campus border that we are renting to faculty and staff at below-market rates.

But the biggest deal, a real coup for us, is just two months old. Late last December the Foundation closed on the purchase of three complete blocks - 153 units - from Parkmerced. This new, seven-acre property runs down Holloway from Varela to Font, and back up along Serrano. This transaction - something the University could not have done - offers tremendous possibilities, starting with the growth of a University community as we fill vacated units with faculty, staff and students. I'll have more to say in coming months about this incredible asset and what it offers the University.

What next for the Foundation? For one thing, to support future entrepreneurial efforts, it is continuing to develop its Board. It is bringing on new members with the ideas, expertise and even connections to help move good plans forward. With an active and creative Board that already includes three highly respected faculty members - with a fourth to be added at the next Board meeting - the SFSU Foundation is poised to "promote, assist and enhance" this University even more strongly in the years ahead.

Sincerely yours,

Robert A. Corrigan

President
November 4, 2002

One January over 14 years ago, just a few months after I arrived at San Francisco State, I found myself on a stage in one of the beautiful historic buildings at the Asilomar conference center, amid a costumed group of faculty, administrators and staff, playing an unrehearsed part in a clever and satirical play that purported to recount the University's history.

Our audience was the rest of the several hundred other members of the SFSU community who had gathered at Asilomar, near Monterey, for the University's biennial off-campus retreat. That night, we were, indeed, a community.

New as I was to the campus, I did not know that in the years to come, one of the things I would hear most often in conversations with faculty, staff and students, would be their desire for a greater sense of campus community. It has been many decades since we were a small enough campus that faculty and staff easily knew most of their colleagues by sight, and often by name. But though we have grown and changed in many ways since then, the need for a feeling of camaraderie, of familiarity, persists. I hear it in CUSP II meetings, in gatherings of faculty and staff, and, most recently, at the student leadership retreat.

We know what makes that difficult: our size, our largely non-residential student population, the absence of a collegiate neighborhood around us; even the high cost of housing that has led to long commutes for many on campus.

All the same, I believe we can, with deliberate effort, recover much of that sense of academic community that we once had. A number of successful approaches to this are already under way. Under the warm and energetic leadership of Prof. Vicki Casella, director of the Center for the Enhancement of Teaching, our new faculty orientation program is bringing colleagues together as a cadre, across disciplinary and college lines. I see the effect in the series of new faculty dinners I host during the year. Before we even sit down, the dozen or so faculty, drawn from across campus, are engaging in animated conversation, obviously on familiar terms with each other.

Our Presidential Scholars program, which has proved spectacularly successful in achieving its aim of giving students a "small college within a major university" experience, has given us a model we can expand to many more students through such strategies as moving small groups together through core classes, or working to replicate beyond the residence halls the kind of on- and off-campus activities that help those students feel closer to each other and to...
the university. Another fine example of enriching students' personal, as well as academic experience, is our RISE program (Research Initiative for Scientific Enhancement) in the biomedical sciences, which takes its cadre of talented, underrepresented students through a demanding curriculum, pairs them with faculty mentors, helps them form study groups, and brings them together for special events, while preparing them for successful entry into Ph.D. or M.D. programs.

New construction and remodeling has enabled us to give many more faculty individual offices, and providing all tenure-track faculty with a computer has made it more possible -- and more likely -- that they will spend time on campus beyond their teaching and other obligations. The new cafes around campus are part of an effort to provide both a needed service and occasions for casual interaction. And we are looking at opportunities to provide similar gathering spots in some of our academic buildings. With our Parkmerced purchases -- we currently own 180 rental units immediately adjacent to the campus -- we have begun to address the critical issue of faculty and staff housing while providing the foundation for a university neighborhood. We are making further efforts to increase the number of university-owned rental units and we are starting to explore the possibility of developing for-sale housing for staff and faculty.

But we need to find more ways to make this campus much closer to the ideal of the community of scholars that drew so many of us to academic life in the first place. At the recent student leader retreat, led by Vice President Saffold, students told us in no uncertain terms that they wanted more "campus life" -- events and activities that would bring them together. Early on, CUSP II began to discuss the issue of campus community and has been addressing it from several perspectives.

Right now, though, one of our very best opportunities to enjoy a sense of community is at hand. Registration is still open for the 2003 Asilomar retreat, being held January 20-22. Asilomar brings us close to that old, smaller, more collegial campus. The serene, seaside setting, the shared meals, the presentations and discussions, and the simple pleasure of strolling the car-free paths, talking with colleagues, make for a remarkably rewarding experience. Probationary faculty and lecturers are eligible for subsidies; check the Senate web page for details. Asilomar is a retreat for all of us -- faculty, staff, and administrators. I hope to see a great many of you there.

[Return to top]
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June 12, 2009

Bill Wycko
Environmental Review Officer
San Francisco Planning Department
1650 Mission Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103

Re: Parkmerced NOP of EIR

Dear Mr. Wycko,

On behalf of San Francisco Architectural Heritage (Heritage), thank you for the opportunity to comment on the scope of the upcoming Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for Parkmerced.

The Notice of Preparation states:

“The EIR will discuss the potential for eligibility of individual buildings or groups of buildings for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historic Resources, and will discuss the impacts of the Proposed Project on the existing context. The EIR will also include cultural landscape analysis and will determine the eligibility of the landscaping for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or the California Register of Historical Resources.”

Heritage concurs with the Historic Resource Evaluation Report (HRER), prepared by Page & Turnbull, that Parkmerced appears to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and the California Register of Historic Resources as a historic district, and should be treated as an eligible resource during the environmental review process.

As the purpose of an EIR is “to provide information about potential significant physical environmental effects of the proposed project, to identify possible ways to minimize the significant effects, and to describe and analyze possible alternatives to the Proposed Project,” we ask that the EIR include a preservation alternative that follows the Secretary of Interior Standards.

Thank you,

Jack A. Gold
Executive Director
San Francisco State University

Master Plan Enrollment: 25,000 FTE

Master Plan approved by the Board of Trustees: September 1964

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Burk Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Business Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>HSS Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Science Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gymnasium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Fine Arts Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Creative Arts Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Children’s Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Gymnasium/Recreation Wellness Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>BSS Classroom Replacement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>HHCS Classroom Replacement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Business Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies and Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Academic Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Academic Building / University Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Temporary Library Building (Buildings 16a-16b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Ethnic Studies and Psychology Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>J. Paul Leonard Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>The Village at Centennial Square (Buildings 23a-23d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Corporation Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Central Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26A.</td>
<td>Waste Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Student Health Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Residence Dining Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Administration Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Humanities Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Facilities Building and Corporation Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Satellite Power Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Florence Hale Stephenson Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>Field House No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Field House No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Hensill Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>Thornton Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Science Replacement Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>Children’s Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61.</td>
<td>Greenhouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>Greenhouse No.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>Softball Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>Accessory Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Parking Garage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>University Park South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>University Park South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Mashouf Performing Arts Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76.</td>
<td>University Park South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.</td>
<td>University Park South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78.</td>
<td>University Park South</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>University Park South (Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>University Park South (Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82.</td>
<td>Warehouse #1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84.</td>
<td>Warehouse #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Pedestrian Bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Press Box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Stadium Restroom Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88.</td>
<td>Parking Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89.</td>
<td>Cesar Chavez Student Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91.</td>
<td>Mary Ward Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92.</td>
<td>Mary Park Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94.</td>
<td>Clinical Sciences Building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97.</td>
<td>The Towers at Centennial Square</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97A.</td>
<td>Science and Technology Theme Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98.</td>
<td>Sutro Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99.</td>
<td>University Park North (Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.</td>
<td>University Park North</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101.</td>
<td>Temporary Building A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102.</td>
<td>University Park North (Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103.</td>
<td>University Park North (Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104.</td>
<td>University Park North (Housing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105.</td>
<td>University Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>106.</td>
<td>Modular Building G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>113.</td>
<td>Restrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>114.</td>
<td>Modular Building H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115.</td>
<td>Modular Building J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>116.</td>
<td>Modular Building K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117.</td>
<td>Modular Building N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>118.</td>
<td>Modular Building O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>119.</td>
<td>Modular Building P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120.</td>
<td>Modular Building Q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121.</td>
<td>Modular Building R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122.</td>
<td>Modular Building S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200.</td>
<td>Cox Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.</td>
<td>Maloney Field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202A.</td>
<td>Maloney Field</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Romberg Tiburon Center – Field Station

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Building Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tiburon Building 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Marine Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Blacksmith Shop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Arc Welding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Rockfish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Tiburon Building 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Dispensary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Tiburon Building 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Storage Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Tiburon Building 49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Tiburon Building 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>Tiburon Building 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Physiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>Storage Shed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>Water Tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79.</td>
<td>Utility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86.</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

LEGEND:
Existing Facility / Proposed Facility

NOTE: Existing building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Data Base (SFDB)
San Francisco State University
Campus Master Plan Project

Findings of Fact

(Pursuant to Sections 21081 and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code
and Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines)

Final Environmental Impact Report
(State Clearinghouse Number 2006102050)
FINDINGS OF FACT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This statement of findings addresses the environmental effects associated with the San Francisco State University (SF State) Campus Master Plan project located on the SF State campus in San Francisco, California. These findings are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Sections 21081 and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. 15000, et. Seq. The potentially significant impacts were identified in both the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the Final EIR, as well as additional facts found in the complete record of proceedings.

Public Resources Code 21081 and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines require that the lead agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation for the rationale for each finding. The California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees is the lead agency responsible for preparation of the EIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines states, in part, that:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR 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.

In accordance with Public Resource Code 21081 and Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, whenever significant impacts cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered "acceptable." In that case, the decision-making agency may prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.
Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines state that:

a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091. As required by CEQA, the Board of Trustees, in adopting these findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project. The Board of Trustees finds that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

The Final EIR for the project identified potentially significant effects that could result from project implementation. However, the CSU Board of Trustees finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less than significant levels. Those impacts that are not reduced to less than significant levels are identified and overridden due to specific project benefits in a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees adopts these findings as part of its certification of the Final EIR for the project. Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the Public Resources Code, the Board of Trustees also finds that the Final EIR reflects the Board's independent judgment as the lead agency for the project.

1.2. Organization and Format of Findings

Section 1.0 contains a summary description of the project and background facts relative to the environmental review process. Section 2.0 discusses the CEQA finding of independent judgment. Section 3.0 identifies the impacts of the project that were studied in the EIR. Section 3.1 of these Findings identifies the significant impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, even though all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project.
Section 3.2 identifies the potentially significant effects of the project that would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Section 3.3 identifies the project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant and, therefore, do not require mitigation measures. Section 4.0 discusses the feasibility of project alternatives. Section 5.0 discusses findings with respect to mitigation of significant adverse impacts, and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP).

1.3 Summary of Project Description

The Board of Trustees adopted the 1989 Campus Master Plan to serve as a guide for the physical development of the SF State campus and campus enrollment growth through 20,000 FTE students. As of Fall 2006, the Campus was nearing the enrollment ceiling established by the 1989 Master Plan. Therefore, SF State has prepared a new Campus Master Plan that addresses all aspects of future physical development and land use on the campus to accommodate the proposed increased enrollment ceiling of 25,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students through 2020. This represents 5,000 additional FTE students over the existing enrollment ceiling of 20,000 FTE, or a 25 percent increase in enrollment capacity. Concurrent with the enrollment increase, faculty and staff would also increase from about 3,428 employees to about 4,139, or an increase of 711 employees. The proposed Campus Master Plan for SF State is intended to respond to the Board of Trustees’ directive to plan for its share of increased enrollment and accommodate the evolving needs of the CSU System’s academic, administrative, and student- and campus-support programs.

The proposed Campus Master Plan provides a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the SF State campus over the next 13 years through 2020. The proposed Campus Master Plan for SF State addresses the recent acquisition of adjacent properties, aging 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 proposed Campus Master Plan accommodates a building program that envisions the development of an additional 0.9 million gross square feet of non-residential building space, including a Conference Center and guest accommodations on the campus, and the development or conversion of an additional 1,198 units of housing for employees and students on campus.

The proposed Campus Master Plan includes a master plan map that locates major buildings to guide the siting of future campus facilities. The master plan map proposes to maintain the current general configuration of land uses on the campus, which consists of a concentrated academic core surrounded by residential and other campus uses. Most of the growth in facilities would occur through replacement and densification projects within the already developed campus.

1.4. Project Objectives

CEQA states that the statement of project objectives should be clearly written and define the underlying purpose of the project, in order to permit the development of a reasonable range of alternatives and aid the Lead Agency in making findings.

The objectives of the proposed Campus Master Plan project originate in the obligation SF State has to meet its
educational mission as defined by the California Education Code. The University undertook a lengthy Campus Master Plan development process, led by a Steering Committee comprising the academic and administrative communities on the SF State campus. The project objectives that are drawn from the Campus Master Plan are based on the physical planning principles derived from the long-term vision for the SF State campus, consistent with the University’s strategic plan. The project objectives are provided below.

1. Provide facilities for expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the proposed enrollment ceiling increase of 25,000 FTEs, required by the CSU and California Education Code;
2. Provide student, faculty, and staff housing to aid in recruitment and retention;
3. Implement the planning principles provided in the proposed Campus Master Plan as follows:

   **A vibrant on-campus community**
   - Reinforce the academic core and extend it westward
   - Integrate residential properties to create a unified campus
   - Provide more close-in, affordable housing that enables faculty, staff, and students to walk to school and work.
   - Redefine Holloway and Buckingham as “college main streets” offering neighborhood retail and services

   **Strong connections to the surrounding city**
   - Strengthen the University’s connections to Lake Merced and the surrounding neighborhoods
   - Work with neighbors, the City of San Francisco, and other entities to improve public transportation and other services that benefit the entire district.

   **Emphasis on the pedestrian and alternative transportation**
   - Cluster development around high-frequency transit connections to encourage transit use
   - Establish bicycle and pedestrian networks that provide safe, direct and attractive connections to work and school
   - Develop the 19th Avenue edge as a transit-, bicycle-, and pedestrian-friendly parkway
   - Implement Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce parking demand
   - Decentralize campus parking over time from the current central garage to a series of smaller perimeter parking facilities to disperse traffic and parking impacts, claim the campus core for pedestrians and bicycles, and allow for the eventual removal of the central parking garage from the valley

   **Recognition in the city and region**
   - Position semi-public uses at the corners of campus, creating icons that redefine the University’s external identity and engage the larger community
   - Create an identifiable and inviting campus perimeter
A continuous greenbelt between 19th Avenue and Lake Merced

- Establish the valley as the central open space of campus
- Provide expanded recreational fields
- Restore ecological landscapes in the valley

**Universal design and access**

- Ensure that all aspects of the campus physical environment—notably primary circulation routes and main building entrances—are comfortably usable by and inviting to the widest group of people possible
- Organize and design primary pathways and graphic signage to facilitate wayfinding, using a combination of visual, tactile, and auditory cues
- Establish strong north-south connections across the valley and Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue that link the University to its residential districts and to the surrounding neighborhoods
- Establish clear east-west functional and visual connections across campus and to the surrounding district

**A campus that models sustainability**

- Develop transportation and land use patterns that encourage greater use of transit, walking, and bicycle commuting and reduce dependence on automobiles
- Make efficient use of redevelopment sites
- Promote sustainability through green building and site design, native landscape, natural stormwater management, alternative transportation, higher-density housing, and walkable neighborhood retail.

These project objectives guided the proposed Campus Master Plan development process and the identification of physical improvements necessary and appropriate for the SF State campus to fulfill its educational mission as well as implement its strategic vision and core values.

**1.5. Environmental Review Process**

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects associated with the development of the SF State Campus Master Plan project.

To determine the number, scope and extent of environmental issues to be addressed in this EIR, the University prepared a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and circulated it for 30 days, beginning October 10, 2006 and ending November 10, 2006, to interested public agencies, organizations, community groups, and individuals in order to receive input on the proposed project. The University also held two Draft EIR scoping meetings on October 24, 2006, to obtain public input on the proposed scope and content of the EIR. Interested parties attended the meeting and provided input.
The Draft EIR was circulated for a 60-day public review period, which was longer than the 45-day review period required by state law, beginning February 2, 2007 and ending April 2, 2007. During this public review period, the University received written comments on the Draft EIR. SF State also held two public hearings on March 6, 2007, in conjunction with circulation of the Draft EIR to obtain public input regarding the Draft EIR. Interested parties attended the meeting and provided input.

Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the Lead Agency responsible for the preparation of an EIR evaluate comments on environmental issues received from parties who reviewed the Draft EIR and prepare a written response addressing each of the comments. The intent of the Final EIR is to provide a forum to air and address comments pertaining to the information and analysis contained within the Draft EIR, and to provide an opportunity for clarifications, corrections, or minor revisions to the Draft EIR as needed.

This Final EIR assembles in one document all of the environmental information and analysis prepared for the proposed project, including comments on the information and analysis contained in the Draft EIR and responses by the University to those comments.

Pursuant to Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR consists of the following:

(a) The Draft EIR, including all of its appendices, is incorporated by reference in this Final EIR.

(b) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.

(c) Copies of all letters received by the University during the Draft EIR public review period and responses to significant environmental points concerning the Draft EIR raised in the comment letters.

(d) Revisions to the Draft EIR.

(e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

2.0 CEQA FINDING OF INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT

The EIR reflects the Board of Trustees’ independent judgment. The Board of Trustees has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code 21082.1(c)(3) in retaining its own environmental consultant in the preparation of the EIR, as well as reviewing, analyzing and revising material prepared by the consultant.

Having received, reviewed and considered the information in the EIR, as well as any and all other information in the record, the Board of Trustees of the California State University hereby makes findings pursuant to and in accordance with Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

3.0 FINDINGS OF FACT

3.1 Environmental Effects of the Project which are Considered Unavoidable Significant Impacts
This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued by the Board of Trustees, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the project is approved. Based on the analysis contained in the EIR, the following impacts have been determined to fall within the "significant unavoidable impacts" category:

a) Historic resource impacts,

b) Construction noise impacts, and

c) Traffic impacts.

**HISTORIC RESOURCE IMPACTS**

An evaluation of the historic resource impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.4, *Cultural Resources*, of the Draft EIR (see Impact CULT-2).

The Draft EIR identifies buildings and structures that will be 50 years or older by 2020, which is the planning horizon for the proposed Campus Master Plan. Structures older than 50 years of age have not been evaluated at this time because while they may not qualify as historic structures at this time, their significance could change between now and the time that they are proposed for removal or alteration. Therefore it is possible that some of the site buildings or structures could qualify as historic resources in the future and their alteration or removal could represent a significant adverse impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate historic resource impacts of the project to a level less than significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measure would partially reduce the identified impacts.

**Mitigation CULT-2A:** The campus shall identify all buildings and structures within the project’s area of potential effect that will be 50 years of age or older at the time of project construction. If potentially historic structures are present, Mitigation CULT-2B shall be implemented.

**Mitigation CULT-2B:** Potential historic structures present within the project’s area of potential effect will be evaluated as follows:

(i) Before altering or otherwise affecting a building or structure 50 years old or older, the campus shall retain a qualified architectural historian to record it based on professional standards, and assess its significance under CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. The evaluation process shall include the development of appropriate historical background research as context for the assessment of the significance of the structure in the history of the California State University system, the campus, and/or the region. For historic buildings, structures or features that do not meet the CEQA criteria for a historical resource, no further mitigation is required.

(ii) For a building or structure that qualifies as a historic resource, the architectural historian and the campus shall consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to
the building or structure. These measures could include preserving a building on the margin of the project site, using it “as is,” or other measures that would not alter the building. If the project cannot avoid modifications to a significant building or structure, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-2C.

Mitigation CULT-2C: For a structure or building that has been determined by a qualified architectural historian to qualify as a historical resource, and where avoidance is not feasible, documentation and treatment shall be carried out as described below:

(i) If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).

(ii) If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if available. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the SF State Library. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.

(iii) If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.

(iv) If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment.

Cumulative Impacts

Direct project impacts in this area include impacts on historic resources, as described above. The campus’ contribution to the destruction of the historic resources database in San Francisco will be minimized to the extent feasible, with the implementation of the above mitigation measure. Similarly, the protocols in place for development projects in San Francisco, such as are provided in the CEQA Review Procedures for Historic Resources would also be expected to minimize significant impacts to the cultural resource base associated with construction projects elsewhere in the City. Therefore, it is concluded that the cumulative impact would be less than significant with the protocols in place for development projects on campus and in San Francisco, and the campus’ contribution to this impact would not be cumulatively considerable.
Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the project historic resource impacts. Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that would mitigate, in part, the significant historic resource impacts. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the identified significant impact to a level below significant. Therefore, this impact must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible historic resource mitigation measures. Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR and the identified historic resource impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Statement of Overriding Considerations).

CONSTRUCTION NOISE IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the construction noise impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.9, Noise, of the Draft EIR (see Impact NOIS-1).

Routine airborne noise levels from conventional construction activities (with a typical number of pieces of equipment operating on the site) range from 75 to 86 dBA $L_{eq}$ at a distance of 50 feet. Due to improvements in construction equipment silencing technology developed during the past 30 years, these sound levels are 3 decibels less than the noise levels reported in the U.S. EPA 1971 reference study. Typically, the quietest phase of building site construction for similar projects (i.e., schools) is that associated with constructing foundations (75 dBA $L_{eq}$ at a distance of 50 feet), and the typical loudest phases producing 86 dBA $L_{eq}$ at 50 feet are those associated with grading and finishing activities. Noise levels from construction activities generally decrease at a rate of 6 dB per doubling of distance from the activity.

At distances of 100 feet or more from the construction activity, noise from on-campus construction is predicted to be below the significance criteria of 80 dBA $L_{max}$ daytime (between 7:00 AM and 8:00 PM). However, if a construction site were less than 100 feet from a nearby receptor, the noise levels from certain construction activities would exceed the significance criteria. In addition, at distances of 500 feet or less from noise sensitive receptors, construction noise levels could exceed nighttime ambient noise levels by 5 dBA or more, which would exceed the nighttime significance threshold.

Most of the new construction would occur in parts of the campus that are distant from off-campus sensitive receptors and relatively distant from most on-campus residential receptors. Therefore, although noise from construction would be audible and would temporarily elevate the local ambient noise levels to some degree at distances greater than 100 feet from the source, construction noise on the campus would not cause an exceedance of the noise impact significance criteria at existing off-campus residences or at receptors on campus.

Construction of replacement and new facilities on some sites on the campus would, however, occur at distances less than 100 feet from existing and future sensitive receptors on the campus. For example, the
redevelopment of two blocks of University Park South would occur less than 100 feet from nearby campus and off-campus receptors, and would result in noise levels that would exceed the criteria at these nearby receptors. This would be a significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate noise levels attributable to project construction to a level less than significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measure would partially reduce the identified impacts.

**Mitigation NOIS-1:** The campus shall include the following noise control measures in all construction contracts for construction projects that are within 100 feet of a sensitive receptor:

- Construction equipment used on campus is properly maintained and has been outfitted with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.
- Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible.
- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses.
- Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise will be informed in writing at least a week before the start of each construction project.
- Loud construction activity (i.e., construction activity such as jackhammering, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall not be scheduled during finals week.
- Loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic use shall, to the extent feasible, be scheduled during weekends, holidays, Thanksgiving break, Christmas break, Spring break, or Summer break.
- Loud construction activity within 500 feet of a residential building shall be restricted to the hours between 7:30 AM and 7:30 PM, Monday through Saturday.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Direct project impacts in this area include increases in noise during construction, as described above. As construction noise on campus would not cumulate with construction noise from off-campus construction sites due to distance, significant cumulative construction noise impacts are not anticipated.

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the project construction noise impacts. Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that would mitigate, in part, the significant construction-related noise impacts. However, there are no feasible mitigation measures that would reduce the
identified significant impact to a level below significant. Therefore, this impact must be considered unavoidably significant even after implementation of all feasible construction-related noise mitigation measures. Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR and the identified construction noise impact is thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Statement of Overriding Considerations).

**Traffic Impacts**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of the traffic impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.11, *Traffic, Circulation, and Parking* of the Draft EIR (see Impact TRA-1) and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, pages 3-29 through 3-40).

As a result of campus growth under the Campus Master Plan, the additional students, faculty, and staff would make new trips to the campus using a variety of modes of transportation. To avoid increasing the number of daily and peak hour vehicle trips to the campus, the Campus Master Plan includes an expanded and enhanced Transportation Management program that emphasizes alternate travel modes and a housing program that is designed to house more of the SF State affiliates on the campus. The timely and successful implementation of these programs included in the Campus Master Plan would help avoid a substantial increase in vehicle trips. The EIR presents potential traffic impacts under two scenarios: (1) an analysis of likely traffic impacts assuming that the Campus Master Plan Transportation Management and housing programs are successfully implemented, and (2) a conservative worse-case analysis that assumes that the proposed Transportation Management and housing programs are not implemented successfully or in a timely manner, and therefore new vehicle trips would be added to study area roadways and intersections.

Scenario 1 concludes that the combined effect of the TDM, parking, transit, and housing programs will likely be to maintain campus-related auto traffic levels at their current rates through 2020, and the impact at the study area intersections would be less than significant. Scenario 2 concludes that: (1) Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive and (2) Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard would be significantly affected with the addition of project traffic under Year 2020 Conditions. These affects constitute significant cumulative impacts for which the project would have a considerable contribution. No direct project impacts were identified on study intersections.

Traffic impacts under Scenario 2 were evaluated based on standards of significance used by the City and County of San Francisco to evaluate traffic impacts. Based on these standards, the project’s traffic impacts at signalized intersections were considered significant if:

- Project-related traffic causes the level of service to deteriorate from LOS D or better to LOS E or F, or from LOS E to LOS F, or
- If a signalized intersection operates at LOS E or F under cumulative without project conditions and the following conditions occur: (1) project-related traffic contributes 5 percent or more of the total
traffic at the intersection, and (2) the project-related traffic contributes 5 percent or more of the cumulative growth in traffic volumes at the affected intersection.

With the addition of project traffic, the level of service at the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard and South State Drive would decline from LOS C to LOS E by 2020. The level of service at Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard intersection would be LOS F with and without the addition of project traffic by 2020. However, the new vehicle trips added by the project at the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard would make up more than 5 percent of the total volume of traffic in 2020 and more than 5 percent of the growth in traffic between 2006 and 2020. Therefore, the project would result in significant impacts at these two intersections, based on the significance standards identified above. Intersection capacity improvements that can be implemented to improve intersection operations are described below.

- **Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive** – The intersection can be restored to operate at an acceptable level of service by widening the westbound approach to provide an additional shared left-right-turn lane (currently, one exclusive left-turn lane and one right-turn lane exists). Implementation of this improvement would require removal of parking at a minimum within 500 feet from the intersection on the west leg.

- **Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard** – The intersection can be restored to operate at an acceptable level of service by widening the southbound approach to provide an additional exclusive left-turn lane (currently, one exclusive left-turn lane exists). Implementation of this mitigation measure would require elimination of on-street parking between South State Drive and at a minimum 600 feet south of the intersection. The westbound approach will also need to be widened to provide an additional exclusive left-turn lane and an additional exclusive right-turn lane (currently, shared left-right-turn lane exists). Implementation of this improvement would require removal of parking on the west leg of the intersection.

**Mitigation Measures**

The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate traffic impacts attributable to the project to a level less than significant. However, the following feasible mitigation measure would partially reduce the identified impacts.

**Mitigation TRA-1**: The campus shall implement the following monitoring and mitigation program:

- As a first step, the campus shall conduct a new baseline cordon survey no less than 18 months following the certification of this EIR. Alternatively, the campus may use the 2006 cordon survey as a baseline.

- Next, at intervals of no more than every three years, and no later than the addition of each 1,000 students in enrollment, the campus will hire an outside transportation planning or data analysis firm to conduct a statistically significant cordon survey of campus commuters during the PM peak hours. The cordon survey will cover all major entrances to the campus and will examine the travel behavior of SF State affiliates. The survey will be conducted during typical days while classes are in session, excluding final examination, national holiday or orientation weeks.

- If cordon surveys show that the PM peak period auto trips to and from campus are greater than 5 percent above the baseline, the campus shall conduct the cordon surveys annually until such trips fall
below 5 percent above the baseline for 2 years in a row. If and when this occurs, cordon surveys will continue in accordance with the second bullet above.

- If the cordon surveys show an increase in PM peak period auto trips sufficient to result in project impacts at the two affected intersections, the campus will increase the level of TDM programs until the project impacts associated with traffic increases are mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

- If the campus fails to reduce its traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level for more than two years in a row, it will contribute its “fair share” of the cost of identified intersection improvements to the City and County of San Francisco, as appropriate, provided that the legislature appropriates funds as requested by CSU in the State budget process.

No additional mitigation is required beyond that identified in Mitigation TRA-1 above.

Cumulative Impacts

As indicated above, no direct project impacts would occur on study intersections with growth contemplated by the Campus Master Plan. Based on the conservative, worst-case analysis provided in the EIR, significant cumulative impacts on two study intersections would occur for which the project would have a considerable contribution. Even with proposed mitigation in place for the intersections analyzed as part of the Final EIR, cumulative traffic impacts remain significant and unavoidable, as described below.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce project traffic impacts. Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which would mitigate, in part, the significant traffic impacts attributable to increased vehicle trips identified in the Final EIR.

A mitigation measure has been identified that would, if implemented in a timely manner, reduce the impacts on traffic conditions to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, pursuant to the recent State Supreme Court decision (City of Marina v Board of Trustees of the California State University), the CSU and the University acknowledge responsibility to negotiate with local agencies in order to determine the amount of voluntary mitigation payment (process subject to Chapter 13.7 of Government Code Section 67685) that would fund the University’s fair share of the off-site traffic improvements under Mitigation TRA-1 above, that may be required to mitigate or avoid the environmental effects of this project. Related to this measure, SF State agrees to work in good faith with the City to fund its “fair share” of intersection improvements identified in Mitigation TRA-1.

The mitigation measure is structured so that off-campus intersection improvements are a last resort to be implemented only if campus PM peak hour trips increase sufficiently and additional transportation demand management measures fail to reduce new vehicle trips. However, since a portion of this mitigation measure (i.e., off-campus intersection improvements) is not within the authority and jurisdiction of the CSU board of trustees, the implementation of these improvements cannot be guaranteed to fully mitigate the potentially significant impacts. In the event the identified traffic improvements on intersections under the jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco are required to mitigate the significant impacts of additional campus-
related vehicle trips and are not constructed in a timely manner or caused to be constructed by the responsible agency, traffic impacts would not be reduced to a level below significant. In this instance, there are no additional feasible mitigation measures under the authority and jurisdiction of the CSU board of trustees that would reduce the identified significant impacts, and no agreement has been reached that ensures timely implementation of the necessary improvements, if in fact they are needed. Further, as there is no guarantee that the legislature will appropriate the funds requested by CSU to support the fair share payment of the cost of identified intersection improvements, this measure may ultimately be determined to be infeasible by CSU. Therefore, these impacts must be considered remaining, unavoidably significant even with the implementation of the portion of the mitigation measure that is under the control of the board, because the board cannot guarantee full implementation of all aspects of the measure necessary to reduce traffic impacts to less than significant as described herein.

Therefore, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project override the identified traffic impacts if the responsible agency does not complete the off-campus intersection improvements identified in the mitigation measure, if required, and are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Statement of Overriding Considerations).

3.2 Environmental Effects Discussed in the EIR Which Can Be Avoided or Substantially Lessened to Less Than Significant Levels with Implementation of the Identified Mitigation Measures

This section identifies significant adverse impacts of the project that require findings to be made under Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines. Based on information in the EIR, the Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce the identified significant impacts to less than significant levels. Based on the analysis contained in the EIR, the following impacts have been determined to fall within the category of impacts that can be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures set forth below:

a) Aesthetics (off-campus visual character);
b) Air Quality (construction and operational emissions);
c) Biological Resources (sensitive habitats and special-status species);
d) Cultural Resources (archaeological and paleontological resources, and human remains);
e) Geology, Soils and Seismicity (seismic-related ground failure);
f) Hazards and Hazardous Materials (exposure to contaminated building materials);
g) Hydrology and Water Quality (surface water quality); and
h) Traffic, Circulation, and Parking (transit services).
OFF-CAMPUS VISUAL CHARACTER IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the off-campus visual character impact associated with the project is found in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, pages 3-8 through 3-9).

The Parkmerced neighborhood is located south of the SF State campus. The buildings on the University Park South (UPS) property and development further south, constitute the Parkmerced neighborhood. The proposed Campus Master Plan calls for the redevelopment of a portion of these buildings in UPS to provide for higher density housing. These new buildings will be limited in height to 50-feet, which is taller than the existing Parkmerced buildings immediately to the south of UPS, which are about 20 feet in height. The buildings in UPS along Holloway Avenue and immediately south are mostly 2-stories in height and have a unique architectural style. Given this unique style and the fact that these buildings are part of a larger neighborhood that has fairly uniform and distinct visual characteristics, the redevelopment of the buildings in UPS by the campus could potentially degrade the existing visual character of the adjacent area if not properly designed. This is considered a potentially significant impact. (See Impact AES-3 for additional information.)

Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential off-campus visual character impact of the project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation AES-3: Develop appropriate architectural and urban design guidelines that apply specifically to the proposed redevelopment of a portion of the existing University South Park (UPS) buildings. These guidelines will require that any proposed new structures in UPS respect the existing visual characteristics of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood. The guidelines should consider building color and design, exterior treatments and design details, and building heights/massing such that the proposed new development is visually compatible with the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood.

Cumulative Impacts

Direct project impacts include potential impacts related to the alteration of the visual character and appearance of the adjacent Parkmerced neighborhood. This impact is a direct project impact specific to the project circumstances and location. Therefore, this impact would not compound over time, or persist and worsen.

As the majority of future development in the vicinity of the campus will be limited to intensification or rebuilding of existing uses, changes to visual character will likely be limited to changes in building size and architectural character. Further, no large-scale changes in land use to the neighborhoods adjacent to the campus are proposed in local plans. Therefore, existing visual conditions around the campus will presumably continue. Although there may be incremental changes over time, these changes will not result in significant cumulative impacts due to substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the area. Therefore, the potential cumulative impact on visual character will be less than significant. (See Impact AES-5 for
Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the potential off-campus visual character impact of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant off-campus visual character impact as identified in the Final EIR.

CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION AIR EMISSIONS IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the construction and operation air emissions impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.2, Air Quality, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, pages 3-9 through 3-10).

Construction-related activities will generate fugitive dust, which is measured in terms of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$, from earthmoving, excavation, grading, and travel over unpaved haul roads. The Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD) recognizes that construction activities can cause a substantial increase in localized PM$_{10}$ concentrations, which can create nuisance to nearby sensitive receptors. However, the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines do not require lead agencies to estimate emissions from construction. This impact is considered potentially significant. The BAAQMD guidelines indicate that if the project proponent implements identified control measures during construction, then construction-phase air quality impacts are considered to be less than significant. (See Impact AIR-1 for additional information.)

The BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines distinguish between projects and plans and recommend that the evaluation of air quality impacts from plans not focus on the quantification of emissions but on an analysis of the plan’s consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP). The proposed Campus Master Plan is a plan for the development of the SF State campus over the next 13 years. Therefore, impacts from the development under the proposed Campus Master Plan were evaluated in terms of the plan’s consistency with the CAP. The Draft EIR reported that campus growth might not be consistent with the most recent CAP population projections and criteria regarding toxics. This was identified as a potentially significant impact. (See Impact AIR-2 for additional information.)

Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential construction and operation air emissions impacts of the project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation AIR-1: The Campus shall apply the following feasible control measures as required by Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD):
Basic Control Measures – For all construction sites:

• Water all active construction areas at least twice daily, or as needed.

• Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard.

• Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

• Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites.

• Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets.

Enhanced Control Measures – For sites greater than 4 acres in area:

• All “Basic” control measures listed above.

• Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more.)

• Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.)

• Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph.

• Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways.

• Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible.

• Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph.

• Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time.

Mitigation AIR-2A: The SF State campus will work with the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to ensure that campus growth associated with the proposed Campus Master Plan is accounted for in the regional population forecasts.

Mitigation AIR-2B: The SF State campus will work with BAAQMD to ensure that campus growth-related emissions are accounted for in the regional emissions inventory and mitigated in future air quality planning efforts.

Mitigation AIR-2C: The SF State campus will work with BAAQMD to ensure that environmental review of projects that will result in new TACs (i.e., expansion of the Central Plant, the new Northern Plant, and expansion of building space for science programs) are closely coordinated with the District’s permitting process. The analysis of TACs from these new sources will be conducted in accordance with the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines and appropriate and feasible mitigations measures will be developed as necessary to ensure that impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures that could be incorporated into future projects include but are not limited to: the establishment of buffer zones, the installation of control devices on equipment, and changes to operational practices.
**Cumulative Impacts**

Direct project impacts in this area include construction and operation air emissions, as describe above. Localized emissions of PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ from construction activities on campus would not cumulate with those from other off-campus construction sites due to the distance; and therefore, there is no potential for a cumulative impact. Additionally, the proposed Campus Master Plan would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact related to regional emissions from project operation, nor would the plan contribute considerably to such a cumulative impact, assuming the mitigation measures identified above are implemented. (See Impact AIR-4 for additional information.)

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential construction and operation air emissions impacts of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant construction and operation air emissions impacts as identified in the Final EIR.

**SENSITIVE HABITAT AND SPECIAL-STATUS SPECIES IMPACTS**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of the sensitive habitat and special-status species impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, pages 3-10 through 3-15).

The adjacent Lake Merced area contains sensitive habitats (e.g., wetlands) and special-status plants and wildlife (e.g., San Francisco spineflower and double-breasted cormorants). Construction of the proposed Lake Merced Boulevard bridge underpass, creek inlet into Lake Merced, and path connection, and the discharge of storm water into the lake could potentially affect wetlands and other sensitive habitats, as well as special-status plant and wildlife species in the adjacent Lake Merced area. This is considered to be a potentially significant impact. (See Impact BIO-1 for further information.)

Additionally, Lake Merced does provide nesting habitat for a number of special-status and sensitive bird species. The bulrush marsh and willow scrub along the lake edge have been identified as important bird habitat due to its value for nesting. While there are no known occurrences of special-status wildlife species on the SF State campus, there is low potential that the landscaped habitat on campus provides suitable nesting habitat for special-status birds-of-prey and therefore such nesting may be occurring on the site, or may occur in the future. Proposed development contemplated under the Campus Master Plan could potentially result in loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds on-campus or in the adjacent Lake Merced area. (See Impact BIO-2 for further information.)

**Mitigation Measures**
The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential sensitive habitat and special-status species impacts of the project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

**Mitigation BIO-1A:** The new path connection and the new seasonal creek inlet in the East Lake area shall be located in consultation with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and any other agency with jurisdiction over the management of Lake Merced. The new path connection shall be sited to avoid wetland and other sensitive habitats (including bulrush marsh and willow scrub areas along the lake edge), and the path will also be sited to avoid bringing people into sensitive bird habitat.

**Mitigation BIO-1B:** All wetland or other sensitive habitat in Lake Merced temporarily disturbed/removed during the construction of the bridge underpass, path connection and/or seasonal creek shall be replaced and restored in accordance with the SFPUC through its subsequent approval process and all regulatory permit requirements. Prior to any work that could disturb jurisdictional or other wetland habitat, appropriate permits shall be obtained as required from ACOE and/or RWQCB. Consultation with all of these agencies shall govern how the disturbance of wetlands and other sensitive habitats will be mitigated, including the location and extent of wetland restoration and creation, and planting and management specifications (e.g., success criteria, monitoring, reporting, etc.).

**Mitigation BIO-1C:** At the time that the path connection and/or seasonal creek inlet in the East Lake area are proposed, a clearance-level plant survey shall be performed for these projects to determine the presence or absence of special-status or sensitive plant species. If such species are found and will be either directly or indirectly affected by proposed construction an appropriate replacement and/or mitigation plan shall be developed and implemented in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and/or any other agency with jurisdiction over the management of Lake Merced, as appropriate. Such a replacement and/or mitigation plan would include, but would not necessarily be limited to:

- Replacement of removed vegetation at a defined replacement ratio and/or restoration of existing habitat via new plantings, removal of exotic species, etc.
- Monitoring and maintenance of any newly planted areas for a specified time period
- Specification of success criteria
- Specification of reporting requirements

**Mitigation BIO-1D:** The design and engineering of the creek corridor and the Lake Merced Boulevard underpass/bridge shall ensure that these facilities do not cause erosion along the sand banks in the Lake Merced area, which could degrade localized sensitive habitat values. Erosion of sand banks in Lake Merced could be avoided by providing for adequate stormwater detention on campus and appropriate design elements (e.g., check dams, slope stabilization, etc.) to ensure that the longitudinal creek profile and channel cross-section are stable.

**Mitigation BIO-2A:** If project construction on campus is scheduled during the typical avian nesting season (February 15 to July 31), each work site (including access routes) and the areas within 150 feet of the work site shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist for the presence of migratory and/or special-status nesting birds. Surveys shall be conducted at each work site within two weeks prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activities. Work sites include tree-removal areas and/or any construction sites on campus.
If nesting birds were found to be present, a 150-foot buffer zone shall be established around the perimeter of the nest substrate (tree, shrub, herb, etc.) and clearly marked with “environmentally sensitive area” fencing. Construction or any related activities shall not be conducted within those areas until all observed nesting activities are completed. A qualified biologist shall determine nesting status. Pre-construction surveys will not be required if project construction is scheduled outside the typical avian nesting season (August 1 – February 15).

Mitigation BIO-2B: For construction off-campus in the Lake Merced area, construction-phase mitigation measures for the protections of nesting special-status birds shall be developed in consultation with the SFPUC through its subsequent approval process to ensure that substantial effects on nesting birds do not occur. Measures could include, but would not be limited to: provisions for pre-construction surveys, prohibitions on initiating construction during certain times of the year (e.g., typical nesting season), and/or buffer distances from active nest sites.

Mitigation BIO-2C: Appropriate signage and other design features (e.g., fencing) will be installed as deemed appropriate by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and any other agency with jurisdiction over the management of Lake Merced, to keep people on the connector path and to prohibit the creation of ad-hoc trails. This signage will explain the potential for people to disturb birds nesting in the marsh vegetation around the edges of the lake, if they stray from the path.

Cumulative Impacts

Direct project impacts in this area include those related to sensitive habitat and special-status species, as describe above. Additionally, neither development on campus, nor reasonably foreseeable future development within the southwestern portion of San Francisco, would result in a significant cumulative impact associated with adverse effects to sensitive natural communities and/or special-status species. Therefore, the potential cumulative biological resources impact would be less than significant. (See Impact BIO-4 for additional information.)

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential sensitive habitat and special-status species impacts of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant sensitive habitat and special-status species impacts as identified in the Final EIR.

Other Cultural Resource Impacts

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the other cultural resource impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of the Draft EIR, and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft
There is one known archeological site on campus (P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25), which is described as possible sand midden with some shell and no charcoal. While there are no other known archeological sites on campus, there is a potential that subsurface resources may exist on the campus. Any future campus project under the proposed Campus Master Plan that would disturb site soils or surface features has the potential to result in impacts to archaeological resources of the prehistoric or historic period. Significant resources under CEQA are those that meet CRHR eligibility criteria or are defined as unique under CEQA. If the resource is significant under CEQA, impacts would be significant if the project results in a substantial adverse change in the significance of the resource. Substantial adverse changes to archaeological deposits and features may result from ground disturbance or from increased traffic, erosion, vibrations or other activities that could affect the physical integrity of archaeological deposits or features. (See Impact CULT-1 for further information.)

Although no human remains have been encountered during the construction of buildings and other improvements on the campus, development under the proposed Campus Master Plan that includes excavation and grading has the potential to uncover, displace, and destroy human remains. This is a potentially significant impact. (See Impact CULT-3 for further information.)

There is potential that significant paleontological resources could exist in the Colma Formation that underlies the campus. Given that the Colma Formation has yielded significant vertebrate fossils within the project region, undisturbed sediments of the Colma Formation below the campus are considered to have a high potential for the occurrence of significant paleontological resources. This does not necessarily imply that vertebrate fossils will always be recovered from a high potential-rated rock unit, but only that there are recorded occurrences within the unit elsewhere in the region. Therefore, development under the proposed Campus Master Plan that could result in the disturbance of undisturbed sediments of the Colma Formation has the potential to result in a significant impact on paleontological resources that could exist in this formation. (See Impact CULT-4 for further information.)

**Mitigation Measures**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the other cultural resource impacts of the project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation CULT-1A:** During the planning and environmental review of specific development projects under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the campus shall follow the following protocol:

- If the project site is within 200 feet of archaeological site P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25, the campus shall have a qualified archaeologist conduct subsurface testing in order to determine whether buried archaeological materials are present and if so the extent of the deposit relative to the project’s area of disturbance. In the event that an archaeological resource is encountered during subsurface testing, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeologist will prepare written findings. No surveys or subsurface testing is necessary at project sites in the rest of the campus.

- The campus shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract, which requires that in the event that an archaeological resource is discovered during construction
whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease, and the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B below.

Mitigation CULT-1B: For an archaeological site that is encountered during the subsurface testing or during construction, the campus shall:

- Retain a qualified archaeologist to determine whether the resource qualifies as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource.
- If the resource is determined to be a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource, the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with the campus, shall prepare a research design and archaeological data recovery plan for the recovery that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, and implement the data recovery plan prior to or during development of the site. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials.

Mitigation CULT-3A: The campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1 to minimize the potential for disturbance or destruction of human remains in an archaeological context and to preserve them in place, if feasible.

Mitigation CULT-3B: The campus shall provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor any excavation (including archaeological excavation) within the boundaries of a known Native American archaeological site.

Mitigation CULT-3C: In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the County of San Francisco Medical Examiner of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the campus will ensure that the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).

Mitigation CULT-3D: If human remains cannot be left in place, the campus shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided an opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinternment. The campus shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As stipulated by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the campus shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.

Mitigation CULT-4A: Prior to construction, a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted regarding the likelihood of encountering significant fossils on a given construction site. If the paleontologist determines fossils may be present, a paleontologic monitor shall be present at each excavation that penetrates potentially...
fossiliferous undisturbed native soil of the Colma Formation that has been identified by the paleontologist as moderately to highly sensitive.

Mitigation CULT-4B: If a monitor is not required, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential paleontological resources and must notify the campus if paleontological resources are found.

Mitigation CULT-4C: If paleontological resources are discovered, all soil disturbing work shall cease within 100 feet of the location. The resources shall be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist who will determine the resource’s potential scientific significance. If the find is determined to be significant, or potentially significant, a qualified paleontologist shall design and carry out data recovery consistent with the Standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists. Adequate recordation and recovery would include, at a minimum, the following:

- Development of site-specific environment and contextual information regarding the particular resource.
- Archival research and review of other studies in the area.
- Accurate recordation and excavation of the noted resources.
- In the event that a major significant find is uncovered, prior to excavating the significant resource, the campus shall ensure that an appropriate museum or scientific repository is selected for curation of the recovered materials.

Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level, no adverse cumulative impacts to cultural resources are anticipated.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce impacts to cultural resources of the project, with the exception of historical resources in exceptional cases, to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the potentially cultural resources impacts as identified in the Final EIR. Please see Section 3.1 above for a discussion of the historical resource impacts of the project.

Seismic Impacts

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the seismic impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.5, Geology, Soils, and Seismicity, of the Draft EIR.

Severe seismic ground shaking and related ground failure is a possibility in the area of the SF State campus. The
valley portion of the campus has potential for ground failure related to liquefaction, settlement, and landslide; while the remainder of the campus has some potential for effects related to settlement in areas with loose surficial fills. The CDMC has designated the valley portion of the campus as a Seismic Hazard Zone for liquefaction potential, and the CGS has designated one isolated area on the SF State campus as a Seismic Hazard Zone for landslide potential. To address these types of concerns, the SF State campus routinely performs geotechnical investigations that evaluate the potential for liquefaction, settlement, and other types of ground failure at each building site. This is a potentially significant impact. (See Impact GEO-1 for additional information).

Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential seismic impacts of the project will be reduced to less than significant levels by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation GEO-1: Where existing geotechnical information is not adequate, detailed geotechnical investigations shall be performed for areas that will support buildings or foundations. Such investigations for building or foundation projects located in the valley portion of the SF State campus will comply with the California Geological Survey’s Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California (Special Publication 117), which specifically address the mitigation of liquefaction and landslide hazards in designated Seismic Hazard Zones (CGS, 1997). All recommendations of the geotechnical investigations will be incorporated into project designs.

Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level, no adverse cumulative impacts related to seismicity are anticipated.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the seismic-related impact of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant seismic-related impact identified in the Final EIR.

EXPOSURE TO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS DURING BUILDING DEMOLITION

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the potential project impact associated with exposure to hazardous materials during building demolition is found in Section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR.

Hazardous materials could be encountered in campus buildings when they are demolished or remodeled under the proposed Campus Master Plan. These hazardous materials could be related to lead-based paints or asbestos used in the construction of the buildings, or to past spills and other releases of hazardous materials in
laboratories during research activities. In particular, the Science Building will be demolished in the course of the proposed Campus Master Plan. This building contains laboratories that have been used by the biology and chemistry departments. While no significant spills or contamination have been reported in this building since 1994, proper procedures should be followed whenever a laboratory is scheduled for demolition or renovation. Without such procedures in place, demolition of laboratory space could result in a potentially significant impact related to exposure to contaminated materials. (See Impact HAZ-4 for additional information).

Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential hazardous materials impact of the project related to building demolition will be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation HAZ-4: SF State will develop procedures regarding the demolition of laboratory space to ensure compliance with all applicable State regulations. These provisions will ensure the removal of hazardous materials; the decontamination of surfaces and equipment; proper characterization, storage and shipment of hazardous materials removed from laboratories; and proper worker training and safety procedures. These procedures should provide for the following:

- Removal of all hazardous materials
- User inspection for contamination
- Performance of a site audit to determine likelihood of chemical spills
- Performance of sampling for potential chemical contamination, if site audit finds that this is warranted
- Use of survey meters or wipe samples to detect lingering radioactivity, if radioactive materials were present
- Performance of sampling for potential chemical contamination, if site audit finds that this is warranted
- Communication with workers to ensure any remaining risk and health and safety procedures are understood and followed during demolition
- Following proper procedures for characterizing, storing, and shipping hazardous wastes, if necessary

Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level, no adverse cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials exposure during building demolition are anticipated.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the impact of the project related to hazardous materials exposure during building demolition to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public
Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant impact related to hazardous materials exposure during building demolition identified in the Final EIR.

**Surface Water Quality Impacts**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of the surface water quality impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.7, *Hydrology and Water Quality*, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, pages 3-17 through 3-19).

The proposed Campus Master Plan includes a proposal to direct some of the runoff generated by new and replacement buildings and other impervious surfaces built under the proposed Campus Master Plan into a surface creek that would discharge excess runoff into Lake Merced. This element of the proposed Campus Master Plan would have a beneficial effect on Lake Merced as it would add new flows to the lake. To avoid an impact on surface water quality, the proposed Campus Master Plan relies on Low Impact Development (LID) concepts of on-lot infiltration and control, and distributed retention to reduce the impact of increased storm water runoff to Lake Merced. Overall, the proposed open storm water system incorporating LID concepts would treat surface water runoff by utilizing both physical and biological treatment processes occurring in the system’s vegetation and soils. The Campus Master Plan indicates that the proposed system emphasizes on-site filtration and will be designed to meet the highest applicable standards for water quality. Additionally, runoff from locations that could have concentrated sources of pollution (e.g., loading docks and parking lots) would not be directed into the open system, and therefore runoff from these locations would not be a potential source of surface water contamination.

Data on the effectiveness of the various treatment systems included in the proposed Campus Master Plan is variable and not definitive but the data available shows that the use of LID concepts lowers the levels of pollutants in urban runoff especially for heavy metals, with some studies showing large decreases in pollutant loads. Furthermore, the use of LID concepts in urban planning is considered state-of-the-practice and therefore for most urban runoff pollutants such as sediment, metals and oil/grease should result in a less-than-significant impact on Lake Merced water quality. However, potentially significant impacts may occur if campus storm water discharges increase the lake’s concentrations of nutrients and ammonia, which could potentially further decrease the lake’s dissolved oxygen concentrations causing further eutrophication. (See Impact HYDRO-1 for additional information.)

**Mitigation Measures**

The Board of Trustees finds that based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential surface water quality impact of the project will be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

**Mitigation HYDRO-1:** The campus shall conduct monitoring of storm water discharges to Lake Merced. If monitoring data indicate that the discharge of storm water from SF State to Lake Merced increases the level of nutrients in the lake, then depending on the source of the nutrient, additional measures (e.g., fertilizer best management practices) to reduce and/or offset nutrient loads shall be implemented on campus. The protocol
and specific requirements for conducting monitoring of campus storm water discharges shall be developed in accordance with the SFPUC through its subsequent approval process.

Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts will be mitigated to a less than significant level, no adverse cumulative impacts related to surface water quality are anticipated.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the surface water quality impact of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant surface water quality impact identified in the Final EIR.

TRANSIT IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the transit impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, pages 3-35 through 3-45).

The transit impact analysis provided in the Draft EIR was conducted for the PM peak hour (5:00-5:59 PM) in accordance with the City and County of San Francisco’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review. These guidelines call for a screenline analysis based on the “capacity, ridership and load factors during PM peak hour conditions for the affected transit lines.” Moreover, the PM peak hour is also when peak loads on the Muni system occur. An additional analysis of the SF State peak was also performed as part of the Final EIR, which was determined to be between 8:00-9:00 AM.

This analysis indicated that the four Muni screenlines would operate at levels far below Muni capacities, based on Muni’s passenger load standard of 85 percent. Therefore, the addition of new Muni riders generated by the Campus Master Plan would not substantially impact the peak hour capacity utilization at the screenlines. However, given the unavailability of M-line ridecheck data, it was not possible to calculate current or projected ridership for the M-line. As a result, peak hour trips associated with campus growth could not be added to existing or projected trips to determine if the M-line would be over capacity. However, observations of passenger loads on the M-line platform at SF State, as well as standing loads on the M-line vehicles suggest that the addition of campus riders to the M-line would exacerbate the crowding and worsen the capacity problems on this line.

The Draft EIR indicated that the City and County of San Francisco has already identified this problem, and is suggesting remedies as part of two ongoing projects: (1) The San Francisco County Transportation Authority's 19th Avenue Project, and (2) The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP). The 19th Avenue Project is considering multimodal solutions for 19th Avenue, including Bus Rapid Transit service. The TEP is looking at a variety of planning, operations and capital
solutions to enhance Muni performance systemwide, but is not yet to the point of making specific recommendations at the route level. If these improvements were implemented, the Draft EIR concludes that they would be more than sufficient to meet the campus's additional transit travel demands and the impact on the M-line would be less than significant. However, these improvements are only in the early planning stages and are under the jurisdiction of Muni or SFCTA to implement and the University cannot guarantee their implementation. Therefore, the Draft EIR concluded that the impact on the M-line is considered significant. Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would also result in overcrowding and capacity problems on the Campus Shuttle. (See Impact TRA-2 for additional information.)

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation TRA-2A: The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) can and should implement improvements to transit services along 19th Avenue via the implementation of MTA’s Transit Effectiveness Project and SFCTA’s 19th Avenue Project, which are in the planning stages. Improvements ultimately included in these programs could include, but would not be limited to, travel time improvements along the M-line and 28/28L lines (e.g., bus rapid transit, improved stop spacing, transit prioritization treatments, expanded Proof-of-Payment, in-lane bus stops), re-establishing a “short-run” of the M-line between the Embarcadero and the SF State stations, etc.

Mitigation TRA-2B: In the event that transit capacity enhancements listed in the Campus Master Plan are not implemented in a timely manner by Muni and/or SFCTA, the campus will extend the Campus Shuttle service to West Portal Station on an interim basis, based on the following program:

- The University will collect data from Muni to establish the baseline average peak period, peak direction passenger loading between the campus and West Portal Station.
- The University will monitor SF State peak period transit use by conducting cordon counts as specified in Mitigation TRA-1.
- If Muni reports that M-line average peak period, peak direction passenger loading between the campus and West Portal Station exceeds 85 percent of combined seating and standing load capacity for two years in a row, and if the cordon surveys show that peak period transit trips on the M-line between the campus and West Portal Station are greater than 5 percent above the baseline, the University will extend campus shuttle service to West Portal Station during the peak period(s).
- This additional campus shuttle service will be operated with adequate capacity (i.e., it will not exceed a 85 percent combined seated/standing passenger capacity target).
- This additional campus shuttle service will be operated until MTA’s and SFCTA’s planned transit capacity enhancements related to 19th Avenue are implemented, as described in Mitigation TRA-2A above.

Mitigation TRA-2C: The campus shall monitor peak hour utilization of Campus Shuttle buses on an annual basis and if average peak period, peak direction passenger loading exceeds 85 percent of combined seated and standing load capacity for shuttle service between the campus and the Daly City BART station, the campus shall increase shuttle frequency or otherwise increase the capacity of the shuttle services during the peak period(s) until this standard is met.
Cumulative Impacts

No direct project impacts would occur on transit services with growth contemplated by the Campus Master Plan. Based on the conservative, worst-case analysis provided in the EIR, significant cumulative impacts on the M-line and the Campus Shuttle would occur for which the project would have a considerable contribution, as described above.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the transit impacts of the project to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant transit impact identified in the Final EIR.

Additionally, pursuant to the recent State Supreme Court decision (City of Marina v Board of Trustees of the California State University), the CSU and the University acknowledge responsibility to negotiate with local agencies in order to determine the amount of voluntary mitigation payment (process subject to Chapter 13.7 of Government Code Section 67685) that would fund the University’s fair share of the off-site transit improvements under Mitigation TRA-2A above, that may be required to mitigate or avoid the environmental effects of this project. Related to this measure, SF State agrees to work in good faith with the City to fund its “fair share” of transit improvements between the campus and West Portal station, not to exceed the cost of extending the campus shuttle service to West Portal Station. If SF State and the City cannot come to agreement on the appropriate transit improvements or SF State’s “fair share,” SF State agrees to extend campus shuttle service to West Portal Station during the peak period(s) per Mitigation TRA-2B. This additional campus shuttle service will be operated with adequate capacity (i.e., it will not exceed a 85 percent combined seated/standing passenger capacity target). This additional campus shuttle service will be operated until the City meets its own capacity targets in the campus-to-West Portal corridor. Therefore, the implementation of Mitigations TRA-2A and -2B per the above will ensure that the project’s contribution to potentially significant cumulative transit impacts in the campus-to-West Portal corridor are mitigated or avoided.

3.3 Environmental Effects Found to Be Less Than Significant

3.3.1 Environmental Effects Discussed in the EIR Found to Be Less than Significant and Not Requiring Mitigation

This section identifies impacts of the project that are less than significant and do not require mitigation measures. Based on information in the EIR, the Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following impacts have been determined to fall within this category:

a) Aesthetics (scenic resources, on-campus visual character, and light and glare);

b) Air Quality (local CO emissions);

c) Biological Resources (conflicts with adopted HCPs);
d) Geology, Soils and Seismicity (construction soil erosion);
e) Hazards and Hazardous Materials (use/transport of hazardous materials and wastes, hazards to adjacent schools, exposure to contaminated soil or groundwater, and interference with Emergency Operations Plan);
f) Hydrology and Water Quality (groundwater);
g) Land Use and Planning;
h) Noise (operational noise);
i) Population and Housing;
j) Traffic, Circulation, and Parking (pedestrian and bicycle access, parking, and conflicts with adopted plans); and
k) Utilities and Public Services.

SCENIC RESOURCES, ON-CAMPUS VISUAL CHARACTER, AND LIGHT AND GLARE IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the scenic resources, on-campus visual character, and light and glare impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, pages 3-8 through 3-9).

A small groves of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine located in and around the Quad constitute scenic resources on the campus, as they play an important role in creating the park-like character of the campus. Moreover, they constitute the only surviving pre-campus vegetation that formerly stood amid agricultural fields. The proposed Campus Master Plan identifies the area within and adjacent to the Quad as the Campus Core landscape zone, and indicates that new landscaping in this zone should follow the existing palette of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine, broad lawns, boarders of lush, green, clumping masses of plants like agapanthus, bergenia, camellia, and azalea. The proposed Campus Master Plan also identifies the need for a replacement program for the Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine so that as existing trees naturally decline others will be sufficiently mature to take their place. However, proposed development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially damage some of the small groves or individual trees of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine in the Campus Core landscape zone if not sensitively sited and constructed. This is considered a less-than-significant significant impact. (See Impact AES-1 for additional information.)

The proposed Campus Master Plan will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the existing SF State campus. The proposed Campus Master Plan provides for the replacement of some of the older campus buildings and construction of new campus buildings. Overall, the density of campus development will increase. However, this increase in density will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the campus, as: (1) the amount of open space on campus will generally be maintained, (2) the existing pattern of development will be maintained, (3) the building heights of new development will be similar to other existing campus development, and (4) other design standards and guidelines of the proposed Campus Master Plan will maintain or further enhance the existing visual character of the campus. (See Impact AES-2 for further information.)
New light sources associated with new development proposed under the Campus Master Plan could include streetlights, illuminated signage, exterior safety and way finding lighting, and light emitted from building windows. The existing night lighting on and adjacent to the campus is typical of a developed urban area and new campus lighting will not substantially change these nighttime conditions. This is considered a less-than-significant impact. Moreover, the proposed Campus Master Plan lighting standards will require that LEED-NC guidelines for light pollution reduction be followed. While mitigation is not required to reduce a significant impact, it is recommended to ensure that these lighting standards will be implemented with future development, which will further reduce the impact. (See Impact AES-4 for further information.)

If new campus buildings will have reflective surfaces, such as metal and glass, the resultant glare could affect nearby residents, pedestrians, and passing motorists, which is considered a less-than-significant impact. However, architectural standards provided in the proposed Campus Master Plan indicate that stucco cladding or poured-in-place concrete are common features in campus buildings that should be applied in new development. Therefore, while it is unlikely that reflective building materials will be utilized, implementation of recommended mitigation will ensure that future buildings do not use reflective building surfaces as the primary materials for building facades. (See Impact AES-4 for further information.)

**Mitigation Measures**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential aesthetic impacts of the project related to scenic resources, on-campus visual character, and light and glare are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. However, these less-than-significant impacts will be further reduced by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

**Mitigation AES-1A:** The small groves of mature Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine trees located within the Campus Core landscape zone will be maintained and preserved with development under the proposed Campus Master Plan. Tree trimming and/or tree removal will take place in this portion of the campus only if required based on tree health conditions, public safety issues, and/or to allow for proposed development.

**Mitigation AES-1B:** Any mature Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine trees that will be removed with proposed development under the proposed Campus Master Plan shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio elsewhere within the Quad landscape zone. This planting shall be in addition to any replacement program implemented under the proposed Campus Master Plan to address the natural decline of trees.

**Mitigation AES-1C:** Mature Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine trees that will be retained within or immediately adjacent to a construction site shall be adequately protected prior to the commencement of construction activities. Fencing shall be installed no closer than the drip line of trees, to the extent possible. Fencing closer to the trunk than the dripline will be permitted only when necessary to allow construction of project elements. The campus shall periodically inspect construction sites to ensure that protective construction fencing remains in place during the entire construction phase of future projects.

**Mitigation AES-4A:** New campus lighting will be consistent with the most recent LEED-NC guidelines for light pollution reduction. These guidelines require that directional and other lighting methods be used to minimize light trespass from buildings and outdoor areas. Available methods, include but are not limited to: directional and design methods to reduce spillage, automatically controlled turn off of interior spaces during
non-business hours, lighting exterior areas only for safety and comfort, and using lower intensity lights.

**Mitigation AES-4A:** Reflective metal, mirrored glass, or any other reflective building materials shall not be used as primary building materials for facades.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Because project impacts related to scenic resources, on-campus visual character, and light and glare will be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts related to these topics are anticipated.

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential aesthetic impacts of the project related to scenic resources, on-campus visual character, and light and glare are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. However, these less-than-significant impacts will be further reduced by implementation of the mitigation measures identified above.

**LOCAL CO EMISSIONS IMPACTS**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of the local carbon monoxide emissions impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, of the Draft EIR.

As indicated in the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines, the air quality analysis for land use plans should focus on an evaluation of the plans consistency with the CAP. However, these guidelines also indicate that there may be some instances where quantification of a plan’s air quality impacts is appropriate, such as when a plan may lead to increased traffic congestion and associated CO concentrations at vicinity intersections. Therefore, the plan’s contribution to CO concentrations at vicinity intersections was estimated. The resulting analyses show that predicted CO concentrations at all four intersections analyzed would be less than the state and federal standards for CO. Because the intersections analyzed had either the highest delay (i.e., worst LOS) or the highest traffic volumes, the other intersections not analyzed are expected to experience even smaller impacts related to CO concentrations. The impact would therefore be less than significant. (See Impact AIR-3 for additional information.)

**Cumulative Impacts**

The analysis described above constitutes the cumulative assessment of CO concentrations at vicinity intersections. As no significant cumulative impacts were found, no direct project impacts would occur.

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential local CO emissions impact of the project is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**CONFLICTS WITH ADOPTED HCPs**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**
An evaluation of conflicts with adopted HCPs associated with the project is found in Section 4.3, *Biological Resources*, of the Draft EIR.

The campus does not fall within the boundaries of an adopted HCP or NCCP, nor is it adjacent to any properties that have such an adopted plan. Therefore, there is no potential that the implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan would result in conflicts with an adopted HCP or NCCP.

A Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan (San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department 2006) is in place for the adjacent Lake Merced Natural Area. The implementation of the new storm water management system and the new path connection into the East Lake area under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not conflict with or otherwise impede the implementation of the general and site-specific recommendations that apply to Lake Merced, with the implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this section. Therefore, it is expected that these proposed project elements would not conflict with the ultimate management goals of the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan for the adjacent Lake Merced Natural Area. The impact is less than significant. (See Impact BIO-3 for additional information.)

**Cumulative Impacts**

Because project impacts related to conflicts with adopted HCPs will be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated.

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential biotic impacts of the project related to conflicts with adopted HCPs are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**CONSTRUCTION SOIL EROSION IMPACTS**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of potential construction-phase soil erosion associated with the project is found in Section 4.5, *Geology, Soils, and Seismicity*, of the Draft EIR.

Construction of facilities anticipated under the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in short-term soil-disturbing activities that could lead to increased erosion including cut and fill, grading, trenching, boring, and removal of trees and other vegetation. To comply with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements for construction site storm water discharges, projects involving construction sites that are 1 acre or more are required to prepare and implement a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWPPP). Appropriate erosion-control measures will be incorporated into each SWPPP and implemented during site preparation, grading, and construction. These measures will include but are not limited to the following: design and construction of cut and fill slopes in a manner that will minimize erosion, protection of exposed slope areas, control of surface flows over exposed soils, use of wetting or sealing agents or sedimentation ponds, limiting soil excavation in high winds, construction of beams and runoff diversion ditches, and use of sediment traps, such as hay bales. Following construction of individual projects, erosion potential will be very low because future project sites will be covered by buildings, pavement, and/or landscaping. Therefore, the impact related to erosion and sedimentation will be less than significant. (See Impact GEO-2 for additional information.)
Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts related to construction-phase soil erosion will be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential construction-phase soil erosion of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

OTHER HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of other hazards and hazardous materials impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials, of the Draft EIR.

Campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan will involve an increase in the number of laboratories and the expansion of other facilities, such as maintenance facilities, which involve the use of hazardous materials, generation of hazardous waste, and the transportation of such materials to and from the campus. SF State is committed to providing a safe environment for the campus and local community by implementing the increasingly complex and stringent laws and regulations regarding the use, storage, and transport of hazardous materials. Throughout the planning horizon of the proposed Campus Master Plan, SF State will continue to comply with all federal and state laws and regulations and will continue to implement all safety programs and procedures currently in place as established by EH&OS. These procedures will continue to avoid or substantially limit exposure of students, faculty, staff, and the community at large to hazardous materials. All SF State projects implemented under the proposed Campus Master Plan will comply with these controls. Therefore, the project will not create significant hazards to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials, or under upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. The impact is therefore considered less than significant. (See Impact HAZ-1 for additional information.)

Although hazardous materials and waste use within ¼ mile of an existing or proposed school will likely increase as a result of campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan, these materials will not exist in quantities sufficient to pose a risk to occupants of the school or campus community. Because hazardous materials in laboratories are typically handled in small quantities and will continue to be handled in this manner under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the potential consequences of an accidental release will be limited to a single building and in most cases, to the individual laboratory where the spill occurred. Furthermore, as discussed above SF State will continue to comply with federal and state regulations and will continue to implement existing campus safety programs and procedures. Therefore, the impact to those attending existing or proposed schools and childcare centers will be less than significant. (See Impact HAZ-2 for additional information.)

The proposed project will not be located on a site that is on a list of hazardous material sites complied pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. There are no known sites with soil or groundwater
contamination on the main campus as several former UST or LUST sites on campus have been remediated and contamination is no longer a concern. EH&OS is not aware of any existing contaminated sites on campus. Also, the past uses of the campus are well known and are not likely to have resulted in soil or groundwater contamination. Due to the low probability of any remaining contaminated locations on campus, this impact is less than significant. (See Impact HAZ-3 for additional information.)

SF State currently has a campus-wide Emergency Operations Plan (EOP) and individual EOPs for campus buildings in place. Campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not interfere with the campus (EOP) through construction-related road closures. Under current campus policy, contractors must complete work with the least possible obstruction to traffic, and must keep fire hydrants accessible at all times. The SF State Capital Planning Agency is the lead agency regulating lane closures, and the Department of Public Safety ensures that lanes are passable at all times. Additionally, as new buildings are constructed, new EOPs will be developed for new buildings under current campus policies. While the impacts related to emergency response plans would be less than significant, mitigation measures are recommended in the EIR to ensure that current campus policies regarding EOPs are continued. (See Impact HAZ-5 for additional information.)

Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts of the project related to exposure to other hazards and hazardous materials are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. However, these less-than-significant impacts will be further reduced by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation HAZ-5A: The campus shall continue to include the following requirements in its standards established by Capital Planning and implement them under the proposed Campus Master Plan:

- Construction work shall be conducted so as to ensure the least possible obstruction to traffic.
- Contractors shall notify the SF State’s Representative at least two weeks before any road closure.
- When paths, lanes, or roadways are blocked, detour signs must be installed to clearly designate an alternate route.
- Fire hydrants shall be kept accessible to fire fighting equipment at all times.
- To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction projects will result in temporary lane or roadway closures, campus police and dispatchers must be notified of the closures and alternative travel routes.

Mitigation HAZ-5B: New building and/or department-specific EOPs shall be developed for any new development project.

Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts related to other hazards and hazardous materials issues will be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Findings
The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts of the project related to exposure to other hazards and hazardous materials are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. However, these less-than-significant impacts will be further reduced by implementation of the mitigation measures identified above.

GROUNDWATER IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the groundwater impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.7, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, pages 3-18 through 3-19).

Because redevelopment of existing building sites is a major component of the proposed Campus Master Plan, the plan would not result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces on the campus. The increase in impervious surfaces would not substantially reduce the recharge of the groundwater basin. Furthermore, the proposed Campus Master Plan includes a storm water drainage system that incorporates LID concepts. These LID concepts would maximize the infiltration of new runoff into the campus lands, and in some areas, the modified storm water drainage system would divert existing runoff from the storm drain system into infiltration areas. Overall, implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan would add more water to the groundwater basin. Additionally, the proposed open storm water system incorporating LID concepts would treat surface water runoff by utilizing physical and biological treatment processes. These facilities would not only treat surface water runoff, but also would treat water that infiltrates into the groundwater basin. Further, as runoff from locations that could have concentrated sources of pollution (e.g., loading docks and parking lots) would not be directed into the open system, they would not be potential sources of groundwater contamination. In summary, the proposed project would not reduce groundwater recharge or adversely affect water quality in the groundwater basin. The impact is less than significant. (See Impact HYDRO-2 for additional information.)

Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts related to groundwater will be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential groundwater impacts of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

LAND USE AND PLANNING IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the land use and planning impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.8, Land Use and Planning, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, page 3-19).
The proposed Campus Master Plan will not physically divide an established community. Additionally, the proposed Campus Master Plan, if adopted, will become the applicable campus land use plan. The California State University System is the only agency with land use jurisdiction over campus projects. Thus, campus development that is consistent with the adopted proposed Campus Master Plan will not have land use impacts under this CEQA threshold of significance. Additionally, while SF State is not subject to local land use regulations, the proposed Campus Master Plan for SF State generally conforms to relevant local land use plans. Overall, land use and planning impacts are less than significant. (See Impacts LU-1 and LU-2 for additional information.

**Cumulative Impacts**

Because project impacts related to land use would be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated.

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential land use impacts of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**OPERATIONAL NOISE IMPACTS**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of the operational noise impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.9, *Noise*, of the Draft EIR.

Traffic noise increases above existing conditions were calculated under an existing plus project scenario, under a 2020 without project scenario, and under a 2020 with project scenario. Noise levels along off-campus study area roadway segments were modeled and evaluated. The selected roadway segments are representative of areas that are expected to experience the greatest project-related traffic increases under the proposed Campus Master Plan. The modeled locations, therefore, represent the reasonable worst-case noise increases for this analysis. Cumulative traffic noise increases under Year 2020 cumulative conditions, both with and without the project, would be less than the standards of significance used in this analysis. This impact would be less-than-significant. (See Impact NOIS-2 for additional information.)

**Cumulative Impacts**

Based on the conservative, worst-case analysis provided in the EIR, significant cumulative operational traffic noise impacts would not occur with the project, as described above.

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential operational noise impacts of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.
POPULATION AND HOUSING IMPACTS

Summary of Potential Impacts

An evaluation of the population and housing impacts associated with the project are found in Section 4.10, Population and Housing, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, pages 3-19 through 3-27).

Growth of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan would directly increase the study area population as a result of new SF State affiliates and their dependents. Overall, the increment of population that would be added to the study area as a result of SF State campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not be substantial, and the impact would be less than significant. (See Impact POP-1 for additional information.)

Growth in off-campus areas would not be triggered by the utility extensions serving new campus buildings, as the surrounding neighborhoods are already built out, and the undeveloped lands adjacent to the campus to the west are within city or state parks and are protected from development. Moreover, the proposed Campus Master Plan does not propose any roadway widening improvements. Therefore, the surrounding neighborhoods and commercial areas would not be expected to grow substantially as a result of utility extensions or roadway widening from campus development. (See Impact POP-2 for additional information.)

The proposed Campus Master Plan would affect study area housing resources in two ways: (1) by adding more people to the study area that would require housing and (2) by removing and replacing some of the existing housing on and adjacent to the campus. Regarding the first item, the housing demand in San Francisco associated with new SF State affiliates will be well within the projected supply and would not trigger shifts of demand to other parts of the Bay Area region, nor would it stimulate the need to build additional new housing above and beyond that already projected. Likewise, housing demand elsewhere in the Bay Area region associated with new SF State affiliates also would be well within the projected supply. Therefore, there would be no substantial shift in demand to more distant communities outside the Bay Area region, nor would the project stimulate the need to build additional new housing above and beyond that already projected. Therefore, this impact is less than significant. (See Impact POP-3 for additional information.)

Regarding the second item above, the proposed Campus Master Plan calls for new housing on a portion of the UPN and UPS sites, which would result in the demolition of existing apartments and the construction of new units, for a net gain in units on campus. While the project would temporarily displace housing units, it would more than compensate for the loss, and the total housing supply in the study area would increase as a result of the proposed Campus Master Plan. Therefore, this temporary displacement of housing units will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region. However, the redevelopment of a few blocks in UPS and UPN could displace non-SF State people that have not already voluntarily vacated their units by the time this proposed construction takes place. Because the number of units is small compared to the projected increase in housing in San Francisco and the Bay Area, this displacement will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. Therefore, these impacts are less than significant. Furthermore, the campus will comply with the California Relocation Assistance Act (Government Code 7260 et seq), which applies to state entities that may displace residents and businesses. This act generally requires
that public entities provide assistance and financial payments to persons who are displaced as the result of the acquisition of property for a public use. Financial assistance that may be required would include, for example, moving expenses and temporary rent subsidies. In addition to what is required by the law, SF State will provide displaced persons with the option to relocate to comparable units in other campus housing in UPN and UPS and maintain their current rent. (See Impacts POP-3 and POP-4 for additional information.)

**Cumulative Impacts**

Campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other regional growth in the study area, would result in a demand for housing that could potentially exceed the projected housing supply in 2020. This cumulative impact would be significant. However, because the demand generated by campus growth would not constitute a substantial portion of the total housing demand in the region (2.0 percent or less than 45 new units per year over the 13-year plan period), the project’s contribution would not be cumulatively considerable. (See Impact POP-5 for additional information.)

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential population and housing impacts of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**PED/BIKE ACCESS, PARKING, AND TRANSPORTATION PLAN IMPACTS**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of the pedestrian/bike access, parking, and transportation plan impacts associated with the project are found in Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking, of the Draft EIR.

As a result of both improved pedestrian facilities and an increase in campus population, the level of pedestrian activity in and around the campus is expected to increase. The increase in enrollment at the campus will not cause substantial overcrowding on public sidewalks, especially the sidewalks and crosswalks near the Holloway and 19th Avenue intersection, based on a pedestrian level of service analysis conducted in the Draft EIR. With respect to the concern regarding pedestrian safety from increased campus-related traffic along Holloway Avenue, the Campus Master Plan has been designed to avoid the increase in vehicle trips to the campus. Furthermore, the Campus Master Plan envisions Holloway Avenue as a pedestrian-friendly street that would have two narrow travel lanes, bicycle lanes, street trees, and ground-floor activity and entrances facing the street. This would be effective in reducing automobile travel speeds and improving conditions for pedestrians along this street. The proposed project would not otherwise create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians. In summary, the Campus Master Plan would have a beneficial effect on pedestrians. It should also be noted that existing pedestrian safety concerns on 19th Avenue are being addressed by a number of projects under the 19th Avenue/Park Presidio Boulevard Transportation Plan. (See Impact TRA-3 for additional information.)

In order to facilitate safe and convenient bicycle access across campus and to increase the use of bicycles among the campus commuters, the Campus Master Plan includes an on-campus bicycle network along shared bicycle-pedestrian routes. Bicycle racks will also be provided in visible locations near buildings. Secure bicycle lockers will be provided at multiple locations on campus, including in conjunction with all new
parking structures on campus. As the campus is developed, the Bike Barn will be replaced with a Bike Station. The Bike Station will extend services to SF State students, faculty, and staff. In summary, the proposed Campus Master Plan includes numerous improvements to enhance bicycle use on the campus and the plan therefore would not adversely affect conditions for bicyclists. (See Impact TRA-4 for additional information.)

The proposed project would not have a significant impact related to parking because the parking strategy included in the Campus Master Plan is consistent with the City’s Transit First policy, and the planned supply of parking is designed to ensure that single-occupant vehicle mode split does not increase in the future and that new single-occupant vehicle trips are not generated. Pursuant to Mitigation TRA-1, the campus will conduct cordon counts every three years or if necessary every year, and make additional improvements to its TDM program to ensure that new trips are not generated. Therefore, the demand for parking will not exceed the projected supply. Furthermore, pursuant to the Campus Master Plan, the campus will work with the MTA to minimize the social impact of campus affiliates parking in surrounding neighborhoods. (See Impact TRA-5 for additional information.)

The Campus Master Plan includes a parking strategy, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, and a program for shuttle service improvements. All of these elements of the Campus Master Plan are designed to discourage automobile use and encourage the use of alternate means of transportation. In addition, campus representatives will participate in local planning efforts to advocate for prioritization and funding of improvements to transit services that serve the campus area, including the TEP and the 19th Avenue study. Therefore, implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies or programs that support alternative transportation. (See Impact TRA-6 for additional information.)

**Cumulative Impacts**

Because project impacts related to ped/bike access, parking, and transportation plans would be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated.

**Findings**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential ped/bike access, parking, and transportation plan impacts of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

**Utilities and Public Service Impacts**

**Summary of Potential Impacts**

An evaluation of the utilities and public service impacts associated with the project are found in Section 4.12, *Utilities and Public Services*, of the Draft EIR and as revised in the Final EIR (see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, pages 3-47 through 3-52).

Off-site improvements to the distribution piping or other facilities near the campus would not be required to serve the estimated increase in demand for potable water. However, the SFPUC has indicated that it is unclear whether or not off-site improvements (e.g., line or pump up-grades) would be required to provide for adequate fire flows. The SFPUC supplies water to the campus at two points of connection, located in 19th
Avenue and Lake Merced Boulevard. These connections are equipped with turbine meters to maximize available water flow and pressure. Within the boundaries of the SF State campus, beyond these points of connection with the City’s system, the University has its own water system that it manages.

According to the Campus Master Plan Existing Conditions Analysis (WRT, 2006), while no major upgrades to the campus water system are known to be needed at this time, it is possible that if a given proposed building has a substantially larger flow requirement than existing development, upsizing of existing on-campus piping may be required. Given the pressure and flow provided by the turbine meters, however, improvements to the off-campus system to provide for adequate fire flows are not anticipated by the University.

While such off-campus upgrades are not expected, if they are required the SFPUC can charge the SF State campus for these upgrades under Government Code Section 54999, which authorizes public utilities to charge the campus a limited capital facilities fee under certain circumstances. This fee (i.e., a non-discriminatory charge to defray the actual cost of that portion of a public utility facility actually serving the campus) covers SF State’s fair share of the construction cost, including the cost of mitigation measures to address environmental impacts, if any. However, it should be noted that any such upgrades would not be expected to result in significant environmental effects due to the urban context. For the above reasons, the proposed project will not require the construction of new water supply facilities or new water supply entitlements off campus that could cause significant environmental effects. The impact is less than significant. (See Impact UTIL-1 for additional information.)

The campus is planning to meet a net zero increase in combined wet weather flows both over the long term and incrementally. Given this, off-site improvements to the downstream sewer system should not be required. While significant impacts to the physical environment have not been identified, Mitigation UTL-2 has been developed (see below) to ensure that SF State verifies that a “net zero” increase in combined wet-weather flows can be achieved incrementally, as each individual building and phase is implemented, in consultation with the SFPUC.

While off-site improvements to the wastewater distribution system are not anticipated to serve growth at the campus, as described above, it is possible that improvements to San Francisco’s distribution piping near the campus may be required if the campus does not achieve the objective of having a “net zero” increase in combined sewer flows. Specifically, the City has indicated that sewer lines on Font Boulevard and Holloway Avenue and further downstream may need to be enlarged to accommodate higher combined peak wet weather flows. While such upgrades are not expected to result in significant environmental effects due to the urban context, the SFPUC can charge the SF State campus for these upgrades under Government Code Section 54999, which authorizes public utilities to charge the campus a limited capital facilities fee under certain circumstances. This fee (i.e., a non-discriminatory charge to defray the actual cost of that portion of a public utility facility actually serving the campus) covers SF State’s fair share of the construction cost, including the cost of mitigation measures to address environmental impacts, if any. Therefore, the proposed project will not require the construction of new wastewater facilities off campus that could cause significant environmental effects. The impact is less than significant. (See Impact UTIL-2 for additional information.)

While the proposed Campus Master Plan calls for new generating facilities to reduce its requirements for power from PG&E’s electrical power grid and to promote energy independence, it is possible that the campus...
may satisfy some or all of the increase in demand for power from PG&E’s electrical power grid. Given that the campus is located in a developed urban area, it is highly unlikely that proposed campus growth would result in the need for expansion or construction of new electrical system capacity improvements above and beyond those already being pursued by PG&E in the San Francisco Peninsula Area (e.g., the 230-kilovolt Jefferson-Martin transmission line). Moreover, the project-generated demand for electricity will be negligible in the context of overall demand within San Francisco and the State, and will not in and of itself require a major expansion of power facilities. Therefore, the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction of new or expanded electrical system capacity improvements off-campus that could result in significant environmental impacts. The impact is less than significant. (See Impact UTIL-3 for additional information.)

Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in an increased demand for police protection services on and adjacent to the campus. It is expected that with the proposed population increase and facility development that about 20 additional officers will be needed by 2020. This additional staffing and associated increase in the police fleet will require a substantially larger police station and parking area over that currently in use. Under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the existing police station and the rest of the facilities located in the Corporation Yard and the Lakeview Center will be relocated to a site in the northwestern portion of the campus, north of Winston Drive. A larger police station could be accommodated in this area as well. The environmental effects of constructing and operating facilities in the northwestern portion of the campus, including a proposed new police station are addressed in other sections of this EIR. If potentially significant impacts were indicated, they will be mitigated to less-than-significant levels by the implementation of mitigation measures presented in this EIR. Therefore, the proposed Campus Master Plan will not result in the construction of new police facilities that will cause significant environmental impacts. The impact is less than significant. (See Impact UTIL-4 for additional information.)

The project will also result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire protection services from the SFFD. However, this increase in demand will not likely be substantial in relationship to the existing demand for fire protection services in San Francisco as a whole. Furthermore, the increase in demand will not likely require the construction of any new fire protection facilities that might result in significant environmental impacts. Therefore, significant impacts related to fire protection services would not occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan. (See Impact UTIL-4 for additional information.)

Additionally, significant impacts related to solid waste, schools, and parks and recreational facilities would not occur as a result of the implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan. (See Impact UTIL-5 for additional information.)

Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees finds that based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential utilities and public service impacts of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. However, the less-than-significant wastewater impact will be further reduced by implementation of the following mitigation measure:

Mitigation UTL-2: As each future building project is proposed, SF State will verify that it can achieve a net
zero increase in combined wet weather flow to the City’s combined sewer system. If a net increase in such flows would occur campus wide, SF State will coordinate with the SFPUC to determine whether such an increase will require downstream system capacity improvements.

Cumulative Impacts

Because project impacts related to utilities and public services would be less than significant, no adverse cumulative impacts are anticipated.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential utilities and public services impacts of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required. However, the less-than-significant wastewater impact will be further reduced by implementation of the mitigation measure identified above.

3.3.2 Environmental Effects Determined Not to be Significant in the NOP Scoping Process and Not Discussed in the EIR

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. Section 4.13, Other Environmental Resources, of the Draft EIR addresses the potential environmental effects that have been found not to be significant as a result of the distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP), the responses to the NOP, and the NOP scoping process. Based on the NOP scoping process, potential impacts on the following resources were determined to be less than significant without the implementation of mitigation measures and are, therefore, not discussed in detail in this EIR: Agriculture and Mineral Resources.

4.0 FINDINGS REGARDING CONSIDERATIONS THAT MAKE ALTERNATIVES ANALYZED IN THE EIR INFEASIBLE.

Based on the entire record, the Board of Trustees finds that the EIR identified and considered a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the proposed project which are capable, to varying degrees, of reducing identified impacts. The EIR evaluates three alternatives in accordance with CEQA guidelines, including:

- No Project Alternative, which assumes that no development occurs on the project site;
- Reduced Housing Growth Alternative, which reduces the amount of new housing construction in response to the community concerns about reconstruction and replacement of existing units; and
- Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, which would reduce traffic impacts and impacts on regional housing resources.

No Project Alternative

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR’s alternatives analysis must include consideration of the No Project Alternative. The “No Project” analysis discusses the existing conditions as well as what would
reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project was not approved (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6 (e) (2) and (3) (A)). Under the No Project Alternative, a new Campus Master Plan and an enrollment ceiling increase to 25,000 FTE students would not be adopted and the campus would continue to operate under the previously adopted 1989 Campus Master Plan, as amended most recently in early 2006. While the existing 1989 Campus Master Plan map (as amended) does identify sites for new academic buildings (e.g., Behavioral and Social Sciences building), these buildings cannot be built under the existing plan because they would add FTE capacity to the campus. This additional capacity cannot be added until the CSU Board of Trustees approves an enrollment ceiling increase. The only new building shown on the existing Campus Master Plan map that could be built without adding FTE capacity to the campus is a proposed new greenhouse.

**Environmental Effects.** The implementation of the No Project Alternative will avoid or reduce environmental impacts in all categories to less-than-significant levels, as only a new greenhouse will be developed under this alternative. Therefore, the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Campus Master Plan will be avoided under this alternative.

**Relation to Project Objectives.** The No Project Alternative would not meet the primary project objectives of increasing the enrollment cap to 25,000 FTEs and providing for the necessary expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the enrollment increase (see Section 1.4 above). Therefore, this alternative will not allow the SF State campus to be responsive to the CSU Board of Trustees’ directive to plan for its share of the increased enrollment anticipated to occur in the CSU system. Additionally, this alternative would not meet any other of the project objectives.

**Feasibility.** The No Project alternative is infeasible because it would not meet any of the project objectives. The No Project alternative would not provide any of the benefits outlined in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**Reduced Housing Growth Alternative**

Under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative, future development of the campus would be planned to accommodate the proposed enrollment ceiling increase to 25,000 FTE students on campus by 2020. However, under this alternative the existing housing in UPS and UPN will be retained and will not be redeveloped to provide for higher density housing and to provide for the Hotel and Conference Center. Therefore, this alternative will not result in the construction of new housing in UPN and UPS, nor will it result in the construction of the Hotel and Conference Center. While the replacement of units in UPN and UPS will not result in significant environmental impacts under CEQA, some members of the surrounding community are concerned about this demolition and the resulting possible displacement of people that currently live in these units. Therefore this alternative considers the environmental implications of not providing this housing.

**Environmental Effects.** The Reduced Housing Growth Alternative would reduce aesthetic impacts with no redevelopment in UPS. The Reduced Housing Growth Alternative would have greater impacts on housing supply and the alternative’s contribution to the cumulative housing supply deficit in the study area by 2020 will also be greater than the proposed project. This alternative would have similar or slightly reduced impacts.
in the other impact categories. However, the level of significance of all impacts would remain the same. In particular, the significant unavoidable impacts associated with historic resources, construction noise, and traffic would remain under this alternative.

**Relation to Project Objectives.** Like the proposed project, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative would support the primary project objectives of increasing the enrollment cap to 25,000 FTEs and providing for the necessary expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the enrollment increase. The alternative, however, would not fully meet the objective of providing for faculty and staff housing to aid in recruitment and retention, as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. This alternative also would not meet the project objectives related to: (1) providing more close-in housing that enables the SF State population to walk to school and work; (2) redefining Holloway and Buckingham as “college main streets” that offer neighborhood retail and services, because with no redevelopment of UPN and UP for higher density housing and for the Hotel and Conference Center, such retail could not be provided; (3) making efficient use of redevelopment sites; (4) integrating new residential properties to create a unified campus; and (5) positioning semi-public uses at key campus corners. Additionally, it would be more difficult to establish a strong north-south connection across the valley and Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue without redeveloping UPN and UPS. The other planning principles of the proposed Campus Master Plan could be implemented under this alternative.

**Feasibility.** The Reduced Housing Growth Alternative is infeasible because it would prevent attainment of many of the basic project objectives as identified in Section 1.4, above; it would negatively impact the University's ability to recruit and retain quality faculty and staff in support of its educational mission; and, it would not provide many of the benefits outlined in the Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**Expanded Housing Growth Alternative**

Under the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, future development of the campus would be planned to accommodate the proposed enrollment ceiling increase to 25,000 FTE students on campus by 2020, similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan. However, under this alternative all of the existing housing in UPS and UPN would be redeveloped to provide for higher density housing and to provide for the Conference Center. No other land beyond these properties to the north and south was considered in this alternative (e.g., other locations within Parkmerced), because the campus is not considering expanding beyond UPN and UPS. This alternative was considered in order to maximize the provision of on-campus housing in order to minimize vehicle trips to the campus in the surrounding neighborhoods.

**Environmental Effects.** The environmentally superior alternative is the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative because it would reduce the project’s significant impacts with respect to traffic and air quality, and would place a reduced demand on off-campus housing supply. Some of the footprint impacts of this alternative, such as impacts on cultural and biological resources, would be greater than that of the proposed project or the other alternatives evaluated in detail, but because the additional areas that would be redeveloped (UPN and UPS) under this alternative are already highly disturbed, the likelihood of significant impacts related to biological and cultural resources in these areas is very low. This alternative would also provide a greater environmental benefit compared to the proposed project and the other alternatives evaluated in detail because under this alternative more storm water runoff from the campus would be infiltrated and/or
discharged into Lake Merced and this would help restore lake levels. However, the level of significance of all impacts would remain the same. In particular, the significant unavoidable impacts associated with historic resources, construction noise, and traffic would remain under this alternative.

**Relation to Project Objectives.** The Expanded Housing Growth Alternative would support the primary project objectives of increasing the enrollment cap to 25,000 FTEs and providing for the necessary expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the enrollment increase. The alternative would meet all other project objectives. In particular, the objectives related to the provision of on-campus housing to aid in recruitment and retention of faculty and staff and to allow the SF State population to walk to work or school would be more fully met under this alternative, given that it provides for more on-campus housing.

**Feasibility.** The Expanded Housing Growth Alternative is infeasible within the time frame of the Campus Master Plan (i.e., 2020). However, the long-term vision identified in the Campus Master Plan does contemplate the amount of new housing development in UPN and UPS reflected in this alternative. Therefore, while it is not being recommended for approval at this time, ultimately the campus may propose additional housing in its next Campus Master Plan revision consistent with this alternative.

### 5.0 FINDINGS WITH RESPECT TO MITIGATION OF SIGNIFICANT ADVERSE IMPACTS, AND ADOPTION OF MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

Based on the entire record before the Board of Trustees, and having considered the unavoidable significant impacts of the project, the Board of Trustees hereby determines that all feasible mitigation within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the CSU has been adopted to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts identified in the EIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts. The feasible mitigation measures are discussed in Section 3.1 and 3.2, above, and are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

The CSU Board of Trustees is vested with "full power and responsibility in the construction and development of any state University campus, and any buildings or other facilities or improvements connected with the California State University" (California Education Code 66606). CEQA provides that each public agency shall mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects it approves or carries out whenever it is feasible to do so (Public Resources Code 21001.1[b]). In mitigating or avoiding a significant effect of a project on the environment, a public agency may exercise only those express or implied powers provided by law other than under CEQA (PRC 21004). The California State University (CSU) has specific powers to mitigate effects that occur within its jurisdiction, namely within the campus.

Local agencies frequently impose fees for the mitigation of projects and cumulative impacts to finance the fair share cost of infrastructure improvements needed to accommodate growth. Such imposition of fees can occur only for those entities that are within the jurisdiction of that local agency. Government Code 54999 et. seq. does allow local entities to negotiate with the State for the imposition of "capital facilities fees" for the connection of specified utility services. Therefore, insofar as CSU agrees with a local entity for a capital facilities fee, such as needed expansion of a wastewater treatment facility to accommodate university growth, that amount may be assessed CSU. Utilities covered under 54999 include water, light, heat, communications, power, garbage service, flood control, drainage, sanitation and sewage collection, treatment, and disposal.
Additionally, pursuant to the recent State Supreme Court decision (City of Marina v Board of Trustees of the California State University), the CSU and the University acknowledge responsibility to negotiate with local agencies in order to determine the amount of a voluntary mitigation payment (process subject to Chapter 13.7 of Government Code Section 67685) that would fund the University’s fair share of the off-site improvements required to mitigate or avoid the environmental effects of this project including off-site impacts to roadways and intersections as well as potential impacts in other areas of local services and infrastructure.

The Board of Trustees finds that each mitigation measure within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the CSU is a binding condition of project approval, fully enforceable by the Board. However, certain mitigation measures that are adopted by the board are solely within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco, and therefore are not fully enforceable by the board. For these mitigation measures that are under the sole jurisdiction of the City and County of San Francisco, the board recognizes that a Memorandum of Understanding or other binding agreement is needed to ensure that the City and County agree to the conditions of approval.

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires the Board of Trustees to adopt a monitoring or compliance program regarding the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. The Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the SF State Campus Master Plan project is hereby adopted by the Board of Trustees because it fulfills the CEQA mitigation monitoring requirements:

- The Mitigation Monitoring Program is designed to ensure compliance with the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed on the project during project implementation; and
- Measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through conditions of approval, permit conditions, agreements or other measures.
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Independent Auditors’ Report

Dr. Robert A. Corrigan  
President  
San Francisco State University:

We have audited the accompanying financial statements of San Francisco State University (the University), an agency of the State of California, and its aggregate discretely presented component units as of and for the year ended June 30, 2011, which collectively comprise the University’s financial statements as listed in the table of contents. These financial statements are the responsibility of the University’s management. Our responsibility is to express opinions on these financial statements based upon our audit. We did not audit the financial statements of the aggregate discretely presented component units. Those financial statements were audited by other auditors whose reports thereon have been furnished to us, and our opinions, insofar as they relate to the amounts included for the aggregate discretely presented component units, are based solely on the reports of the other auditors.

We conducted our audit in accordance with auditing standards generally accepted in the United States of America. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain reasonable assurance about whether the financial statements are free of material misstatement. An audit includes consideration of internal control over financial reporting as a basis for designing audit procedures that are appropriate in the circumstances, but not for the purpose of expressing an opinion on the effectiveness of the University’s internal control over financial reporting. Accordingly, we express no such opinion. An audit also includes examining, on a test basis, evidence supporting the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements, assessing the accounting principles used and significant estimates made by management, as well as evaluating the overall financial statement presentation. We believe that our audit and the reports of other auditors provide a reasonable basis for our opinions.

As discussed in note 2, the financial statements of the University, an agency of the State of California, are intended to present the financial position, the changes in financial position, and cash flows of only that portion of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the State of California that is attributable to the transactions of the University. They do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the State of California or the California State University System as of June 30, 2011, the changes in their financial position, or, where applicable, their cash flows for the year then ended in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.

In our opinion, based on our audit and the reports of other auditors, the financial statements referred to above present fairly, in all material respects, the respective financial position of the University and of its aggregate discretely presented component units as of June 30, 2011, and the respective changes in financial position and, where applicable, cash flows thereof, for the year then ended in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.
Management’s discussion and analysis on pages 3 through 16 is not a required part of the basic financial statements but is supplementary information required by U.S. generally accepted accounting principles. We have applied certain limited procedures, which consisted principally of inquiries of management regarding the methods of measurement and presentation of the required supplementary information. However, we did not audit the information and express no opinion on it.

January 27, 2012
This section of San Francisco State University (the University) annual financial report presents our discussion and analysis of the financial performance of the University for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011. This discussion has been prepared by management and should be read in conjunction with the financial statements and notes.

**Introduction to the Financial Statements**

This annual report consists of a series of financial statements prepared in accordance with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statement No. 34, *Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for State and Local Governments*, as amended by GASB Statement No. 35, *Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for Public Colleges and Universities*. For reporting purposes, the University is considered a special-purpose government engaged only in business-type activities.

The financial statements include the statement of net assets; the statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets; and the statement of cash flows. These statements are supported by the notes to the financial statements and this section. All sections must be considered together to obtain a complete understanding of the financial picture of the University.

**Statement of Net Assets** – The statement of net assets includes all assets and liabilities. Assets and liabilities are generally reported at their book value, on an accrual basis, as of the statement date, except investments, which are reported at their fair value. It also identifies major categories of restrictions on the net assets of the University.

**Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets** – The statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets presents the revenues earned and expenses incurred during the year on an accrual basis.

**Statement of Cash Flows** – The statement of cash flows presents the inflows and outflows of cash for the year and is summarized by operating, noncapital financing, capital and related financing, and investing activities. The statement is prepared using the direct method of cash flows and, therefore, presents gross rather than net amounts for the year’s activities.

The statement of cash flows for the discretely presented component units is not included in the University’s financial statements.

**Analytical Overview**

**Summary**

The following discussion highlights management’s understanding of the key financial aspects of the University’s financial activities. Included is an analysis of current year activities and balances; a discussion of restrictions of University net assets; a discussion of capital assets and long-term debt; and factors impacting future reporting periods.
The University’s condensed summary of net assets as of June 30, 2011 and 2010 is as follows:

### Condensed Summary of Net Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets:</td>
<td>$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>177,803,586</td>
<td>152,022,137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets</td>
<td>553,732,295</td>
<td>536,957,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other noncurrent assets</td>
<td>37,045,593</td>
<td>58,372,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total assets</td>
<td>768,581,474</td>
<td>747,352,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>84,242,963</td>
<td>82,738,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt obligations, net of current portion</td>
<td>242,237,842</td>
<td>248,137,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other noncurrent liabilities</td>
<td>25,148,782</td>
<td>29,092,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total liabilities</td>
<td>351,629,587</td>
<td>359,968,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in capital assets, net of related debt</td>
<td>299,539,040</td>
<td>279,452,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, nonexpendable</td>
<td>2,666,131</td>
<td>2,972,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted, expendable</td>
<td>18,963,461</td>
<td>39,520,306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>95,783,255</td>
<td>65,437,721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total net assets</td>
<td>$ 416,951,887</td>
<td>387,383,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assets**

Total assets increased $21.2 million from prior year due to a $25.8 million increase in current assets and $16.8 million increase in capital assets, offset by a $21.3 million decrease in other noncurrent assets.

Total current assets increased $25.8 million primarily due to a $7.6 million increase in cash and a $34.2 million increase in short-term investments, offset by a $15.9 million decrease in accounts receivable, net. The $7.6 million increase in cash is due to cash deposited at the end of the year but not yet invested. The $34.2 million increase in short-term investments primarily consists of a tuition fee increase of $14.4 million, a new recreation and wellness fee of $2.0 million, an $8.3 million prior year claim reimbursement from the State Controller’s Office (SCO) and California State Library received in current year, a $4.2 million of Chancellor’s Office (CO) reimbursements for achieving over the enrollment target, and a $3.1 million reimbursement from the CO for retirement rate increases.

The above increases were offset by a $15.9 million decrease in accounts receivable, net primarily due to $10.8 million decrease in other receivables, a $3.0 million decrease in government grants and contracts receivable, and a $1.7 million decrease in accounts receivable from CO. The $10.8 million decrease in other receivables is due to a $4.5 million prior year claim reimbursement from the SCO received in current year and a $6.8 million reimbursement of the California State Library’s share of the library project-to-date renovation costs in current year. The $3.0 million decrease in government grants and contracts receivable were primarily due to $1.4 million in projects with large accounts receivable balances in prior year that have expired in current year.
and higher reimbursement received before year end for the HeadStart program. The $1.7 million decrease in accounts receivable from CO attributed to the settlement in current year of the funds due to the student union debt decentralization. The decentralization of the student union debt occurred prior to current year and the University has had an accounts receivable on its books for a few fiscal year for such funds held centrally by the CO.

Capital assets, net, increased $16.8 million primarily due to $41.4 million of current year additions, which was offset by current year depreciation expense of $24.3 million. Current year capital asset additions of $41.4 million are primarily related to purchases of equipment ($3.7 million) and library books and materials ($0.7 million) as well as a $37.0 million increase in construction work in progress related to the following projects: library renovations ($26.6 million), new creative arts building ($4.5 million), renovation for university park south property ($1.1 million), parking lot seismic upgrade ($1.3 million), and $3.5 million in other various projects.

Other noncurrent assets decreased $21.3 million primarily due to a decrease in state appropriation receivable as a result of spending down on the appropriation for the library projects in current year of $20.0 million.

**Liabilities**

Total liabilities decreased $8.3 million from prior year due to $1.5 million increase in current liabilities, offset by a $5.9 million decrease in long-term debt obligations, net of current portion, and $3.9 million decrease in other noncurrent liabilities.

Total current liabilities increased $1.5 million primarily due to an increase of a $4.0 million long-term debt-current, a $2.5 million increase in accrued compensated absences current portion, and a $1.3 million increase in accrued salaries and benefits payable, offset by a decrease in accounts payable of $6.8 million. The primary reason for the $4.0 million long-term debt, current increase is due to a $3.8 million Bond Anticipation Note taken for the parking seismic project in current year. The $2.5 million increase in accrued compensated absences, current portion, is primarily due to expected higher usage in the coming year as a result of the elimination of furloughs. The $1.3 million increase in accrued salaries and benefits payable is primarily due to no furloughs in the current year and benefit rate changes. These increases were offset by a decrease in accounts payable of $6.8 million because the University’s cash on-hand at year end exceeded outstanding checks (see change in cash discussed above). In prior year, $4.8 million of outstanding checks created a cash overdraft position and were classified as accounts payable. There were also lower noncapital payables due to third-parties as a result of timing differences.

Long-term debt obligations, net of current portion decreased $5.9 million primarily due to principal payments.

Other noncurrent liabilities decreased $3.9 million primarily due to $3.7 million decrease in accrued compensated absences, net of current portion due to expected higher usage in the coming year, which led to a higher amount classified to current portion.

**Net Assets**

Total net assets increased $29.6 million from the prior year. A significant portion, $299.5 million, of net assets at the end of the year is invested in capital assets, net of related debt. Net assets invested in capital assets, net of related debt increased $20.1 million from prior year primarily due to a $16.8 million increase in capital assets and a $5.9 million payment of long-term debt, which were offset by a $3.8 million increase in long-term debt.
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Restricted net assets totaled $19.0 million as discussed below.

$95.8 million of net assets at the end of the year is unrestricted. Unrestricted net assets represent all other net resources available to the University for general and educational obligations. A significant amount of unrestricted net assets are designated to support future operations in areas specified by legislative requirements. These requirements limit the area of operations for which expenditures of net assets may be made. Campus housing programs, student center programs, student health services, parking programs, and financial aid programs are primary examples of operations that have unrestricted net assets with designated uses. Unrestricted net assets increased $30.0 million mainly because the campus received the final state appropriation late in the current year. Due to the uncertainty of the state budget, the campus budget implemented in July 2010 was based on anticipated cut in state funding and reduced resident student enrollment. In October 2010, the campus received the final state appropriation, which included restored state funding of $18.0 million. In addition, the campus also received $9.0 million of federal stimulus funding. The late funding received will be used to help fill the further budget cut for fiscal year 2012. See Factors Impacting Future Periods on page 16.

**Restricted Resources**

Net assets of the University include funds that are restricted by donor or law. The following table summarizes which funds are restricted, the type of restriction, and the amount:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted Net Assets</th>
<th>June 30</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonexpendable:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonexpendable-endowments</td>
<td>$2,666,131</td>
<td>2,972,668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total restricted net assets – nonexpendable</strong></td>
<td>$2,666,131</td>
<td>2,972,668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expendable:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>$346,111</td>
<td>340,120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital projects</td>
<td>18,617,350</td>
<td>38,574,937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debt service</td>
<td></td>
<td>605,249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total restricted net assets – expendable</strong></td>
<td>$18,963,461</td>
<td>39,520,306</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total restricted net assets – expendable decreased $20.6 million primarily due to $20.0 million spent on the library project in the current year.
The University’s condensed summary of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets for the years ended June 30, 2011 and 2010 is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>June 30</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees, net</td>
<td>144,138,893</td>
<td>139,481,482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital</td>
<td>53,420,094</td>
<td>53,774,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>2,805,120</td>
<td>2,912,196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, net</td>
<td>41,321,485</td>
<td>39,259,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>7,153,073</td>
<td>7,885,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td>248,838,665</td>
<td>243,313,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses</td>
<td>(439,824,396)</td>
<td>(412,103,547)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating loss</td>
<td>(190,985,731)</td>
<td>(168,790,311)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating revenues (expenses):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations, noncapital</td>
<td>143,570,384</td>
<td>130,172,853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>48,420,572</td>
<td>39,795,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>15,800,771</td>
<td>14,865,874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental and other financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>19,107</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other federal nonoperating grants, noncapital</td>
<td>9,036,000</td>
<td>27,208,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, noncapital</td>
<td>1,320,141</td>
<td>1,510,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income, net</td>
<td>313,991</td>
<td>(99,022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment income</td>
<td>6,921</td>
<td>14,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense</td>
<td>(11,668,164)</td>
<td>(11,938,422)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating expenses, net</td>
<td>4,313,801</td>
<td>5,570,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total nonoperating revenues</strong></td>
<td>211,133,524</td>
<td>207,100,423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income before other additions</td>
<td>20,147,793</td>
<td>38,310,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations, capital</td>
<td>5,277,167</td>
<td>715,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and gifts, capital</td>
<td>4,451,735</td>
<td>1,212,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to permanent endowments</td>
<td>(308,226)</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase in net assets</strong></td>
<td>29,568,469</td>
<td>40,238,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning net assets</td>
<td>387,383,418</td>
<td>347,144,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ending net assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 416,951,887</td>
<td>$ 387,383,418</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Revenues and Expenses**

Operating revenues and expenses come from sources that are connected directly to the University’s primary business function. This includes revenues from categories such as tuition and fees, certain grants and contracts that will be used for noncapital purposes, and sales and services of auxiliary enterprises and education activities. Expenses include categories such as salaries, benefits, supplies and other services, scholarships and fellowships,
and depreciation and amortization. In this discussion and analysis, expenses are reported by functional program such as instruction, research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation and maintenance of plant, student grants and scholarships, auxiliary enterprise expenses, and depreciation and amortization.

**Operating Revenues**

Total operating revenues increased $5.5 million primarily due to a $4.7 million increase in student tuition and fees, net, a $2.1 million increase in sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, net, $1.2 million increase in state grants and contracts, noncapital, offset by a decrease in federal grants and contracts, noncapital of $1.3 million, and $0.7 million decrease in other operating revenues.

Student tuition and fees, net, increased $4.7 million from prior year due to $12.6 million, or 7.6%, increase in tuition fees, offset by an $8.0 million increase in scholarship allowance. The increase in tuition fees was due to rate increases per student of 5% and 10% for the Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 semesters, respectively. Student headcount remained consistent between the current and prior years. The scholarship allowance increase is primarily due to higher tuition (7.6%), an increase of percentage of students receiving financial aid (51% in prior year versus 53% in current year), and a Pell grant award increase of $200 per student.

Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises increased $2.1 million primarily due to a new recreation and wellness fee of $2.0 million.

State grants and contracts, noncapital increased $1.2 million primarily due to higher revenue for the following programs: Coastal Ocean Currents Monitoring Program (COCMP), $1.0 million and child development program, $0.6 million.

Federal grants and contracts, noncapital decreased $1.3 million primarily due to the Headstart program ($0.8 million) and expiration of various projects ($1.4 million) offset by an increase of $1.0 million for the Master: Fall Habitat project.

Other operating revenues decreased $0.7 million primarily due to nonrecurring proceeds for a legal settlement of $0.8 million received in prior year.

The following charts present the proportional share that each category of operating revenues contributed to the total for fiscal years 2011 and 2010.
Operating Revenues 2011
(Dollar amounts in millions)
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Operating Revenues
Year ended June 30, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees, net</td>
<td>$144,138,893</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – federal</td>
<td>$36,025,396</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – state</td>
<td>$9,071,983</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – local</td>
<td>$4,355,060</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – nongovernmental</td>
<td>$3,967,655</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>$2,805,120</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, net</td>
<td>$41,321,485</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$7,153,073</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248,838,665</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
Operating Revenues 2010
(Dollar amounts in millions)

Operating Revenues
Year ended June 30, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees, net</td>
<td>$139,481,482</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – federal</td>
<td>$37,347,523</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – state</td>
<td>$7,921,895</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – local</td>
<td>$4,790,562</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital – nongovernmental</td>
<td>$3,714,245</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>$2,912,196</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, net</td>
<td>$39,259,877</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$7,885,456</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$243,313,236</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Operating Expenses

The University’s operating expenses consist of salaries and fringe benefits of $281.1 million, supplies and other services of $72.4 million, scholarships and fellowships of $62.0 million, and depreciation of $24.3 million. Total operating expenses increased by $27.7 million, primarily due to increases of $14.5 million in instruction, $7.1 million in student grants and scholarships, $4.2 million in institutional support, and $2.4 million in research.

Instruction increased $14.5 million primarily due to $7.8 million of higher payroll and $5.2 million of higher benefits relating to the fact that furloughs were eliminated in the current year.

Student grants and scholarships increased $7.1 million primarily due to a $5.0 million Pell grant increase because the maximum award increased by $200 per student and tuition increased by 7.6%.

Institutional support increased $4.2 million primarily due to higher payroll expense from elimination of furloughs in the current year.

Research increased $2.4 million primarily due to the Master: Fall Habitat, a new grant in current year ($1.0 million) and higher spending on the COCMP project resulting in $0.3 million higher in payroll and $0.7 million higher in supplies and services cost.
The following chart presents the distribution of resources in support of the University’s mission for fiscal years 2011 and 2010:

### Operating Expenses

**Year ended June 30, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$147,846,602</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>18,493,525</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>25,865,068</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>41,785,764</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>32,338,954</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student grants and scholarships</td>
<td>61,992,562</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total instruction and educational support activities</td>
<td>328,322,475</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>34,538,816</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>29,039,431</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprises expenses</td>
<td>23,587,718</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>24,335,956</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating expenses</strong></td>
<td>$439,824,396</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Operating Expenses

Year ended June 30, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$133,396,503</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>$16,128,033</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>$26,796,446</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>$43,687,890</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>$30,038,170</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student grants and scholarships</td>
<td>$54,937,628</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total instruction and educational support activities**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$304,984,670</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Institutional support                        | $30,346,115  | 7.4        |
| Operation and maintenance of plant          | $30,798,253   | 7.5        |
| Auxiliary enterprises expenses              | $22,795,411   | 5.5        |
| Depreciation and amortization               | $23,179,098   | 5.6        |

**Total operating expenses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$412,103,547</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nonoperating Revenues

Nonoperating revenues (expenses) come from sources that are not part of the University’s primary business functions. Included in this classification are categories such as state appropriations, federal grants, certain financial aid grants, noncapital, grants and gifts, capital, investment income, and interest expense.

As the University is part of the California State University System, which is an agency of the State of California, the University’s operations are funded primarily from appropriations of state tax revenues. Appropriations used for purposes of acquisition of capital assets totaled $5.3 million for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011, up from $0.7 million for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2010 primarily due to $4.6 million additional appropriation from the state for library equipment. State appropriations, noncapital increased $13.4 million to partially make up for the $18.0 million decline in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) funding in current year. In addition, federal financial aid grants, noncapital increased $8.6 million due to higher Pell grants attributable to a 7.63% tuition increase and a $200 per student increase in maximum award. Grants and gifts, capital increased $3.2 million primarily due to a contribution from San Francisco State University Foundation to fund the utilities project related to the Creative Arts building. Other federal nonoperating grants, noncapital decreased $18.2 million due to lower ARRA funding in current year versus prior year. Other nonoperating revenues decreased $1.3 million due to lower Infrastructure Terminal Resource equipment assets transferred from CO in current year than in prior year.

Capital Assets and Long-Term Debt Obligations

Capital Assets

Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation, are shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land and land improvements</td>
<td>$43,630,119</td>
<td>$43,630,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art and historical treasures</td>
<td>4,606,522</td>
<td>4,551,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and building improvements</td>
<td>360,887,660</td>
<td>365,994,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements, other than buildings</td>
<td>422,683</td>
<td>505,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>23,267,533</td>
<td>23,762,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal property</td>
<td>17,823,276</td>
<td>17,503,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>4,413,829</td>
<td>5,165,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible assets</td>
<td>109,132</td>
<td>334,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction work in progress</td>
<td>98,571,541</td>
<td>75,510,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>$553,732,295</td>
<td>536,957,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital assets commitments at June 30, 2011 totaled $18.4 million. See note 6 of the notes to the financial statements for further information on capital assets.
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Long-Term Debt Obligations

Debt outstanding at June 30, 2011 and 2010 is summarized below by type of debt instrument:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Revenue Bonds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2004A</td>
<td>$6,000,000</td>
<td>6,135,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2005A</td>
<td>139,100,000</td>
<td>141,985,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2007D</td>
<td>76,825,000</td>
<td>77,855,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2005B</td>
<td>14,010,000</td>
<td>14,920,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2007C</td>
<td>8,240,000</td>
<td>8,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Series M</td>
<td>220,000</td>
<td>240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Series P</td>
<td>470,000</td>
<td>505,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAN</td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>248,603,000</td>
<td>250,320,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized bond premium (discount)</td>
<td>3,912,690</td>
<td>4,124,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized loss on refunding</td>
<td>(779,848)</td>
<td>(851,706)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total long-term debt</strong></td>
<td>251,735,842</td>
<td>253,592,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less current portion</td>
<td>(9,498,000)</td>
<td>(5,455,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-term debt, net of current portion</strong></td>
<td>$242,237,842</td>
<td>248,137,675</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bond Ratings

Moody’s Investors Service currently provides an intrinsic rating of Aa2, with a stable outlook, for the Systemwide Revenue Bonds. Standard & Poor's Rating Service currently provides an intrinsic rating of A+, with a stable outlook, for the Systemwide Revenue Bonds. With the exception of certain maturities of Series 2005C, Series 2007A, Series 2008A, Series 2009A, and all maturities of Series 2010A and 2010B, all Systemwide Revenue Bonds are insured. Since the middle of fiscal year 2008, some providers of insurance for Systemwide Revenue Bonds have been downgraded to ratings below Aaa/AAA. Those bonds that are uninsured bear the intrinsic ratings of the Systemwide Revenue Bonds, which are Aa2 from the Moody’s Investors Service and A+ from the Standard & Poor’s Rating Service. See notes 7 and 8 to the financial statements for further information on long-term debt obligations.
Factors Impacting Future Periods

The State Budget Act for fiscal year 2012, approved by the Governor on June 30, 2011, reduces the California State University System (the System) appropriations by $650 million, or 24% below the fiscal year 2011 enacted budget level. The result will be an approximately $480 million decrease in noncapital state appropriations for the System in fiscal year 2012 to a total of $2.10 billion from $2.58 billion in fiscal year 2011. In December 2011, the System’s fiscal year 2012 appropriations were further reduced by an additional $100 million due to the $1 billion shortfall in the State revenues.

To mitigate the impact of the appropriation reductions, the System increased tuition fee rates, including a 10% increase approved by the Board of Trustees (the Board) in November 2010 and an additional 12% increase approved by the Board in July 2011, both effective for fiscal year 2012, which together will yield approximately $265 million in new tuition fee revenue after discounting for financial aid. Moreover, the System reduced its base resident student enrollment target for fiscal year 2012 by roughly 10,000 full-time equivalent students (FTE) to approximately 332,000, and reduces expense measures of approximately $292 million.

In November 2011, the Board approved an increase in student tuition fees for fiscal year 2013 to raise approximately $138 million in new tuition fee revenue after discounting for financial aid.

The University’s state noncapital appropriations budget enacted for fiscal year 2012 approved by the legislative process is $111.8 million, a decrease of $31.8 million over the fiscal year 2011 funding level of $143.6 million. In addition, an increase in student fees in fiscal year 2012 is expected to generate $21.4 million during fiscal year 2012 in new revenue, net of financial aid.
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY  
Statement of Net Assets  
June 30, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>GASB Auxiliary Organizations</th>
<th>FASB Auxiliary Organizations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 7,593,128</td>
<td>1,133,514</td>
<td>185,081</td>
<td>8,911,723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term investments</td>
<td>154,955,531</td>
<td>5,965,046</td>
<td>10,214,213</td>
<td>171,134,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, net</td>
<td>12,652,139</td>
<td>993,499</td>
<td>3,623,845</td>
<td>17,269,483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges receivable, net</td>
<td>823,541</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>823,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other assets</td>
<td>2,602,788</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,629,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total current assets</strong></td>
<td>177,805,586</td>
<td>8,915,600</td>
<td>16,050,061</td>
<td>202,769,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncurrent assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, net</td>
<td>19,231,551</td>
<td></td>
<td>405,724</td>
<td>19,637,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans receivable, net</td>
<td>9,809,131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,809,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pledges receivable, net</td>
<td>436,529</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>436,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment investments</td>
<td>2,666,131</td>
<td>32,992,301</td>
<td></td>
<td>35,658,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long-term investments</td>
<td>5,338,780</td>
<td>19,931,659</td>
<td>2,752,495</td>
<td>28,022,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets, net</td>
<td>553,732,295</td>
<td>2,512,427</td>
<td>3,071,704</td>
<td>559,316,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total noncurrent assets</strong></td>
<td>590,777,888</td>
<td>55,872,916</td>
<td>6,229,923</td>
<td>652,880,727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>768,581,474</td>
<td>64,788,516</td>
<td>22,279,984</td>
<td>855,649,974</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Liabilities and Net Assets**

| Current liabilities:                        |            |                              |                              |       |
| Accounts payable                           | 5,551,352  | 2,233,204                    | 1,559,869                    | 9,344,425 |
| Accrued salaries and benefits payable      | 20,358,186 | 115,379                      | 61,072                       | 20,561,637 |
| Accrued compensated absences – current port| 11,817,763 | 67,252                       | 391,360                      | 12,276,375 |
| Deferred revenue                           | 28,771,440 |                              | 353,157                      | 29,124,597 |
| Capitalized lease obligations – current port| 771,583    |                              |                              | 771,583 |
| Long-term debt obligations – current port  | 9,498,000  |                              | 141,945                      | 9,639,945 |
| Depository accounts – current port         | 3,062,987  |                              |                              | 3,062,987 |
| Other liabilities                          | 4,384,652  | 343,138                      | 23,826                       | 4,751,616 |
| **Total current liabilities**              | 84,242,963 | 2,758,973                    | 2,531,229                    | 89,533,165 |

| Noncurrent liabilities:                    |            |                              |                              |       |
| Accrued compensated absences, net of current port| 5,983,457 |                              |                              | 5,983,457 |
| Deferred revenue                           |            |                              | 262,406                      | 262,406 |
| Grants refundable                          | 9,837,563  |                              |                              | 9,837,563 |
| Capitalized lease obligations, net of current port| 2,266,682 |                              |                              | 2,266,682 |
| Long-term debt obligations, net of current port| 242,237,842 |                              | 225,045                      | 242,462,887 |
| Depository accounts                        | 897,138    |                              | 151,196                      | 1,048,334 |
| Other postemployment benefits obligation   | 5,484,806  |                              |                              | 5,484,806 |
| Other liabilities                          | 679,136    |                              |                              | 679,136 |
| **Total noncurrent liabilities**           | 267,386,624|                              | 638,647                      | 268,025,271 |
| **Total liabilities**                      | 351,629,587| 2,758,973                    | 3,169,876                    | 357,558,436 |

| Net assets:                                 |            |                              |                              |       |
| Invested in capital assets, net of related debt| 299,539,040 | 2,512,427                    | 2,704,714                     | 304,756,181 |
| Restricted for:                             |            |                              |                              |       |
| Nonexpendable – endowments                  | 2,666,131  | 32,992,301                   |                              | 35,658,432 |
| Expendable:                                 |            |                              |                              |       |
| Scholarships and fellowships               |            |                              | 19,708,868                    | 19,708,868 |
| Loans                                      | 346,111    |                              |                              | 346,111 |
| Capital projects                           | 18,617,350 | 1,351,894                    |                              | 19,969,244 |
| Other                                      |            |                              |                              |       |
| Unrestricted                                | 95,783,255 | 5,464,053                    | 16,405,394                    | 117,652,702 |
| **Total net assets**                        | $ 416,951,887 | 62,029,543                  | 19,110,108                    | 498,091,538 |

See accompanying notes to financial statements.
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Assets
Year ended June 30, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discretely presented component units</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>GASB Auxiliary Organizations</th>
<th>FASB Auxiliary Organizations</th>
<th>Eliminations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees (net of scholarship allowances of $40,684,312)</td>
<td>$144,138,893</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,368,109</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>149,507,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal</td>
<td>36,025,396</td>
<td>171,758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36,197,154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>9,071,083</td>
<td>132,557</td>
<td>210,694</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,415,234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local</td>
<td>4,355,060</td>
<td>7,082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,362,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental</td>
<td>3,967,655</td>
<td>874,094</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,841,749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
<td>2,805,120</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,805,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises (net of scholarship allowances of $50)</td>
<td>41,321,485</td>
<td>4,533,097</td>
<td>18,450,440</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>64,305,022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating revenues</td>
<td>7,153,073</td>
<td>1,238,642</td>
<td>469,502</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,861,217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating revenues</td>
<td>248,838,665</td>
<td>6,785,472</td>
<td>24,670,503</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>280,294,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>147,846,602</td>
<td>219,378</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>148,065,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>18,493,525</td>
<td>631,214</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,124,739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>25,865,068</td>
<td>2,844,759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,709,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>41,785,764</td>
<td>2,242,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44,028,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>32,338,955</td>
<td>93,540</td>
<td>2,453,646</td>
<td></td>
<td>34,886,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>34,538,816</td>
<td>980,172</td>
<td>861,870</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,380,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>29,039,431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,039,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student grants and scholarships</td>
<td>61,992,562</td>
<td>758,945</td>
<td>22,947</td>
<td>(912,009)</td>
<td>61,862,445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprise expenses</td>
<td>23,587,717</td>
<td>1,701,505</td>
<td>20,532,786</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>45,822,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>24,335,956</td>
<td>256,859</td>
<td>824,862</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25,417,677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total operating expenses</td>
<td>439,824,396</td>
<td>9,729,081</td>
<td>24,696,111</td>
<td>(912,009)</td>
<td>473,337,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating loss</td>
<td>(190,985,731)</td>
<td>(2,943,609)</td>
<td>(25,608)</td>
<td>912,009</td>
<td>(193,042,939)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonoperating revenues (expenses):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations, noncapital</td>
<td>143,570,384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>143,570,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>48,420,572</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>48,420,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>15,800,771</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,800,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental and other financial aid grants, noncapital</td>
<td>19,107</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other federal nonoperating grants, noncapital</td>
<td>9,036,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9,036,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts, noncapital</td>
<td>1,320,141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(912,009)</td>
<td>408,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment income, net</td>
<td>313,991</td>
<td>5,037,986</td>
<td>822,725</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,174,702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment income</td>
<td>6,921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest expense</td>
<td>(11,668,164)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(21,075)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>(11,689,239)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonoperating revenues (expenses), net</td>
<td>4,313,801</td>
<td>2,972,960</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>7,286,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net nonoperating revenues (expenses)</td>
<td>211,133,524</td>
<td>8,010,946</td>
<td>801,650</td>
<td>(912,009)</td>
<td>219,034,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income before other additions</td>
<td>20,147,793</td>
<td>5,067,337</td>
<td>776,042</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25,991,172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations, capital</td>
<td>5,277,167</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5,277,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and gifts, capital</td>
<td>4,451,735</td>
<td>(4,282,402)</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>169,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions to permanent endowments</td>
<td>(308,226)</td>
<td>806,196</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>497,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in net assets</td>
<td>29,568,469</td>
<td>1,591,131</td>
<td>776,042</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>31,935,642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets at beginning of year</td>
<td>387,383,418</td>
<td>60,438,412</td>
<td>18,334,066</td>
<td></td>
<td>466,155,896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net assets at end of year</td>
<td>$ 416,951,887</td>
<td>62,029,543</td>
<td>19,110,108</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>498,091,538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.
## SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
### Statement of Cash Flows
#### Year ended June 30, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash flows from operating activities:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nongovernmental grants and contracts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to suppliers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collections of student loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other receipts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used in operating activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Cash flows from noncapital financing activities: |
| State appropriations | 143,570,384 |
| Federal financial aid grants | 48,420,572 |
| State financial aid grants | 15,800,771 |
| Other federal nonoperating grants | 9,036,000 |
| Gifts and grants received for other than capital purposes | 1,031,022 |
| Federal loan program receipts | 138,949,551 |
| Federal loan program disbursements | (139,052,662) |
| Monies received on behalf of others | 2,910,239 |
| Monies disbursed on behalf of others | (3,626,452) |
| Other noncapital financing activities | 12,240,591 |
| Net cash provided by noncapital financing activities | 229,280,016 |

| Cash flows from capital and related financing activities: |
| Proceeds from capital debt | 3,738,000 |
| State appropriations | 29,766,338 |
| Capital grants and gifts | 4,451,735 |
| Acquisition of capital assets | (41,377,389) |
| Principal paid on capital debt and leases | (7,029,975) |
| Interest paid on capital debt and leases | (11,843,321) |
| Net cash used in capital and related financing activities | (22,294,612) |

| Cash flows from investing activities: |
| Proceeds from sales and maturities of investments | 628,207,959 |
| Purchases of investments | (661,406,909) |
| Investment income received | 485,848 |
| Net cash used in investing activities | (32,713,102) |
| Net increase in cash and cash equivalents | 7,580,886 |
| Cash and cash equivalents at beginning of year | 12,242 |
| Cash and cash equivalents at end of year | $7,593,128 |

(Continued)
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
Statement of Cash Flows
Year ended June 30, 2011

Reconciliation of operating loss to net cash used in operating activities:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating loss</td>
<td>$ (190,985,731)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments to reconcile operating loss to net cash used in operating activities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>24,335,956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in assets and liabilities:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts receivable, net</td>
<td>2,886,823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student loans receivable, net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid expenses and other assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts payable</td>
<td>163,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5,441,311)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued salaries and benefits</td>
<td>1,310,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accrued compensated absences</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred revenue</td>
<td>586,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other postemployment benefits obligation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other liabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net cash used in operating activities</td>
<td>$ (166,691,416)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Supplemental schedule of noncash transactions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contributed capital assets</td>
<td>$ 105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition of capital asset through capital lease</td>
<td>21,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction work in progress acquired from the Office of the Chancellor</td>
<td>662,899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change in accrued capital asset costs (purchased but unpaid at year-end)</td>
<td>(776,018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of bond premium</td>
<td>211,691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amortization of loss on refunding</td>
<td>71,858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss on retirement of capital assets</td>
<td>280,127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See accompanying notes to financial statements.
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(1) Organization
San Francisco State University (the University), an agency of the State of California, was established as a campus of the California State University under the State of California Education Code to offer undergraduate and graduate instruction for professional and occupational goals emphasizing a broad liberal arts education. As one of 23 campuses in the California State University System (the System), the University is included in the financial statements of the System. Responsibility for the University is vested in the Trustees of the System (the Trustees) who, in turn, appoint the Chancellor, the chief executive officer of the System, and the University president, the chief executive officer of the University.

The University provides instruction for baccalaureate and masters’ degrees and certificate programs and operates various auxiliary enterprises such as student dormitories, student unions, and parking facilities. In addition, the University administers a variety of financial aid programs, which are funded primarily through state and federal programs, and carries out research and grant administration.

(2) Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

(a) Financial Reporting Entity
In accordance with Governmental Accounting Standards Board (GASB) Statements No. 34, Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for State and Local Governments, and No. 35, Basic Financial Statements – and Management’s Discussion and Analysis – for Public Colleges and Universities, the accompanying financial statements include the accounts of the University and the University’s five recognized auxiliary organizations. These auxiliary organizations are legally separate entities that provide services primarily to the University’s students and faculty. Separate financial statements are issued for each of the recognized auxiliary organizations and may be obtained from the University.

The recognized auxiliary organizations are as follows:

• The University Corporation, San Francisco State (the University Corporation)
• San Francisco State University Student Center (Student Center)
• Associated Students of San Francisco State University (Associated Students)
• Franciscan Shops (operating as SFSU Bookstore)
• San Francisco State University, Foundation (the Foundation)
Summary information for the discretely presented component units is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>June 30, 2011</th>
<th>The University Corporation</th>
<th>The Foundation</th>
<th>Other auxiliary organizations</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current assets</td>
<td>$ 4,820,876</td>
<td>4,094,724</td>
<td>16,050,061</td>
<td>24,965,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital assets, net</td>
<td>2,512,427</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3,071,704</td>
<td>5,584,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other noncurrent assets</td>
<td>8,979,533</td>
<td>44,380,956</td>
<td>3,158,219</td>
<td>56,518,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total assets</strong></td>
<td>16,312,836</td>
<td>48,475,680</td>
<td>22,279,984</td>
<td>87,068,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current liabilities</td>
<td>961,184</td>
<td>1,797,789</td>
<td>2,531,229</td>
<td>5,290,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncurrent liabilities</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>638,647</td>
<td>638,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total liabilities</strong></td>
<td>961,184</td>
<td>1,797,789</td>
<td>3,169,876</td>
<td>5,928,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invested in capital assets, net of related debt</td>
<td>2,512,427</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,704,714</td>
<td>5,217,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restricted</td>
<td>7,877,636</td>
<td>46,175,427</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>54,053,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unrestricted</td>
<td>4,961,589</td>
<td>502,464</td>
<td>16,405,394</td>
<td>21,869,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total net assets</strong></td>
<td>$ 15,351,652</td>
<td>46,677,891</td>
<td>19,110,108</td>
<td>81,139,651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ended June 30, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenues:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student tuition and fees, net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and contracts, noncapital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of educational activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total operating revenues</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenses:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student grants and scholarships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
The auxiliary organizations are presented in the accompanying financial statements as component units due to the nature and significance of their relationship with the University. The relationships are such that exclusion of these organizations from the reporting entity would render the financial statements incomplete, primarily due to the activities that the organizations carry out on behalf of the University, such as foodservice, bookstore, and academic support. The auxiliary organizations are discretely presented to allow the financial statement users to distinguish them from the University.

The financial statements present only the statement of net assets, statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets, and statement of cash flows of only that portion of the governmental activities, the business-type activities, each major fund, and the aggregate remaining fund information of the State of California that is attributable to the transactions of the University and the financial statements do not purport to, and do not, present fairly the financial position of the State of California or the California State University System as of June 30, 2011 and the changes in their financial position, or, where applicable, their cash flows for the year then ended in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles.
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(b) **Basis of Presentation**

The accompanying financial statements have been prepared using the economic resources measurement focus and the accrual basis of accounting in accordance with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles, as prescribed by the GASB. Revenues are recorded when earned and expenses are recorded when a liability is incurred, regardless of the timing of related cash flows. Grants and similar items are recognized as revenue as soon as all eligibility requirements have been met.

The financial statements required by GASB Statement Nos. 34 and 35 include a statement of net assets, a statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets, and a statement of cash flows. As a public institution, the University is considered a special-purpose government under the provisions of GASB Statement No. 35. The University records revenue in part from fees and other charges for services to external users and, accordingly, has chosen to present its financial statements using the reporting model for special-purpose governments engaged only in business-type activities. This model allows all financial information for the University to be reported in a single column in each of the financial statements, accompanied by aggregated financial information for the auxiliary organizations. In accordance with the business-type activities reporting model, the University prepares its statement of cash flows using the direct method.

The Student Center, Associated Students, and Franciscan Shops auxiliary organizations included in these financial statements apply the accounting and reporting standards promulgated by the Financial Accounting Standards Board (FASB), while The University Corporation and The Foundation apply the accounting and reporting standards promulgated by the GASB.

(c) **Election of Applicable FASB Statements**

The University has elected to follow standards of accounting and financial reporting issued by the FASB prior to November 30, 1989, unless those standards conflict with or contradict guidance of the GASB. The University also has the option of following subsequent private-sector guidance subject to the same limitation. The University has elected not to adopt the pronouncements issued by the FASB after November 30, 1989.

(d) **Classification of Current and Noncurrent Assets (other than Investments) and Liabilities**

The University considers assets to be current that can reasonably be expected, as part of its normal business operations, to be converted to cash and be available for liquidation of current liabilities within 12 months of the statement of net assets date. Liabilities that reasonably can be expected, as part of normal University business operations, to be liquidated within 12 months of the statement of net assets date are considered to be current. All other assets and liabilities are considered to be noncurrent. For classification of current and noncurrent investments, refer to note 2(f).

(e) **Cash Equivalents and Statement of Cash Flows**

The University considers highly liquid investments with an original maturity date of three months or less to be cash equivalents. The University considers amounts included in the California State University Investment Pool to be investments. The statement of cash flows does not include the cash flows of the discretely presented component units.
(f) **Investments**

Investments are reflected at fair value using quoted market prices. Realized and unrealized gains and losses are included in the accompanying statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets as investment income, net.

Investments that are used for current operations are classified as short-term investments. Investments that are restricted for withdrawal or use for other than current operations, designated or restricted for the acquisition or construction of noncurrent assets, designated or restricted for the liquidation of the noncurrent portion of long-term debt, and restricted as to the liquidity of the investments are classified as other long-term investment.

(g) **Capital Assets**

Capital assets are stated at cost or estimated historical cost if purchased, or if donated, at estimated fair value at date of donation. Capital assets, including infrastructure, with a value of $5,000 or more and with a useful life of one year or more are capitalized. Such costs include, where applicable, interest capitalized as part of the cost of constructed capital assets. Title to all assets, whether purchased, constructed, or donated, is held by the State. Although title is not with the University for land and buildings, the University has exclusive use of these assets and is responsible for the maintenance of these assets and thus has recorded the cost of these assets on the accompanying financial statements. Capital assets, with the exception of land and land improvements, works of art and historical treasures, and construction work in progress, are depreciated on a straight-line basis over their estimated useful lives, which range from 3 to 45 years. Library books, unless considered rare collections, are capitalized and depreciated over a 10-year period. Periodicals and subscriptions are expensed as purchased. Works of art and historical treasures are valued at cost if purchased or the fair market value at the date of donation if contributed. The costs of normal maintenance and repairs that do not add to the value of the asset or materially extend its life are expensed as incurred.

Depreciation expense is shown separately in the statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets rather than being allocated among other categories of operating expenses.

(h) **Deferred Revenue**

Deferred revenue consists primarily of fees collected in advance for summer and fall terms, continuing education programs, and grants and contracts awards received in advance of work performed.

(i) **Compensated Absences**

Compensated absences are recognized when the right to receive the compensation is earned by the employees. Vacation is accrued on a monthly basis. The University uses an employee’s current pay rate as of July 1, 2011 to calculate the liability for accrued compensated absences. The University employees pay rates are based on length of service and job classifications.

(j) **Grants Refundable**

The University periodically receives contributions from the federal government in support of its operation of the Federal Perkins and Nursing Loan programs, both Title IV loan programs. The
federal government has the ability to terminate its support of these programs at any time and to request the University to return those contributions that it has made on a cumulative basis.

Accordingly, the federal contributions received and retained by the University at year-end are considered to be liabilities of the University, and are reflected as such in the accompanying statement of net assets.

**(k) Net Assets**

The University’s net assets are classified into the following net asset categories:

*Invested in capital assets, net of related debt* – Capital assets, net of accumulated depreciation and outstanding principal balances of debt attributable to the acquisition, construction, or improvement of those assets.

*Restricted – nonexpendable* – Net assets subject to externally imposed conditions that the University retains them in perpetuity. Net assets in this category consist of endowments held by the University or its related auxiliaries.

*Restricted – expendable* – Net assets subject to externally imposed conditions that can be fulfilled by the actions of the University or by the passage of time.

*Unrestricted* – All other categories of net assets. In addition, unrestricted net assets may be designated for use by management of the University or have legislative requirements associated with their use. These requirements limit the area of operations for which expenditures of net assets may be made and require that unrestricted net assets be designated to support future operations in these areas. Campus housing programs are a primary example of operations that have unrestricted net assets with designated uses.

**(l) Classification of Revenues and Expenses**

The University considers operating revenues and expenses in the statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets to be those revenues and expenses that result from exchange transactions or from other activities that are connected directly to the University’s primary functions. Exchange transactions include charges for services rendered and the acquisition of goods and services. Moreover, the Office of the Chancellor administers and charges campuses for centralized expenses such as State pro rata and management of capital projects and pooled investments, which are included in operating expenses by function in the accompanying statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets.

Certain other transactions are reported as nonoperating revenues and expenses or capital contributions in accordance with GASB Statement No. 35. These nonoperating activities include the University’s capital and noncapital appropriations from the State, financial aid and American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) grants, noncapital, net investment income, gifts, interest expense, and capital contributions.

The State appropriates funds to the System on an annual basis. The appropriations are, in turn, allocated among the campuses by the Office of the Chancellor. Appropriations are recognized as
revenue when authorization is received, and are reported as either noncapital appropriations when used to support general operations or capital appropriations when used for capital projects.

In fiscal year 2011, the State received federal education grants that were passed on to school districts and the State's universities to restore state appropriations. The Governor had filed an application with the federal government to receive the State's share of the Education Stabilization Fund that was created as part of the federal stimulus bill under the ARRA. The federal education grants have been appropriated to the System by the State and reported separately under the caption of other federal nonoperating grants, noncapital in nonoperating revenues and expenses in the accompanying statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets.

Student tuition and fee revenue, and sales and services of auxiliary enterprises, including revenues from student housing programs, are presented net of scholarships and fellowships applied to student accounts. Certain other scholarship amounts are paid directly to, or refunded to, the student and are reflected as expenses.

(m) Internal Services Activities

Certain institutional internal service providers offer goods and services to University departments, as well as their external customers. These include activities such as copy centers, postal services, and telecommunications. All internal services activities to University departments have been eliminated in the accompanying financial statements. These eliminations are recorded by removing the revenue and expense in the internal service sales and service units and, if significant, allocating any residual balances to those departments receiving the goods and services during the year.

(n) Income Taxes

The System was established under the State of California Education Code as an agency of the State. As a campus of the System, the University is generally not subject to federal or state income taxes. However, the University remains subject to income taxes on any net income that is derived from a trade or business, regularly carried on and not in furtherance of the purpose for which it was granted exemption. No income tax provision has been recorded as the net income, if any, from any unrelated trade or business, in the opinion of management, is not material to the financial statements taken as a whole.

(o) Eliminations

All significant nonexchange transactions between the University and the discretely presented component units have been eliminated from the total column and are separately presented in the eliminations column in the accompanying statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets.

(p) Use of Estimates

The preparation of financial statements in conformity with U.S. generally accepted accounting principles requires management to make estimates and assumptions that affect the reported amounts in the accompanying financial statements. Actual results could differ from those estimates.
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(3) Cash and Cash Equivalents and Investments

The University’s cash and cash equivalents and investments as of June 30, 2011 are classified in the accompanying statement of net assets as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$ 7,593,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term investments</td>
<td>154,955,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endowment investments</td>
<td>2,666,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other long-term investments</td>
<td>5,338,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total investments</strong></td>
<td><strong>162,960,442</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cash, cash equivalents, and investments</td>
<td>$ 170,553,570</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Cash and Cash Equivalents

At June 30, 2011, cash and cash equivalents consisted of demand deposits held at commercial banks and petty cash. Total cash and cash equivalents of $7.6 million had a corresponding carrying balance with the commercial banks of $7.1 million at June 30, 2011. The differences related primarily to deposits in transit and outstanding checks.

Custodial Credit Risk for Deposits

Custodial credit risk for deposits is the risk that the University will not be able to recover deposits or will not be able to recover collateral securities that are in possession of an outside party. The California Government Code and Education Code do not contain legal or policy requirements that would limit the exposure to custodial credit risk for deposits, other than the provision that a financial institution must secure deposits made by state or local governmental units by pledging securities in an undivided collateral pool held by a depository regulated under state law. This risk is mitigated in that the University’s deposits are maintained at financial institutions that are fully insured or collateralized as required by state law.

(b) Investments

At June 30, 2011, the University’s investment portfolio consists primarily of investments in the State of California Surplus Money Investment Fund (SMIF) and the California State University Investment Pool. For the California State University Investment Pool, separate accounting is maintained as to the amounts allocable to the University’s various funds and programs.

Investment Policy

State law and regulations require that surplus monies of the University must be invested. The primary objective of the University’s investment policy is to safeguard the principal. The secondary objective is to meet the liquidity needs of the University. The third objective is to return an acceptable yield. The University’s investment policy authorizes funds held in local trust accounts under Education Code Sections 89721 and 89724 to be invested in any of the securities authorized by Government Code Section 16430 and Education Code Section 89724, subject to certain limitations. In general, the University’s investment policy permits investments in obligations of the
federal and California state governments, certificates of deposit, and certain other investment instruments.

**Interest Rate Risk**

Interest rate risk is the risk that changes in interest rates will adversely affect the fair value of an investment. Generally, the longer the maturity of an investment, the greater the sensitivity of its fair value to changes in market interest rates. The University has formal duration guidelines to manage its interest rate risk. The duration guidelines include limits on the maximum maturity of any individual investment in the portfolio and average duration of the investment portfolio. One of the ways that the California State University Investment pools its exposure to interest rate risk is by purchasing a combination of short-term and long-term investments and by timing cash flows from maturities so that a portion of the portfolio is maturing or nearing maturity evenly over time as necessary to provide the cash flow and liquidity needed for operations. The University monitors the interest rate risk inherent in its allocated share at the California State University Investment pool by measuring the weighted average maturity of its portfolio. Weighted average maturity is based on the stated maturity date, assuming that the callable investments will not be called. The weighted average maturity of the University’s allocated share at the California State University Investment pool for each investment type as of June 30, 2011 is presented in the table in the following page.

**Credit Risk**

Credit risk is the risk that an issuer of an investment will not fulfill its obligation to the holder of the investment. This is measured by the assignment of a rating by a nationally recognized statistical rating organization.

The following table presents the fair value, weighted average maturity, and actual rating by investment type of the University’s allocated share of the California State University Investment Pool and the Surplus Money Investment Fund as of June 30, 2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investment type</th>
<th>Fair value</th>
<th>average maturity (in years)</th>
<th>Rating as of year-end</th>
<th>Not rated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>AA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money market</td>
<td>$ 277,379</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>$ 277,379</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repurchase Agreements</td>
<td>376,693</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Paper</td>
<td>11,825,622</td>
<td>0.075</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificates of deposit</td>
<td>22,112,098</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>1,481,203</td>
<td>14,402,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. agency securities</td>
<td>49,466,600</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>34,014,209</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate and fixed income</td>
<td>52,246,746</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>19,671,490</td>
<td>13,605,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Treasury securities</td>
<td>21,203,495</td>
<td>1.445</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of California Surplus</td>
<td>4,603,485</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money Investment Fund</td>
<td>848,324</td>
<td>7.550</td>
<td>717,364</td>
<td>130,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortgage-backed securities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$ 162,960,442</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 54,680,442</td>
<td>15,217,962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
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Concentration of Credit Risk

The University’s investment policy contains no limitations on the amount that can be invested in any one issuer beyond that stipulated by the California Government Code. As of June 30, 2011, the following allocation of pooled investments (other than U.S. Treasury securities, mutual funds, and external investment pools) represented 5% or more of the University’s investment portfolio: Federal Home Loan Banks Office of Finance, $18.5 million (11.7%), Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation, $18.5 million (11.7%), and Federal National Mortgage Association, $10.3 million (6.5%).

Risk and Uncertainties

The University may invest in various types of investment securities. Investment securities are exposed to various risks such as interest rate, market, and credit risks. Due to the level of risk associated with certain investment securities, it is at least reasonably possible that changes in the values of investment securities will occur in the near term and that such changes could materially affect the amounts reported in the statement of net assets.

The University through the California State University Investment pool invests in securities with contractual cash flows, such as asset-backed securities and mortgage-backed securities. The value, liquidity, and related income of these securities are sensitive to changes in economic conditions, including real estate value, delinquencies or defaults, or both, and may be adversely affected by shifts in the market’s perception of the issuers and changes in interest rates.

For information regarding the investments of the individual discretely presented component units, refer to their separately issued financial statements.

(4) Accounts Receivable

Accounts receivable at June 30, 2011 consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current</th>
<th>Noncurrent</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State appropriations</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>19,102,114</td>
<td>19,102,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary organizations</td>
<td>1,900,520</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1,900,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student accounts</td>
<td>714,543</td>
<td>33,584</td>
<td>748,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government grants and contracts</td>
<td>9,290,835</td>
<td>129,436</td>
<td>9,420,271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1,319,028</td>
<td>583,605</td>
<td>1,902,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13,224,926</td>
<td>19,848,739</td>
<td>33,073,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>(572,787)</td>
<td>(617,188)</td>
<td>(1,189,975)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$12,652,139</td>
<td>19,231,551</td>
<td>31,883,690</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(5) **Student Loans Receivable**

Student loans receivable, net at June 30, 2011 consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perkins loans</td>
<td>$11,016,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other loans</td>
<td>$165,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total student loans receivable, gross</strong></td>
<td><strong>11,181,174</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less allowance for doubtful accounts</td>
<td>$(1,372,043)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total student loans receivable, net</strong></td>
<td><strong>$9,809,131</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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(6) Capital Assets

Capital assets activity for the year ended June 30, 2011 consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Balance, June 30, 2010</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Retirements</th>
<th>Transfers</th>
<th>Balance, June 30, 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nondepreciable capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and land improvements</td>
<td>$ 43,630,119</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43,630,119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Works of art and historical treasures</td>
<td>4,551,522</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,606,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction work in progress</td>
<td>75,510,305</td>
<td>37,014,659</td>
<td>(169,322)</td>
<td>(13,784,101)</td>
<td>98,571,541</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total nondepreciable capital assets</td>
<td>123,691,946</td>
<td>37,069,659</td>
<td>(169,322)</td>
<td>(13,784,101)</td>
<td>146,808,182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciable capital assets:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and building improvements</td>
<td>656,965,252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>670,586,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements, other than buildings</td>
<td>3,107,740</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,107,740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>27,953,097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,115,529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold Improvements</td>
<td>6,878,645</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,878,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal property:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>40,380,953</td>
<td>3,646,848</td>
<td>(1,057,906)</td>
<td></td>
<td>42,969,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books and materials</td>
<td>19,995,038</td>
<td>661,794</td>
<td>(166,767)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20,490,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible assets</td>
<td>2,235,641</td>
<td>12,409</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,248,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total depreciable capital assets</td>
<td>757,516,366</td>
<td>4,321,051</td>
<td>(1,224,673)</td>
<td>13,784,101</td>
<td>774,396,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td>881,208,312</td>
<td>41,390,710</td>
<td>(1,393,995)</td>
<td></td>
<td>921,205,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less accumulated depreciation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buildings and building improvements</td>
<td>(290,970,981)</td>
<td>(18,728,280)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(309,699,261)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvements, other than buildings</td>
<td>(2,601,860)</td>
<td>(83,197)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,685,057)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>(4,190,748)</td>
<td>(657,248)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4,847,996)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leasehold improvements</td>
<td>(1,712,898)</td>
<td>(751,918)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,464,816)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal property:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>(27,213,066)</td>
<td>(3,108,140)</td>
<td>947,101</td>
<td></td>
<td>(29,374,105)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library books and materials</td>
<td>(15,659,461)</td>
<td>(769,885)</td>
<td>166,767</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16,262,579)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intangible assets</td>
<td>(1,901,630)</td>
<td>(237,288)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2,138,918)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total accumulated depreciation</td>
<td>(344,250,644)</td>
<td>(24,335,956)</td>
<td>1,113,868</td>
<td></td>
<td>(367,472,732)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net capital assets</td>
<td>$536,957,668</td>
<td>17,054,754</td>
<td>(280,127)</td>
<td></td>
<td>553,732,295</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For information regarding the capital assets of the individual discretely presented component units, refer to their separately issued financial statements.
(7) Lease Obligations

The University is obligated under various capital and operating leases and installment purchase agreements for the acquisition of equipment and facility rentals.

Capital leases consist primarily of leases of certain facilities and office equipment. Total capital assets related to capital leases have a carrying value of $4.3 million and capital leases passed down from the CO of $0.5 million at June 30, 2011. Substantially all of these assets are pledged as security for the related leases. The leases bear interest at rates ranging from 1.04% to 19.00% and have terms expiring in various years through 2018.

Operating leases consist primarily of leases for the use of real property and have terms expiring in various years through fiscal year 2022. Future minimum lease payments under capital and operating leases having remaining terms in excess of one year are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ending June 30:</th>
<th>Capital leases</th>
<th>Operating leases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$ 887,956</td>
<td>5,541,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>508,261</td>
<td>4,719,971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>476,299</td>
<td>4,779,125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>456,723</td>
<td>4,623,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>448,339</td>
<td>4,625,683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 – 2021</td>
<td>663,622</td>
<td>24,499,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022 – 2026</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,999,315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total minimum lease payments</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,441,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>51,788,396</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Less amount representing interest        | (402,935)      |                 |
| Present value of future minimum lease payments | 3,038,265      |                 |
| Less current portion                     | (771,583)      |                 |
| **Capital lease obligations, net of current portion** | **$ 2,266,682** | **$** |

Rent expense under operating leases for the year ended June 30, 2011 totaled $5.5 million.

Lease financing is provided to the System for the construction of various System and campus facilities through its participation with the State in the State Public Works Board Lease Revenue Bond Program. Certain capital assets recorded by the University may have been financed under these arrangements. However, since the obligation for the repayment of this financing rests with the System and the proceeds of such financing are not readily identifiable with a campus or project, a substantial portion of such financing is not allocated to the individual campuses of the System. Unallocated Lease Revenue Bonds outstanding for the System as of June 30, 2011 totaled $804,745,000.
(8) Long-Term Debt Obligations

(a) General Obligation Bond Program

The General Obligation Bond program of the State has provided capital outlay funds for the three segments of California Higher Education through voter-approved bonds. Each of the approved bond programs provides a pool of available funds, which is allocated on a project-by-project basis among the University of California, the System, and the Community Colleges. Financing provided to the University through State General Obligation Bonds is not allocated to the System by the State. This debt remains the obligation of the State and is funded by state tax revenues. Accordingly, such debt is not reflected in the accompanying financial statements. Total General Obligation Bond debt carried by the State related to System projects is approximately $2,707,128,000 as of June 30, 2011.

(b) Revenue Bond Programs

The Revenue Bond Act of 1947 provides the Trustees with the ability to issue revenue bonds to fund specific self-supporting programs. The statute has enabled the Trustees to finance student housing, student unions, parking facilities, health facilities, continuing education facilities, and auxiliary organization facilities.

The housing program provides on-campus housing primarily for students. Housing is a self-supporting program deriving its revenues from fees collected for the use of the residence facilities and from interest income. Funds are used for current operating expenses, maintenance and repair, improvements to facilities, and interest and principal payments on outstanding bonds. Available balances after payment of all operating expenses and required charges remain available for future program expenses and capital needs.

The student union program provides facilities and programs aimed at creating and enhancing learning experiences outside the classroom by promoting interaction among students, faculty, and staff. The student union program is self-supporting and derives its revenues primarily from student fees and from interest income. Funds are used for maintenance and repair, improvements to facilities, and interest and principal payments on outstanding bonds. After payment of all authorized charges, the balances of these funds are available and can be transferred to a campus auxiliary organization that would have a contract with the University to operate the facility. The operating entity may derive additional revenue from facility subrental, recreational and commercial activities, and interest income.

The parking program provides parking facilities. The parking program is self-supporting and derives its revenues primarily from student fees and from interest income. Funds are used for construction, repair and maintenance, and principal and interest payments on outstanding bonds. Available balances after payment of all operating expenses and required charges remain available for future program expenses and capital needs.

The health facilities program provides facilities on campus in which to provide health services to students. The health facilities program derives its revenues primarily from student fees and from interest income. Funds are used for current operating expenses, maintenance and repair, improvements to facilities, and interest and principal payments on outstanding bonds. Available
balances after payment of all operating expenses and required charges remain available for future program expenses and capital needs.

The continuing education program provides nonstate-supported courses to students. The continuing education program is self-supporting and derives its revenues primarily from student fees and from interest income. Funds are used for current operating expenses, maintenance and repair, improvements to facilities, and interest and principal payments on outstanding bonds. Available balances after payment of all operating expenses and required charges remain available for future program expenses and capital needs.

Designated auxiliary organization programs provide for certain additional facilities on campuses for the benefit of students and staff. Funds received by the University from designated auxiliary organizations are used to pay principal and interest payments on outstanding bonds. Available balances after payment of all operating expenses and required charges remain available for future program expenses and capital needs.

The Systemwide Revenue Bond program, formerly the Housing Revenue Bond program, was approved by the Trustees in fiscal year 2003. This program provides funding for various construction projects, including student residence and dining halls facilities, continuing education buildings, student unions, parking facilities, health facilities, and auxiliary organization facilities at designated campuses within the System as specified by the individual bond documents. It is designed to provide lower cost debt and greater flexibility to finance revenue bond projects of the System. Rather than relying on specific pledged revenues to support specific debt obligations, this program pools several sources of revenue as the pledge for the related revenue producing projects.

The University participates in the Systemwide Revenue Bond program and its allocated share of outstanding Systemwide Revenue Bond debt as of June 30, 2011 was $251,735,842, which has been used to finance certain projects.

The System has pledged future continuing education, healthcare facilities, housing, parking, and student union revenues plus designated auxiliary revenues, net of maintenance and operation expenses before extraordinary items (net income available for debt service), to repay $3,618,713,000 in Systemwide Revenue Bonds issued through fiscal year 2011. The bonds are payable solely from continuing education, healthcare facilities, housing, parking, student union, and designated auxiliary net income available for debt service and are payable through fiscal year 2038. The Systemwide Revenue Bond indenture requires net income available for debt service to be at least equal to aggregate debt service for all bond indebtedness each fiscal year. The total debt service remaining to be paid on the bonds for the System is $6,048,938,884. In fiscal year 2011, total debt service paid and net income available for debt service, which excluded the designated auxiliary net income, for the System were $226,515,000 and $309,165,000, respectively.
(c) **Revenue Bond Anticipation Notes**

Revenue Bond Anticipation Notes (BANs) are authorized and issued by the Trustees and purchased by the California State University Institute (the Institute), an auxiliary organization of the System, to provide short-term financing to the System for construction projects. They are generally issued for a one- to three-year periods of up to three years in anticipation of issuing permanent revenue bonds at a future date. The University issued BANs were issued for the University during 2011 to finance the seismic upgrade of student parking facilities. Interest is variable and changes based upon the cost of the Institute’s commercial paper program. The interest rate ranged from 0.32% and 0.24% as of June 30, 2011. Amounts outstanding under the BANs totaled $3,738,000 at June 30, 2011.

Long-term debt obligations of the University as of June 30, 2011 consist of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Interest rate</th>
<th>Fiscal year maturity date</th>
<th>Original issue amount</th>
<th>Amount outstanding at June 30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide revenue bonds:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2004A (Housing)</td>
<td>3.50 – 5.25%</td>
<td>2033/35</td>
<td>$6,780,000</td>
<td>6,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2005A (Housing)</td>
<td>3.25 – 5.00%</td>
<td>2035/36</td>
<td>150,655,000</td>
<td>139,100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2005B (Housing)</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>18,160,000</td>
<td>14,010,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2007C (Union)</td>
<td>5.00%</td>
<td>2023/24</td>
<td>9,505,000</td>
<td>8,240,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Series 2007D (Housing)</td>
<td>4.00 – 5.00%</td>
<td>2037/38</td>
<td>80,360,000</td>
<td>76,825,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Series M</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2020/21</td>
<td>495,000</td>
<td>229,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Series P</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>2021/22</td>
<td>975,000</td>
<td>470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAN</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total                        |               |                           |                       | 248,603,000                  |

Unamortized bond premium          | 3,912,690     |
Unamortized loss on refunding     | (779,848)     |

Total long-term debt             | 251,735,842   |

Less current portion             | (9,498,000)   |

Long-term debt, net of current portion | $ 242,237,842 |
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Long-term debt principal obligations and related interest mature in the following fiscal years:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year ending June 30:</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$9,498,000</td>
<td>11,483,324</td>
<td>20,981,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6,040,000</td>
<td>11,247,867</td>
<td>17,287,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6,370,000</td>
<td>10,985,333</td>
<td>17,355,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6,720,000</td>
<td>10,697,532</td>
<td>17,417,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>7,095,000</td>
<td>10,390,058</td>
<td>17,485,058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2021</td>
<td>42,145,000</td>
<td>46,269,819</td>
<td>88,414,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022-2026</td>
<td>44,630,000</td>
<td>35,533,533</td>
<td>80,163,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2027-2031</td>
<td>51,510,000</td>
<td>24,364,501</td>
<td>75,874,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2032-2036</td>
<td>64,980,000</td>
<td>10,281,150</td>
<td>75,261,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2037-2041</td>
<td>9,615,000</td>
<td>437,512</td>
<td>10,052,512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$248,603,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>171,690,629</strong></td>
<td><strong>420,293,629</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Long-term debt obligations of the discretely presented component units have been issued to purchase or construct facilities for University-related uses. For information regarding the long-term debt obligations of the individual discretely presented component units, refer to their separately issued financial statements.

(9) Long-Term Liabilities Activity

Long-term liabilities activity of the University for the year ended June 30, 2011 was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Beginning balance</th>
<th>Additions</th>
<th>Reductions</th>
<th>Ending balance</th>
<th>Current portion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accrued compensated absences</td>
<td>$20,383,245</td>
<td>10,335,466</td>
<td>(12,917,491)</td>
<td>17,801,220</td>
<td>11,817,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalized lease obligations</td>
<td>4,591,800</td>
<td>21,440</td>
<td>(1,574,975)</td>
<td>3,038,265</td>
<td>771,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total capitalized lease</td>
<td>4,591,800</td>
<td>21,440</td>
<td>(1,574,975)</td>
<td>3,038,265</td>
<td>771,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obligations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term debt obligations (note 8):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systemwide Revenue Bonds</td>
<td>250,320,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5,455,000)</td>
<td>244,865,000</td>
<td>5,760,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAN</td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>250,320,000</td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
<td>(5,455,000)</td>
<td>248,603,000</td>
<td>9,498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized bond premium (discount)</td>
<td>4,124,381</td>
<td></td>
<td>(211,691)</td>
<td>3,912,690</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unamortized loss on refunding</td>
<td>(851,706)</td>
<td></td>
<td>71,858</td>
<td>(779,848)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total long-term debt obligations</td>
<td>253,592,675</td>
<td>3,738,000</td>
<td>(5,594,833)</td>
<td>251,735,842</td>
<td>9,498,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total long-term liabilities</td>
<td><strong>$278,567,720</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,094,906</strong></td>
<td><strong>(20,087,299)</strong></td>
<td><strong>272,575,327</strong></td>
<td><strong>22,087,346</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued)
(10) Pension Plan and Postretirement Benefits

(a) Pension Plan

Plan Description

The University, as an agency of the State, contributes to the CalPERS. The State’s plan with CalPERS is an agent multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan and CalPERS functions as an investment and administrative agent for its members. For the University, the plan acts as a cost-sharing multiple-employer defined benefit pension plan, which provides a defined benefit pension and postretirement program for substantially all eligible University employees. The plan also provides survivor, death, and disability benefits. Eligible employees are covered by the Public Employees’ Medical and Hospital Care Act (PEMHCA) for medical benefits.

CalPERS issues a publicly available comprehensive annual financial report that includes financial statements and required supplementary information. Copies of the CalPERS annual financial report may be obtained from the California Public Employees’ Retirement System Executive Office, 400 P Street, Sacramento, CA 95814.

Funding Policy

University personnel are required to contribute 5% of their annual earnings in excess of $513 per month to CalPERS. The University is required to contribute at an actuarially determined rate; the current rate is approximately 18.2% of annual covered payroll. The contribution requirements of the plan members are established and may be amended by CalPERS. There is no contractual maximum contribution required for the University by CalPERS.

The University’s contributions to CalPERS for the most recent three fiscal years were equal to the required contributions and were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$ 29,215,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27,515,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>31,988,269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Postretirement Healthcare Plan

The GASB has issued GASB Statement No. 45, Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Postemployment Benefits Other Than Pensions, relating to Other Postemployment Benefits (OPEB), which is effective July 1, 2007. Under this Statement, public employers sponsoring and subsidizing retiree healthcare benefit programs will need to recognize the cost of such benefits on an accrual basis.

Plan Description

The State provides retiree healthcare benefits to statewide employees including University employees through the programs administered by CalPERS. The State’s substantive plan represents a single-employer defined benefit OPEB plan, which includes medical and prescription drug benefits (collectively, healthcare benefits) to the retired University employees. The System provides dental
benefits to eligible University’s retirees. Eligible retirees receive healthcare and dental benefits upon retirement at age 50 with five years of service credit.

For healthcare benefits, CalPERS offers Preferred Provider Organizations (PPOs), Health Maintenance Organizations (HMOs), and Exclusive Provider Organizations (EPOs) (limited to members in certain California counties); for dental benefits, a Dental Maintenance Organization (DMO) and dental indemnity plans to the University’s retirees. Health plans offered, covered benefits, monthly rates, and copayments are determined by the CalPERS Board, which reviews health plan contracts annually.

The contribution requirements of retirees and the State are established and may be amended by the State legislature. For healthcare benefits, the State makes a contribution towards the retiree’s monthly health premiums, with the retirees covering the difference between the State’s contribution and the actual healthcare premium amount. The State contribution is normally established through collective bargaining agreements. No retiree contribution is required for dental benefits.

**Funding Policy**

For healthcare benefits, responsibility for funding the cost of the employer share of premiums is apportioned between the State and the System based on “billable” and “nonbillable” accounts. Billable accounts have special revenue sources such as fees, licenses, penalties, assessments, and interest, which offset the costs incurred by a State department during the year. The System reimburses the State for retiree’s health benefit costs allocated to billable accounts but not for costs allocated to nonbillable accounts. The System is responsible for funding the costs of the billable accounts on a pay-as-you-go basis as part of the statewide general administrative costs charged to the System. The University then reimburses the System for its share of healthcare premiums for all billable funds based on annual retirement expenses.

The State is responsible for funding the cost of the employer share of healthcare premiums of retirees for all nonbillable accounts.

The System is responsible for funding the cost of dental benefits for all University retirees. The System makes payments directly to Delta Dental for the retiree’s monthly dental premiums. The System is funding these benefits on a pay-as-you-go basis. The University does not pay the System for its share of dental premiums.
Annual OPEB Cost and Net OPEB Obligation

The following table shows the total annual required contribution (ARC) for the University’s allocated portion of the postretirement healthcare plan, net of dental benefit portion, the amount contributed to the plan by the University, and changes in the University’s net OPEB obligation (NOO) for billable accounts for the fiscal year ended 2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Billable Accounts Only:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual required contribution (ARC) Contributions</td>
<td>$ 2,796,093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>during the year</td>
<td>(1,092,460)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in net OPEB obligation (NOO)</td>
<td>1,703,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOO – beginning of year</td>
<td>3,781,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOO – end of year</td>
<td>$ 5,484,806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of annual OPEB cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contributed during the year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ended June 30, 2011</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Actuarial Methods and Assumptions and Plan Funding Information

As an agency of the State, the University was included in the State’s OPEB actuarial study. The analysis of the statewide ARC by accounts is performed by the State Controller’s Office (SCO) and allocated to the System. The System allocates the ARC to the University, which only includes the health benefit portion for the billable accounts. The dental benefit portion is not allocated to the University because the System centrally funds the cost of dental benefits for all retirees for the System.

Projections of benefits for financial statement reporting purposes are based on the substantive plan and include the types of benefits provided at the time of each valuation and the historical pattern of sharing of benefit cost between the State and the plan members to that point. The actuarial methods and assumptions used are consistent with a long-term perspective. In the June 30, 2010 actuarial valuation, the individual entry age normal cost method was used. The actuarial assumptions included a 4.50% investment rate of return and an annual State health care cost trend rate of actual increases for 2011 and 9.00% in 2012, initially, reduced to an ultimate rate of 4.50% after seven years. Both rates included a 3.00% annual inflation assumption. Annual wage inflation is assumed to be 3.25%. The unfunded actuarial accrued liabilities are being amortized as a level percentage of projected payroll on an open basis over a 30-year period.

Funding progress information specifically related to the System’s portion of the statewide OPEB plan is not available. For more details about the actuarial methods and assumptions used by the State as well as the statewide plans funding progress and status refer to the State of California’s Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) for the fiscal year ended June 30, 2011.
(11) Self-Insurance Program

The System and certain auxiliary organizations have established California State University Risk Management Authority (CSURMA), a blended component unit of the System, to manage centrally workers' compensation, general liability, industrial and nonindustrial disability, unemployment insurance coverage, and other risk-related programs. The liability included in the accompanying financial statements reflects the estimated ultimate cost of settling claims related to events that have occurred on or before June 30, 2011. The liability includes estimated amount that will be required for future payments of claims that have been reported and claims related to events that have occurred but have not been reported. The liability is also reduced by estimated amounts recoverable from the reinsurer that are related to the liabilities for unpaid claims and claim adjustment expenses. The liability is estimated through an actuarial calculation using individual case basis valuations and statistical analyses. Although considerable variability is inherent in such estimates, management believes that the liability is reasonable at June 30, 2011.

Changes in the System's self-insurance claims liability for the two years ended June 30, 2011 are as follows:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liability at June 30, 2009</td>
<td>$70,748,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurred claims and changes in estimates</td>
<td>43,097,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim payments</td>
<td>(26,536,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability at June 30, 2010</td>
<td>87,309,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incurred claims and changes in estimates</td>
<td>21,270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claim payments</td>
<td>(20,338,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability at June 30, 2011</td>
<td>88,241,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less current portion</td>
<td>(25,473,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term liability at June 30, 2011, net of current portion</td>
<td>$62,768,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the year ended June 30, 2011, the CSURMA purchased excess insurance to protect the members from catastrophic losses. The CSURMA maintained excess public entity liability insurance coverage provided by School Excess Liability Fund (SELF), a Joint Power Authority, with coverage for individual claims above $5,000,000 and up to $45,000,000 per occurrence until December 2009, Ironshore Specialty Insurance Company and other various insurers with coverage for individual claims above $5,000,000 and up to $200,000,000 per occurrence. The CSURMA purchased excess workers' compensation insurance provided by the National Union Fire Insurance Company of Pittsburgh, PA (Chartis) to statutory limits in excess of the $2,500,000 self-insured retention. For the Auxiliary Organizations' Risk Management Authority (AORMA) Workers' Compensation Program, the CSURMA purchased excess workers' compensation insurance provided by Safety National to Statutory limit in excess of $500,000 self-insured retention. There have been no settlements in the most recent three fiscal years that have exceeded insurance limits.
Premiums charged to each of the pool participants are based on historical trend information and the pool participant’s estimated share of the CSURMA self-insurance claims liabilities. The University’s allocation of the System’s total self-insurance claims liability as of June 30, 2011 was approximately 4%, or $3,597,000. This allocation reflects the University’s estimated share of the ultimate cost of settling claims relating to events that have occurred on or before June 30, 2011. Any future fluctuations in the University’s estimated share of the self-insurance claims liability will be reflected in subsequent premiums charged to the University for its participation in CSURMA.

There is no amount due to or from CSURMA as of June 30, 2011.

(12) Commitments and Contingencies

Federal grant programs are subject to review by the grantor agencies, which could result in requests for reimbursement to grantor agencies for disallowed expenditures. Management believes that it has adhered to the terms of its grants and that any disallowed expenditures resulting from such review would not have a material effect on the financial position of the University.

Authorized but unexpended expenditures for construction projects as of June 30, 2011 totaled $18,387,696. These expenditures will be funded primarily from state appropriations.

As of June 30, 2011, in order to secure access to natural gas and electricity used for normal operation, the University participates in forward purchase contracts of natural gas and electricity operated by the Department of General Services (DGS) and Shell Energy North America (Shell), respectively. The University’s obligation under these special purchase arrangements requires it to purchase an estimated total of $3,526,872 and $4,956,052 of natural gas and electricity at fixed prices through 2017 and 2014, respectively. The University estimates that the special purchase contracts in place represent approximately 44% and 39% of its total annual natural gas and electricity expenses, respectively.
(13) Classification of Operating Expenses

The University has elected to report operating expenses by functional classification in the statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets, and to provide the natural classification of those expenses as an additional disclosure. For the year ended June 30, 2011, operating expenses by natural classification consisted of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Functional classification</th>
<th>Salaries</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Scholarships and fellowships</th>
<th>Supplies and other services</th>
<th>Depreciation and amortization</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instruction</td>
<td>$102,713,370</td>
<td>37,105,553</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>8,027,679</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>147,846,602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>7,178,207</td>
<td>1,613,321</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9,701,997</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>18,493,525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public service</td>
<td>8,929,565</td>
<td>3,640,832</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>13,294,671</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>25,865,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic support</td>
<td>23,268,049</td>
<td>8,118,261</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>10,399,454</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>41,785,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>19,646,787</td>
<td>7,800,485</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4,891,683</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>32,338,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional support</td>
<td>22,367,385</td>
<td>9,535,219</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2,636,212</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>34,538,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation and maintenance of plant</td>
<td>11,370,549</td>
<td>5,876,379</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11,792,503</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>29,039,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student grants and scholarships</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>61,992,562</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>61,992,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auxiliary enterprise expenses</td>
<td>7,062,322</td>
<td>4,918,891</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>11,606,505</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>23,587,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depreciation and amortization</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24,335,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$202,536,234</td>
<td>78,608,941</td>
<td>61,992,562</td>
<td>72,350,704</td>
<td>24,335,955</td>
<td>439,824,396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14) Transactions with Related Entities

State appropriation revenue, both noncapital and capital, allocated to the University through the Office of the Chancellor aggregated $148,847,551 for the year ended June 30, 2011. The University also received lottery fund distributions from the State in the amount of $2.6 million for the year ended June 30, 2011, which is included in other nonoperating revenues (expenses) in the accompanying statement of revenues, expenses, and changes in net assets.

As discussed in notes 6 and 7, the University has recorded capital assets that have been financed by System or State obligations.
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The accompanying financial statements also include the following transactions with discretely presented component units and other related parties as of and for the year ended June 30, 2011:

Reimbursements from recognized auxiliary organizations for salaries of University employees working on contracts, grants, and other programs $ 599,455
Reimbursements from recognized auxiliary organizations for other than salaries of University employees 3,579,933
Payments to recognized auxiliary organizations for services, office space rental, and programs 8,111,272
Gifts-in-kind to the University from recognized auxiliary organizations 4,773,523
Payments to Office of the Chancellor for administrative activities 317,587
Payments to the Office of the Chancellor for State pro rata charges 1,098,948
Accounts receivable from campuses (other than CO) 5,094
Amounts receivable from recognized auxiliary organizations 1,900,520
Amounts payable to recognized auxiliary organizations (53,443)
State lottery appropriations received 2,583,635

(15) Subsequent Events

In July 2011, the state legislature created a new investment vehicle at the state level in which the System may invest funds. Senate Bill 79 created the State Agency Investment Fund (SAIF), under new Government Code section 16330, which allows state agencies to invest a minimum of $500 million and earn a higher rate of return than other investment options at the state level. Pursuant to a memorandum of understanding between the System and the State, the System transferred $700 million from the California State University Investment Pool to the SAIF in September 2011. The System will earn interest income at an annual rate of 2.0% through April 2013.

In August 2011, Standard & Poor’s Rating Services lowered the long-term debt rating of the U.S. government and federal agencies from AAA to AA+. The University has $49.5 million and $21.2 million, or 30.4% and 13.0%, of total investment in U.S. agency securities and U.S. Treasury securities, respectively, as of June 30, 2011.

In September 2011, Standard & Poor’s Ratings Services changed its outlook on the Systemwide Revenue Bonds from stable to positive. With the change in outlook, Standard & Poor’s Ratings Services affirmed its A+ rating on the Systemwide Revenue Bonds.

In September 2011, the System issued its Systemwide Revenue Bond Series 2011A in the amount of $429,855,000. In addition to providing funding for projects around the System, proceeds of the Systemwide Revenue Bond Series 2011A were also used to pay off $71,000,000 of BANs and refund $80,710,000 of previously outstanding Systemwide Revenue Bond Series 2002A and $112,350,000 of previously outstanding Systemwide Revenue Bond Series 2003A. The University issued in the amount $3,783,000, which was to provide funding for parking seismic structure project to a Systemwide Revenue Bond Series 2011A.
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
CREATIVE ARTS & HOLLOWAY MIXED-USE PROJECT

Name: Aaron Goodman
Organization (if any): SF PBMORAN.org
Do you represent this Organization? Yes No: Yes
Address: 
City, State, Zip: 
E-mail: amgoodman@yahoo.com Telephone: 415.496.6929

Written Comments
(please print)

• Existing tenants of Parkmerced in UPS Should not be displaced from the community. Please consider using
  blocks 42, 2, 5 as faculty/staff/family housing,
  and relocate residents in a less impactful way.

• Please consider the recreation impacts to tenants
  in the loss of block 41 and gardens in the other
  blocks on T church, previous Sample street +
  ace industries, garden areas in block designs.

• Transit - please look at the 19th Ave. impact,
  especially Holloway and Van Ness areas in block designs.

• Please provide data on housing loss of
  family units due to ups. CSU increased enrollment
  population has been ignored in
  terms of housing crunch + acquisition of street
  upn + ups. Data needs to be provided in terms
  of overall cumulative impact in the district.

• Microclimate - big passive should look at green
  facades to allow air flow + sunlight + open - land scale
courtyards.

• Public Services - need to address loss of Frederick Burke
  + public amenities lost in block 41 which
was not been addressed for township.

Please either leave this sheet at the "comment table" before you leave today or mail, email, or
fax to the address below.

(See Reverse for Additional Information)
Written Comment Form

Please note that your address, phone number, e-mail address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, is part of your entire comment. Including your personal identifying information—may be made publicly available at any time. While you can ask us in your comment to withhold your personal identifying information from public review, we cannot guarantee that we will be able to do so.

Mail comments to:
Wendy Bloom
Director of Campus Planning
Capital Planning, Design & Construction
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, California 94132
wbloom@sfsu.edu (subject line of emails: “Creative Arts & Holloway Mixed-Use Project”)

Public Scoping Ends: August 8, 2016

To ensure that comments will be considered during the scoping period, San Francisco State University must receive written comments by the close of the public scoping period (August 8, 2016). There will be additional opportunities to comment on the Draft EIR for the Project during the EIR public review period in the fall of 2016.

* cont’

- DECISION

  4.15. XV. 4) This has been documented as in impact of SFSU growth and enrollment increase that has significant impacts to pedestrian community. SFSU-CSU UPS blocks, reletionation of other blocks has occurred due to student impact and increased enrollment on natural areas. Population increase has affected the environment.

- Block 5

Example

Use as trans. site + low scale with lower blocks as co-op

Look at less impactfullness that allow density for student housing, kitchen, central library, living rooms, patios, water elements light wells to below grade services.