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)(I) 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)(I) 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

additional information.)

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*

EIR, pages 3-16 through 3-17).

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 require 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 then 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 UPN 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.