

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

This document is the Final Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the San Francisco State University (SF State) Campus Master Plan. Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) SF State is required to consult with and obtain comments from public agencies that have jurisdiction by law or discretionary approval power with respect to the proposed project, and to provide the general public with opportunities to comment on the Draft EIR. SF State also is required to respond to environmental issues raised in the review and consultation process. The Draft EIR for the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) for SF State was circulated for 60 days, from February 2, 2007 to April 2, 2007.

The Final EIR consists of the Draft EIR volume, which is incorporated by reference, and this Final EIR volume. The Final EIR includes an executive summary, a description of project refinements contained in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), changes to the Draft EIR text, and responses to agency and public comments. This Final EIR, including all documents referenced therein, is available for public review during normal business hours by appointment at SF State, Office of Government Relations (415-338-6880). Copies of this Final EIR are also available for review at the reference desk of the Main Library on the SF State campus, the City and County of San Francisco Main Public Library (100 Larkin Street), and at vicinity branch libraries. The Final EIR and final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) are also available on the SF State Master Plan web site at <http://sfsumasterplan.org>.

As the public agency principally responsible for approving or denying the proposed project, SF State is the Lead Agency under CEQA. The California State University Board of Trustees is responsible for reviewing and certifying the adequacy of this environmental document and making a decision with respect to the proposed Campus Master Plan.

1.2 FINAL DRAFT CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

The Draft EIR analyzed the impacts of the proposed draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007), which would serve as a guide for the physical development of the SF State campus to accommodate the proposed increased enrollment ceiling target of 25,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students through 2020. In response to agency and public comments, SF State has decided to refine the plan to provide for additional on-campus housing, a significantly scaled-back conference center and guest accommodations, and has made other refinements.

Chapter 2 of the Final EIR volume, *Project Refinements*, provides a full description of project refinements included in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). The implications of these project refinements for the Draft EIR analysis also are provided in Chapter 2. Overall, the

changes would not result in new significant impacts or in substantial increases in the severity of impacts previously identified in the Draft EIR.

Table 1-1, at the end of this section, provides a complete list of all environmental impacts of the final Campus Master Plan and mitigation measures that have been identified to reduce the impacts where applicable. For each impact, Table 1-1 reports the significance of the impact before mitigation, applicable mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures. As indicated above, the Draft EIR impact statements, conclusions, and mitigation measures for the draft Campus Master Plan also apply to the final Campus Master Plan. However, it should be noted that, while no new impacts have been identified, in some cases the language of Draft EIR mitigation measures has been clarified in part due to public comment, and new mitigation measures have been added to more effectively address the identified environmental impacts. Table 1-1 includes these added and revised measures. Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, provides the full text of the revised measures in underline/strikeout format so that the nature of the revisions can be seen.

1.3 ORGANIZATION OF THE FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

A Final EIR is required to include the Draft EIR, a list of persons or entities commenting on the Draft EIR, copies of comments received during public review of the Draft EIR, and responses to comments received on the Draft EIR. The Final EIR volume is organized as follows:

- **Chapter 1, Executive Summary.** Presents the purpose of the Final EIR. Proposed project refinements included in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) and implications for the Draft EIR are summarized. The organization of the Final EIR is also explained.
- **Chapter 2, Project Refinements.** Describes refinements made to the draft Campus Master Plan. It presents an assessment of environmental impacts from these changes and concludes that the changes would not result in new significant impacts or an increase in the severity of impacts previously identified in the Draft EIR.
- **Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR.** Consists of excerpts from the text of the Draft EIR, revised where appropriate based on internal review and in response to comments received. Changes to the wording of impact or mitigation statements, and material added to or deleted from the impact analyses and discussions, are presented. Changes are shown in underscore and strikeout, so that the original and revised text may be compared. Because the project analyzed in detail in the Draft EIR has been refined in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), as described above, this chapter focuses on changes to the technical sections of the Draft EIR that are relevant to the analysis of environmental impacts to these project refinements. However, as indicated in Chapter 2, *Project Refinements*, these refinements would not result in new significant environmental impacts or in a substantial increase in the severity of an impact. Changes to the Draft EIR text have also been made in response to public comments received on the Draft EIR.

- **Chapter 4, Response to Comments.** Includes a list of all agencies, organizations and individuals that submitted comments on the Draft EIR during the public review period. This section also includes all comments received on the Draft EIR, including comment letters and transcripts from public hearings, and responses to each written and verbal comment received. Each letter/transcript and each comment within a letter/transcript has been numbered. Responses are assigned corresponding numbers. Where appropriate, responses are cross-referenced. In addition to individual responses to the comments received, master responses are provided to address multiple comments submitted on a single topic.
- **Chapter 5, List of Preparers.** Lists the University staff, technical specialists and consultants, the production team, and other key individuals who assisted in the preparation and review of the Final EIR.
- **Chapter 6, References.** Lists references used during the preparation of the Final EIR.
- **Appendix A, Traffic Technical Appendix.** This appendix provides the technical backup materials that support the level of service analysis of traffic provided in the EIR. This appendix reflects additional analysis conducted during the preparation of the Final EIR. This additional analysis was conducted for the year 2020 with and without the project, given that one of the pending future projects considered in this analysis is now substantially reduced in size over that originally contemplated in the Draft EIR.
- **Appendix B, Transit Impact Analysis.** This appendix consists of the revised transit impact analysis performed during the preparation of the Final EIR. The revisions relate to the need to assess: (1) the SF State peak hour of transit activity, and (2) project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007).
- **Appendix C, Clinical Sciences Building Shadow Study.** This appendix consists of shadow studies of the proposed Clinical Sciences Building developed to demonstrate the extent of solar access to the west face of the Humanities Building.

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
4.1 Aesthetics					
AES-1	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not substantially damage the small groves of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine located in and around the Campus Core landscape zone that constitute scenic resources on the campus.	LS	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.	LS
			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.	
			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.	
AES-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the existing SF State campus.	LS	AES-2	Mitigation not required	LS
AES-3	Development of the new housing in University Park South under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially degrade the existing visual character of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood, if not properly designed.	PS	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	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				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.	
AES-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not create new sources of substantial light or glare on campus that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.	LS	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.	LS
			AES-4B	Reflective metal, mirrored glass, or any other reflective building materials shall not be used as primary building materials for facades.	
AES-5	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other vicinity development, will not result in significant cumulative impacts due to substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the area.	LS	AES-5	Mitigation not required	LS
4.2 Air Quality					
AIR-1	Construction activities under the Campus Master Plan would result in emissions of PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} on a short-term basis.	PS	AIR-1	The Campus shall apply the following feasible control measures as required by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD): Basic Control Measures – For all construction sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Enhanced Control Measures – For sites greater than 4 acres in area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
AIR-2	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan.	PS	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.	LS
			AIR-2B	The SF State campus will work with BAAQMD to ensure that campus growth-related emissions are	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			AIR-2C	accounted for in the regional emissions inventory and mitigated in future air quality planning efforts. 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.	
AIR-3	Traffic generated by development under the Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with traffic associated with other regional growth, would result in an increase in local CO concentrations at study area intersections.	LS	AIR-3	Mitigation not required	LS
AIR-4	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan in conjunction with other regional growth in the air basin could potentially result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan.	PS	AIR-4	Implement Mitigations AIR-2A through AIR-2C.	LS
4.3 Biological Resources					
BIO-1	Construction of the proposed bridge underpass, creek inlet, and path connection, and the discharge of storm water into Lake Merced could potentially affect wetlands and other sensitive habitats, as well as special-status plant and wildlife species in the adjacent Lake Merced.	PS	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	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
		habitat.	
		<p>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.).</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			BIO-1D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Specification of reporting requirements <p>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 storm water 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.</p>	
BIO-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially result in the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds.	PS	BIO-2A	<p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>	LS
BIO-2B			BIO-2B	For construction off-campus in the Lake Merced area,	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				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.	
BIO-2C			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.	
BIO-3	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan NCCP), or other applicable HCP.	LS	BIO-3	Mitigation not required	LS
BIO-4	Campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other reasonably foreseeable development in the project vicinity, would not result in a substantial adverse cumulative impact on sensitive natural communities or special-status plant and wildlife species.	LS	BIO-4	Mitigation not required	LS
4.4 Cultural Resources					
CULT-1	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource through damage or destruction that could occur as a result of	PS	CULT-1A	During the planning and environmental review of specific development projects under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the campus shall follow the	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
	grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.	following protocol: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
		CULT-1B For an archaeological site that is encountered during subsurface testing or during construction, the campus shall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				that will capture those categories of data for which the site is significant, and implement the data recovery plan prior to or during development of the site. The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the appropriate information center, and provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials.	
CULT-2	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical building or structure, as a result of alteration, removal or demolition of the building, or alteration of the site associated with project development.	PS	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.	SU
			CULT-2B	<p>Potential historic structures present within the project's area of potential effect will be evaluated as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			CULT-2C	<p>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.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (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 	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				<p>oral history collection as appropriate.</p> <p>(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.</p> <p>(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.</p>	
CULT-3	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	PS	<p>CULT-3A</p> <p>CULT-3B</p> <p>CULT-3C</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 §</p>	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			CULT-3D	<p>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).</p> <p>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.</p>	
CULT-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb and destroy significant paleontological resources, if they are located in undisturbed native sediments below the campus.	PS	CULT-4A	<p>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.</p>	LS
			CULT-4B	<p>If a monitor is not required, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential</p>	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			CULT-4C	<p>paleontological resources and must notify the campus if paleontological resources are found.</p> <p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
CULT-5	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could contribute to cumulative damage to and/or loss of the resource base of unique archaeological resources and historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures), human remains, and paleontological resources in the City and County of San Francisco.	PS	CULT-5	The campus shall implement Mitigations CULT-1 through CULT-4.	LS
4.5 Geology, Soils and Seismicity					
GEO-1	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not expose people and structures on campus to substantial adverse effects associated with fault	PS	GEO-1	Where existing geotechnical information is not adequate, detailed geotechnical investigations shall be performed for areas that will support buildings or	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
	rupture, but could result in substantial adverse effects related to seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides, and/or settlement.			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 <i>Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California</i> (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.	
GEO-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not result in substantial erosion of soils during construction.	LS	GEO-2	Mitigation not required	LS
GEO-3	Cumulative development, including the development on campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, could expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving seismic ground shaking and related ground failure.	LS	GEO-3	Mitigation not required	LS
4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
HAZ-1	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will increase routine use of hazardous materials, generation of hazardous wastes, and transport of such materials by SF State laboratories and departments and in maintenance and support operations, which will not create significant hazards to the public or the environment.	LS	HAZ-1	Mitigation not required	LS
HAZ-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not create significant hazards to the public or the environment, such that existing or proposed adjacent schools may be affected.	LS	HAZ-2	Mitigation not required	LS
HAZ-3	Construction and demolition activities under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater.	LS	HAZ-3	Mitigation not required	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
HAZ-4	Demolition or renovation of buildings under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials.	PS	HAZ-4	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	LS
HAZ-5	Campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially interfere physically with the campus's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).	LS	HAZ-5A	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction work shall be conducted so as to ensure the least possible obstruction to traffic. 	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			HAZ-5B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. New building and/or department-specific EOPs shall be developed for any new development project.	
HAZ-6	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other area development, will result in increased use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials, but the increase will not result in a significant cumulative hazard or hazardous materials impact. It is unlikely that there will be a cumulative increase in risk of hazardous materials release, or risk to existing and proposed schools from handling of hazardous materials.	LS	HAZ-6	Mitigation not required	LS
4.7 Hydrology					
HYDRO-1	Storm water runoff from the campus could potentially increase nutrients in Lake Merced, and thereby adversely affect water quality.	PS	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	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				SFPUC through its subsequent approval process.	
HYDRO-2	Development of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect the Westside Groundwater Basin.	LS	HYDRO-2	Mitigation not required	LS
HYDRO-3	Development of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not result in any other hydrology and water quality impacts.	LS	HYDRO-3	Mitigation not required	LS
HYDRO-4	Campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other reasonably foreseeable development in the project vicinity, would not result in an adverse cumulative impact on Lake Merced water quality.	LS	HYDRO-4	Mitigation not required	LS
4.8 Land Use and Planning					
LU-1	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not physically divide an established community.	LS	LU-1	Mitigation not required	LS
LU-2	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LS	LU-2	Mitigation not required	LS
LU-3	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, together with other growth in the vicinity, will not result in the development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or planned uses in the southwestern portion of San Francisco.	LS	LU-3	Mitigation not required	LS
4.9 Noise					
NOIS-1	Construction of campus facilities under the Campus Master Plan could expose nearby sensitive receptors to excessive airborne noise but not to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.	PS	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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction equipment used on campus is properly maintained and has been outfitted with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction- 	SU

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				generated noise. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. 	
NOIS-2	The increase in vehicular traffic on the city road network due to campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would not result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels.	LS	NOIS-2	Mitigation not required	LS
4.10 Population and Housing					
POP-1	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would directly cause population growth in the study area by accommodating increased enrollment and	LS	POP-1	Mitigation not required	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
	employment, but this growth would not be substantial.				
POP-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not indirectly induce substantial population growth in the study area through extension of roads or other infrastructure.	LS	POP-2	Mitigation not required	LS
POP-3	Growth of the SF State campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, would not create a demand for housing that would exceed the supply or displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region.	LS	POP-3	Mitigation not required	LS
POP-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region.	LS	POP-4	Mitigation not required	LS
POP-5	Growth of the SF State campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other regional growth, would create a demand for housing that would exceed the supply, but the project's contribution will not be cumulatively considerable.	LS	POP-5	Mitigation not required	LS
4.11 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking					
TRA-1	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan could potentially contribute substantial traffic at two intersections in southwest San Francisco.	S	TRA-1	The campus shall implement the following monitoring and mitigation program: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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, SF State 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 	SU

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 impacts associated with project 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” (as defined in this EIR) 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. 	
TRA-2	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would result in a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity.	PS	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 19 th Avenue via the implementation of MTA’s Transit Effectiveness Project and SFCTA’s 19 th Avenue Project, which are in the planning stages. Improvements ultimately included	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				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.	
			TRA-2B	<p>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:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 	

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				passenger capacity target). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 	
			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.	
TRA-3	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect conditions for pedestrians or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility.	LS	TRA-3	Mitigation not required	LS
TRA-4	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect conditions for bicyclists.	LS	TRA-4	Mitigation not required	LS
TRA-5	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not result in a parking demand that exceeds the projected supply.	LS	TRA-5	Mitigation not required	LS
TRA-6	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies or programs supporting alternative transportation.	LS	TRA-6	Mitigation not required	LS
4.12 Utilities and Public Services					
UTL-1	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction or expansion of water supply or distribution facilities, nor will new water supply entitlements be required to serve the project.	LS	UTL-1	Mitigation not required	LS
UTL-2	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction or	LS	UTL-2	As each future building project is proposed, SF State will verify that it can achieve a net zero increase in	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative

**Table 1-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
	expansion of wastewater and/or storm water distribution or treatment facilities.			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.	
UTL-3	The proposed Campus Master Plan will result in the construction of new electrical, natural gas, and heating water facilities, which will not cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	UTL-3	Mitigation not required	LS
UTL-4	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction of new or physically altered police or fire protection facilities that will cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	UTL-4	Mitigation not required	LS
UTL-5	Development of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not result in any other utility or public service impacts.	LS	UTL-5	Mitigation not required	LS
UTL-6	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other regional development, will generate increased demand for water supply, wastewater treatment facilities, landfills, energy, and natural gas in the region, and the expansion of associated utilities and public service systems to meet this demand, which will not result in significant environmental impacts.	LS	UTL-6	Mitigation not required	LS

¹NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative