

As described in Chapter 1, *Executive Summary*, in response to community and agency input, SF State has refined the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) to provide for additional on-campus housing, a significantly scaled-back conference center and guest accommodations, parking modifications, and has made other refinements. These project refinements are contained in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) and are described in detail in this chapter. Additionally, this chapter evaluates the environmental implications of these changes, and concludes that the changes would not result in new significant impacts or in substantial increases in the severity of impacts previously identified in the Draft EIR.

2.1 FINAL CAMPUS MASTER PLAN (JULY 2007)

2.1.1 Campus Population Growth

As indicated above, the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) contemplates a smaller University Conference Center. As a result, the projected Campus Master Plan non-SFSU population reported in Draft EIR Table 3-1 related to the smaller facility would be reduced from about 200 employees and 225 visitors to about 65 employees and 72 visitors. This would reduce the total projected population in 2020 from about 37,040 to 36,752. No other population categories would change under the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). See revised Table 3-1 in Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*.

2.1.2 Building Capacity

The Draft EIR indicates that the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) would result in a net increase in non-residential building space of about 1.2 million gross square feet (gsf). With the proposed reduction in the size of the University Conference Center, the non-residential building space would be reduced to 0.9 million gsf under the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). See revised Table 3-2 in Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*.

2.1.3 Urban Design Plan

University Conference Center

In response to agency and public comments about the size and characteristics of the Conference Center/Hotel, the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) specifies a significantly scaled-back University Conference Center with limited guest accommodations, plus housing for students, faculty, and staff in the same location as originally proposed. The final Campus Master Plan replaces the proposed 250-room, 250,000 gsf hotel and 75,000 gsf conference center with a combined 150,000 gsf facility that includes 35,000 gsf of conference space, limited ground floor retail, 80 guest rooms, and 50 units of housing for SF State affiliates. As currently conceived, the University Conference Center would still provide much-needed space for University-sponsored

conferences and events and a venue for programs, meetings, retreats, and seminars. See revised text and Figure 3-6 in Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*.

The revised University Conference Center would be reduced in height, from a maximum of 100-foot tall to a maximum of 70 feet tall. It would also occupy roughly half of the original footprint shown in the draft Campus Master Plan (see revised Figure 3-6, Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*). In addition to incorporating 50 units of housing into the revised conference facility, itself, the final Campus Master Plan uses the area gained by reducing the conference center footprint to locate an additional 140 units of new and replacement housing. See further discussion below about residential buildings.

Residential Buildings

In response to agency and public comments, the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) provides for additional units of on-campus housing in order to minimize impacts on the regional housing supply, traffic, transit, and parking. The Urban Design Plan contained in the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) (as shown in Draft EIR Figure 3-6, *Master Plan Diagram*) originally identified sites in University Park North (UPN) and University Park south (UPS) to be redeveloped with housing in more compact and dense configurations in order to increase the supply of housing. These included the Sutro Library site, a site in University Park North (UPN) north of Cox Stadium, and the block of University Park south (UPS) west of Cardenas Avenue. The final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) contemplates additional housing on two other sites in UPN east of the existing towers and on a portion of the original Conference Center site. Additional housing would also be incorporated into the reconceived University Conference Center building, as described in the section above. See revised text and Figure 3-6 in Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*.

The new housing buildings would be mostly 4-story stacked flats over structured parking with a maximum height of 50 feet, as provided for in the draft Campus Master Plan. An exception would be for the new interior site in UPN east of the towers, which would be 6 stories over parking with a maximum height of 70 feet. All of the new units would be a mix of 1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom units that the University could rent either by bed (to upper division students) or by units. Overall, the new housing construction in UPN and UPS would provide for a total of about 988 new and replacement units (net increase of 657 new units), an increase over the 542 new and replacement units (net increase of 340 new units) provided for in the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007).

Additionally, as indicated in the Draft EIR, of the 960 units currently in UPS and UPN, only about 30 percent are currently occupied by SF State affiliates. The proposed Campus Master Plan acknowledges that the number of SF State affiliates in these units will likely increase over time as units become available to SF State through attrition (i.e., as existing tenants voluntarily vacate their units). The Draft EIR indicated that about 85 percent of the existing units will be occupied by SFSU affiliates by 2020. Therefore, the conversion of existing housing units to SF State uses under the final Campus Master Plan will likely result in about 247 additional units of housing being available for SF State uses through the planning horizon. This accounts for the anticipated

increase in demolition of about 126 units that would be required to allow for the proposed construction of additional new units in UPN, under the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). (The draft Campus Master Plan would result in the demolition of 205 units of housing in UPN and UPS and the final Campus Master Plan would result in the demolition of 331 units of housing in these areas.) The number of student beds in the campus core will decrease by about 37 units (about 148 beds), due to the conversion of Village Building C to Student Services. It should be noted that the Draft EIR reported that 49 units would be lost in the core, rather than 37 units, which was an error. Overall, a net increase in about 1,198 units of new and converted housing would be provided by 2020 (see Table 2-1), an increase of about 352 units over the 846 units provided for in the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007). For the purposes of this EIR, it is assumed that students would occupy approximately half of the 1,198 additional units and faculty and staff would occupy the remaining units. Table 2-1 below provides a comparison in the net increase in on-campus housing provided under the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) and under the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007).

**Table 2-1
Net Increase in On-Campus Housing Through 2020**

HOUSING SITE	Draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) UNITS	Final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) UNITS
Existing - UPS/UPN		
Existing Units Occupied by SF State Affiliates ¹	288	288
Existing Remaining Units Occupied by SF State Affiliates by 2020 (Accounts for Demolition of Units)	642 ²	535 ³
Net Increase	354	247
New/Replacement Construction - UPN/UPS	542	988
Core Housing	-49	-37⁴
TOTAL NET INCREASE	<u>846</u>	<u>1,198</u>

Source: Program Assumptions, San Francisco State University Master Plan, June 2006; draft Campus Master Plan, January 2007; and final Campus Master Plan, July 2007.

Notes:

1. Currently, about 30% of existing 960 UPS and UPN units are occupied by SF State affiliates.
2. The Campus Master Plan acknowledges that the number of SF State affiliates in these units will likely increase over time as units become available to SF State through attrition (i.e., as existing tenants vacate their units). For the purposes of this EIR, it is expected that about 85 percent of these units will be occupied by SF State affiliates by 2020. The number of remaining units provided above is based on that assumption. The number of existing remaining units identified in the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) also accounts for the demolition of about 205 units that would result from the proposed new construction in UPN and UPS by 2020.
3. The number of existing remaining units identified in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) accounts for the demolition of about 331 units that would result from the proposed new construction in UPN and UPS by 2020.
4. The conversion of housing units in the core would result in the loss of 37 units of housing, not 49 units as originally reported in the Draft EIR.

2.1.4 Storm Water Management

As a result of agency comments, additional analysis was performed by Wallace Roberts & Todd and their subconsultants as the basis for confirming that Campus Master Plan development will not increase the City's combined sewer wet weather flows. According to the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), development will cause an approximate 2 percent increase in annual storm runoff from new building areas. Annual storm runoff was calculated using annual precipitation data for the San Francisco area. The final Campus Master Plan provides revised estimates of the quantity of storm runoff directed to the combined sewer system. Due to the new open storm water system the quantity of storm runoff directed to the combined sewer system will be decreased by approximately 20 percent, for a net reduction of 18 percent from the runoff rate and quantity of the existing campus.

The swale and open channel system will filter and percolate storm runoff through the campus using surface swales where possible and convey runoff to Lake Merced, thereby reducing the quantity of storm runoff that enters the public system for treatment. The net reduction in runoff entering the storm drain system has the additional benefit of offsetting the increase in sanitary sewer volume due to new buildings on campus; thus Campus Master Plan development will not increase the City's combined sewer wet weather flow at buildout. The related follow-on studies identified in the final Campus Master Plan will seek to determine how the development specifically will meet a "net zero" increase in combined sewer wet-weather flows incrementally, as each individual building and phase is implemented. In particular, the Integrated Stormwater Management Master Plan, the Infrastructure Master Plan, and the Utility Capacity/Sizing Analysis will aid in making these determinations.

The final Campus Master Plan also clarifies that the use of porous paving will be considered on a project-by-project basis and will be used if appropriate. Additionally, the use of unit pavers placed on a porous setting bed to achieve some limited porosity will also be considered. These materials will provide increased infiltration of stormwater.

2.1.5 Pedestrian Connection to Lake Merced

The final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) provides two additional figures (see page 65) related to the proposed pedestrian connection into Lake Merced. These figures illustrate the likely alignment of the pedestrian paths on either side of the creek and indicate that the paths would not extend to the lake's edge. Rather, the paths would stop short of the edge of lake and associated marsh vegetation. They would converge at an overlook and then would turn to the north where a single path would connect to an existing perimeter pedestrian trail. Therefore, the final Campus Master Plan clarifies that the paths would not be extended to the water's edge or into the lake's marsh vegetation. Further, bicycle access will not be allowed through this campus connection into Lake Merced. Pedestrian only barriers could be placed at the edge of the campus to prevent bicycle access through this campus connection into the Lake Merced area. These refinements serve to clarify the intent associated with the proposed pedestrian connection into the Lake Merced area from the campus.

Additionally, as all of the proposed improvements in the Lake Merced area would take place off-campus on lands not under the jurisdiction or authority of SF State these improvements would require a subsequent planning, design, and approval process under the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission (SFPUC), the agency with jurisdiction over Lake Merced. Additionally, any subsequent approval process would include appropriate public involvement and input. It should also be noted that the approval of the Campus Master Plan by the CSU Board of Trustees does not authorize the campus or any other agency to proceed with the construction of identified improvements in the Lake Merced area. Please also see Master Response 12, *Biological Resource Impacts*, for further information (Chapter 4, *Responses to Comments*).

2.1.6 On-Campus Bike Network

The 8-mph bicycle speed limit recommended in the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) was reevaluated in light of best practices at UC Davis, which is considered to be the best bicycle program in North America. The SF State bicycle speed limit is raised to 15 mph in most locations in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) consistent with the following UC Davis policy:

"Bicyclists must obey all posted speed limits. Additionally, no cyclist may travel at a speed greater than is reasonable and prudent under existing conditions. At the University, the speed limit in the campus core area and all other bike paths is 15 mph and in parking lots is 10 mph."

2.1.7 Parking

With the reduced University Conference Center, the parking at this facility would be reduced to 236 spaces, down from the 440 spaces proposed in the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007). To compensate for the smaller amount of parking at this location, a new surface parking lot with an additional 220 spaces for SF State is identified in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), which would be located on Winston Drive, just west of the Stonestown Galleria. See revised Figure 3-12 in Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*.

2.2 IMPLICATIONS FOR DRAFT EIR IMPACT ANALYSIS

As described above, the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) provides for some additional on-campus housing, a smaller conference center, and other minor refinements. The evaluation and analysis in this section demonstrates that the Draft EIR impact analysis for the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) adequately addresses the project refinements contemplated by the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). Moreover, the refinements would not result in new significant environmental impacts or in a substantial increase in the severity of an impact previously identified in the Draft EIR.

The final Campus Master Plan would lessen some of the impacts of the draft Campus Master Plan that were identified in the Draft EIR, including impacts related to air quality, noise, housing,

traffic, transit, and parking. Some impacts may increase incrementally as a result of the modest amount of additional housing construction in UPN. However, the impact conclusions and need for mitigation for all impact categories would remain unchanged with the project refinements identified above. As described below, while some of the impacts in these issue areas would be reduced, mitigation measures identified in the Draft EIR would still be required. It should also be noted that mitigation measures have been added and others have been revised and augmented in this Final EIR (see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*) in response to comments received during the public review of the Draft EIR.

2.2.1 Aesthetics

The proposed project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) would result in the same amount and type of development in the academic core of the campus and in UPS, as originally contemplated in the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007). However, as described in Section 2.1 above, the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) contemplates a smaller University Conference Center and additional redeveloped housing in UPN.

Impact AES-1, related to the small groves of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine located in and around the campus core; and Impact AES-2, related to the existing visual character of the existing SF State campus, would remain unchanged with the proposed project refinements being contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). The aesthetic impact related to the potential degradation of the visual character of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood (Impact AES-3) will also remain unchanged and Mitigation AES-3 will still be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

The aesthetic impact related to the potential degradation of the visual character of other surrounding neighborhoods (also evaluated in Impact AES-3), such as locations to the east (19th Avenue and Ingleside) and north (Stonestown and schools) would not be substantially changed with the proposed project refinements. The proposed University Conference Center would have a smaller footprint and lower stature (70-foot height maximum) than the 100-foot height maximum evaluated in the Draft EIR. Additionally, while some additional redeveloped housing would be provided in UPN, this housing would be located on interior sites east of the existing towers and would be lower in stature (50- and 70-foot height maximums) than the existing 10-story towers. Overall, the impact conclusions provided in Impact AES-3 in the Draft EIR related to these adjacent areas would remain unchanged with the proposed project refinements. Please refer to Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for minor revisions to account for the reduced building height of the University Conference Center.

While there may be some minor amount of additional lighting associated with the additional redeveloped housing in UPN, this would not result in a substantial increase in the severity of the impact evaluated in Impact AES-4, related to new sources of substantial light. Further, the cumulative impacts related to the existing visual character of the area (Impact AES-5) also would not substantially increase with the proposed project refinements.

2.2.2 Air Quality

The proposed project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) would somewhat increase construction PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} emissions (Impact AIR-1), as some additional housing would be constructed, as compared to the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007). The impact will remain potentially significant and the implementation of Mitigation AIR-1 will still be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

At a regional level, the operational impacts (Impact AIR-2) from the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) will be similar or somewhat lower than those for the draft Campus Master Plan. As discussed in Section 4.2, *Air Quality*, the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines distinguish between projects and plans and recommends that the evaluation of air quality impacts from land use plans not focus on the quantification of emissions but rather on an analysis of the plan's consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP). The project refinements will result in a similar level of population growth as the draft Campus Master Plan, and Mitigations AIR-2A and 2B will still be required to ensure that campus growth is accounted for air quality planning efforts. Because the Bay Area does not attain the state ozone standard, growth that is not consistent with the CAP could potentially hinder attainment efforts. This impact will likely be somewhat reduced under the final Campus Master Plan because regional emissions of criteria pollutants associated with mobile sources (i.e., vehicles) will be reduced, as fewer people will need to travel to the campus in vehicles given the increase in on-campus housing. Specifically, motor vehicle emissions identified in Table 4.2-7 would likely be somewhat reduced. As for the draft Campus Master Plan, the final Campus Master Plan will be consistent with the CAP in relationship to the CAP Transportation Control Measures and in relationship to the CAP criteria regarding odors and toxics assuming Mitigation AIR-2C is implemented.

The final Campus Master Plan would likely result in a somewhat reduced increase in local CO concentrations at study area intersections, as compared to the draft Campus Master Plan (Impact AIR-3). Specifically, CO emissions identified in Tables 4.2-8 and 4.2-9 would likely be somewhat reduced. However, the impact conclusion would remain unchanged for the final plan, as the predicted CO concentrations at study intersections would also be less than the state and federal standards for CO and therefore the impact would be less than significant.

The final Campus Master Plan will also result in a somewhat reduced contribution of ozone precursors to the regional air basin, as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan (Impact AIR-4). However, the impact conclusion would remain unchanged with the proposed project refinements.

2.2.3 Biological Resources

The majority of impacts to biological resources under the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) relate to proposed development in and adjacent to the Lake Merced area (i.e., new pedestrian underpass, path connection, and creek inlet). While the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) provides some clarification related to the improvements in the Lake Merced area, the overall concept for these improvements has not changed. Therefore, the impact conclusions

related to wetlands, sensitive habitat, and special-status species in Lake Merced (Impacts BIO-1 and BIO-2) will remain unchanged with the proposed project refinements contemplated under the final Campus Master Plan. Proposed mitigations for these impacts will continue to be required to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels. However, it should be noted that in response to public comments received on the Draft EIR, the text of Impacts BIO-1 and BIO-2 has been refined, including associated mitigation measures. See Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR* and Chapter 4, *Response to Comments*, Master Response 12, *Biological Resource Impacts*.

The impact related to the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status species (Impact BIO-2) could potentially be somewhat greater on campus, as more units in UPN will be redeveloped. Therefore, somewhat more potential disturbance to nesting birds could occur, if birds are nesting in adjacent trees. However, the impact conclusion has not changed and the implementation of Mitigation BIO-2A will still be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Impacts related to conflicts with the provisions of an adopted HCP (Impact BIO-3) and cumulative impacts (Impact BIO-4) will remain unchanged with the proposed project refinements.

2.2.4 Cultural Resources

With the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), all cultural resource impacts (Impacts CULT-1 through CULT-5) could be somewhat increased, given that some additional housing construction would occur. Therefore, the potential to disturb and/or destroy archaeological sites, historic features and buildings, human remains, and/or paleontological resources through building construction and/or demolition could potentially be somewhat increased with the final plan. However, the impact analysis and conclusions will not change and implementation of the proposed mitigations for these impacts will still be required. As for the draft Campus Master Plan, the final Campus Master Plan could result in significant and unavoidable impacts on historic resources in rare and exceptional cases, even with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

2.2.5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity

The impacts related to seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure (Impact GEO-1) would be somewhat increased with the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), given that some additional housing construction would occur. As more development would occur, the potential to expose more people and structures on campus to effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure would be somewhat increased. However, the impact analysis and conclusion would not change and implementation of Mitigation GEO-1 would still be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Additionally, the impact conclusions related to construction-phase erosion (Impact GEO-2) and cumulative impacts (Impact GEO-3) would not change with the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan.

2.2.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) would result in the same amount and type of development in the academic core of the campus. As a result, all the impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials (Impacts HAZ-1 through HAZ-6) will remain unchanged with the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan. As for the draft Campus Master Plan, the final plan will result in a potentially significant impact associated with exposure to contaminated building materials during demolition of the existing Science building on campus, as this building will also be demolished under the final plan. Mitigation HAZ-4 will also need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

2.2.7 Hydrology and Water Quality

The final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) contemplates the same storm water system improvements and other related improvements in the Lake Merced area, with some minor clarification. However, the impact related to the potential increase in nutrients in Lake Merced (Impact HYDRO-1) could potentially be somewhat increased under the final plan, as with more redevelopment of housing units in UPN, the amount of storm water directed to Lake Merced would increase somewhat. Mitigation HYDRO-1 would still be required, which would ensure that the impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level. This measure, which requires monitoring of water quality, would ensure that the proposed new system would operate as planned and will adequately reduce urban pollutants and nutrients via infiltration and filtration. The overall benefits of the proposed storm water management system would be greater under the final Campus Master Plan because the amount of infiltration and runoff that would benefit Lake Merced lake levels would likely be somewhat increased. Additionally, the impact conclusions related to other hydrology and water quality impacts (Impact HYDRO-3) and cumulative impacts (Impact HYDRO-4) would not change with the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan.

Please refer to Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revised text included in Impact HYDRO-1 and Impact HYDRO-2 developed in response to comments. This revised text clarifies that the increased infiltration of storm water that would result from the proposed open storm water system would not substantially affect groundwater quality.

2.2.8 Land Use and Planning

Similar to the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007), the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) will not result in any significant land use impacts. Moreover, the less-than-significant impacts described in Impacts LU-1 through LU-3 would be similar with the implementation of the final Campus Master Plan. Please refer to Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for minor revisions to account for the reduced building height of the University Conference Center.

2.2.9 Noise

With the expansion of housing construction on the SF State campus under the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), exposure of nearby sensitive receptors to excessive construction noise would be somewhat increased (Impact NOIS-1). Similar to the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007), the impact will also be significant and unavoidable even with the implementation of Mitigation NOIS-1, as the final Campus Master Plan will result in construction activities within 100 feet or less of sensitive receptors.

As vehicular traffic on the city roadway network will likely be reduced with the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan, traffic noise increases above existing conditions will likely be less under the final plan (Impact NOIS-2). However, as for the draft Campus Master Plan, this impact was determined to be less than significant.

2.2.10 Population and Housing

Similar to the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007), the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) will not result in any significant population and housing impacts. However, the final plan will result in a greater amount of potential displacement of existing residents in UPN and UPS (Impact POP-4) as 126 additional units of existing housing would be redeveloped. While this is not a significant impact under CEQA, some members of the surrounding community have expressed concerns about the possible displacement of people that live in these units. Please see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revised language that demonstrates the University's commitment to address the community's concern about displacement by providing displaced persons with the option to relocate to comparable units in other campus housing in UPN and UPS at their current rent. Please also see Chapter 4, *Response to Comments*, Master Response 14, *Regional Housing Supply Impacts* for additional discussion.

As the final Campus Master Plan would increase the amount of on-campus housing, a greater proportion of the new population in the study area associated with the SF State campus would be accommodated in on-campus housing and fewer people would be seeking housing off-campus. Therefore, the project's impact on housing supply (Impact POP-3) would be less with the implementation of the final Campus Master Plan. Additionally, with the additional housing construction, the project would not contribute to the theoretical cumulative housing supply deficit in the study area by 2020 (Impact POP-5). Please see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revisions to the population and housing supply analysis to account for the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan. Please also see Chapter 4, *Response to Comments*, Master Response 14, *Regional Housing Supply Impacts* for additional discussion.

2.2.11 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

As the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) would increase the number of SF State affiliates that can be accommodated in on-campus housing, the total number of daily and peak hour vehicle trips generated under the final plan are expected to be lower, as a smaller number of people would travel to the campus in automobiles. Therefore, the contribution of traffic at study area

intersections is expected to be lower under the final plan. However, the reduction in peak hour vehicle trips would not be large enough to reduce the worst-case significant traffic impacts at two study intersections to a less-than-significant level (see Impact TRA-1, Scenario 2), and Mitigation TRA-1 would still be required. (The traffic impacts associated with growth and development under the Campus Master Plan are evaluated in Impact TRA-1 under two scenarios. See Draft EIR pages 4.11-24 through 4.11-29.) Also similar to the draft Campus Master Plan, under the worst-case traffic scenario (Scenario 2), the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the demand for transit will also decrease under the final Campus Master Plan (Impact TRA-2), as more people would live on campus and fewer would travel to the campus via transit. However, this impact is still expected to be potentially significant related to the M-line and the Campus Shuttle and Mitigations TRA-2B and TRA-2C would also need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, as is the case for draft Campus Master Plan. Please see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revisions to these mitigation measures, which are intended to clarify how they would be implemented. A new transit mitigation measure (Mitigation TRA-2A) also has been added to indicate that the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) should implement improvements to transit services along 19th Avenue via the implementation of MTA's Transit Effectiveness Project and SFCTA's 19th Avenue Project.

The demand for parking would also decrease under the final Campus Master Plan (Impact TRA-5), as compared to parking demand under the draft Campus Master Plan, as more people would live on campus and fewer would travel to the campus via automobile thereby decreasing the demand for parking. Impact conclusions related to pedestrians, bicycles, and alternative transportation programs (Impacts TRA-3, TRA-4, and TRA-6) would remain unchanged with the proposed project refinements.

Please see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revisions to the transportation analysis to account for the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan and/or to account for responses to public comment. Please also see Chapter 4, *Response to Comments*, Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts* for additional discussion.

2.2.12 Public Services and Utilities

Similar to the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007), the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) would not result in any significant public service and utility impacts. Moreover, the less-than-significant impacts described in Impacts UTL-1 through UTL-3, and UTL-5 would be similar with the implementation of the final Campus Master Plan. The overall demand for water, generation of wastewater, and demand for gas and electricity on campus would remain unchanged with the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan. While housing development will increase, the size of the conference facilities will decrease, and therefore utility demands will not change.

The final Campus Master Plan could somewhat increase the need for on-campus sworn police officers (Impact UTL-4) given that the campus residential population would be increased. A

larger on-campus police station would also be required, the impacts of which are evaluated in Section 4.12, *Utilities and Public Services*, and elsewhere in the Draft EIR.

Please refer to Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revised text included in Impacts UTL-1 and UTL-2 developed in response to public comments on the Draft EIR. This revised text clarifies the impact of the project on water supply and wastewater systems.