In response to comments received, the text published in the Draft EIR has been revised, where appropriate. In addition, the text has been revised, as appropriate, to clarify, amplify, and make insignificant modifications and corrections to the Draft EIR. Changes are shown in underscore and strikeout, so that the original and revised text may be compared, and are presented here by chapter and/or sections. It should be noted that the Draft EIR has not been reprinted with these changes incorporated. Therefore, this chapter must be read in conjunction with the original text of the Draft EIR.

This section is provided so that readers may readily review changes that have been made to the impact analyses since publication of the Draft EIR. As the campus has incorporated some project refinements into the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), this chapter focuses on changes to the Draft EIR that are necessary to appropriately reflect these project refinements in the document. 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.

CHAPTER 1.0 INTRODUCTION

Text in the second paragraph of page 1-3 has been revised as indicated below.

The proposed Campus Master Plan provides a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the SF State campus over the next 13 years through 2020. It addresses the recent acquisition of property, aging facilities, changing student demographics, and the need for additional academic building space and other support space to accommodate the anticipated growth in enrollment. To accommodate the projected growth in enrollment and academic activities, the proposed Campus Master Plan accommodates a building program that envisions the development of an additional 1.2 million gross square feet (gsf\(^1\)) of non-residential building space on the campus, and the development or conversion of about 846 additional units of housing on campus for faculty, staff, and students. (Conversion of housing refers to units of housing in University Park South and University Park North that are currently occupied by non-SF State affiliates that will ultimately be turned over for University use if and when existing tenants voluntarily vacate their units through 2020.) See Chapter 3, Project Description, for further information about the building program identified in the proposed Campus Master Plan.

\(^1\) Gross square feet is the sum of all areas, finished and unfinished, on all floors of an enclosed structure. It includes the assignable square feet, circulation and mechanical areas, custodial services and public toilet areas, structural elements and one-half of covered unenclosed areas.
3.2 **CHAPTER 2.0 SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

Section 2.6, *Known Areas of Controversy* on pages 2-5 and 2-6 has been revised as indicated below.

- The potential displacement of people associated with the replacement of existing housing units in UPS and UPN with denser housing within these areas.

- The potential historic resource impacts associated with the redevelopment of existing housing units in UPS, formerly part of the larger Villas Parkmerced complex.

- The potential biological resources impacts associated with proposed improvements in the Lake Merced area.

- Traffic impacts in the vicinity of campus.

- The potential worsening of over-flow parking in the surrounding neighborhoods and associated neighborhood traffic.

- Nighttime noise and security issues associated with students living in the neighborhoods.

- Effects of growth on local public services.

- The campus’s fair-share contribution to off-campus improvements and services.

The text on page 2-2 has been revised as follows.

activities, the proposed Campus Master Plan accommodates a building program that envisions the development of an additional 1,20.9 million gross square feet (gsf²) of non-residential building space, including a Hotel and Conference Center and guest accommodations on the campus, and the development or conversion of an additional 846,1,198 units of housing for employees and students on campus. (Conversion of housing refers to units of housing in University Park South and University Park North that are currently occupied by non-SF State affiliates that will ultimately be turned over for University use if and when existing tenants voluntarily vacate their units through 2020).

3.3 **CHAPTER 3.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

This section provides the changes to the Draft EIR project description that have resulted from the project refinements included in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) and described in Chapter 2, *Project Refinements*. As indicated in that chapter, these changes do not have any substantial implications for the analysis of the environmental impacts of the Campus Master Plan provided in the Draft EIR.

---

² Gross square feet is the sum of all areas, finished and unfinished, on all floors of an enclosed structure. It includes the assignable square feet, circulation and mechanical areas, custodial services and public toilet areas, structural elements and one-half of covered unenclosed areas.
Table 3-1 on page 3-8 has been modified as follows.

### Table 3-1
**Existing And Projected SF State Total Campus Population**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FTE</td>
<td>HC</td>
<td>FTE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SF State Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>26,596</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty and Staff</td>
<td>3,428</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>30,024</td>
<td></td>
<td>36,252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SF State Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus Visitors</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hotel/Conference Center</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Visitors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
<td>788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>30,324</td>
<td></td>
<td>37,040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Existing student FTE and HC population is based on 2006 fall semester enrollment data for the main campus, which is the most recent enrollment data available.
2. The number of employees is based on comparable conference centers at three other universities in the country, including the Hilton University of Florida Conference Center Gainesville; the Inn & Conference Center, University of Maryland; and University Place Conference Center & Hotel a joint complex of Purdue University and the University of Indiana.
3. The number of visitors in the conference center/hotel is based on 90% occupancy of 250 rooms.

The first paragraph on page 3-9 has been revised as follows.

In addition to students, faculty, and staff, other persons who may be on campus on a given day include campus visitors, who currently make up an estimated 300 people. By 2020 under the proposed Campus Master Plan, this population could increase related primarily to the visitors to the proposed Hotel and Conference Center. Additionally, non-SF State employees at the Hotel and Conference Center would also be on campus. Overall, there would be a net increase in non-SF State population under the proposed Campus Master Plan of about 400 people. Apart from these daily populations, additional visitors would be present on the campus on some days attending special events such as concerts, graduation ceremonies, and athletic events.

The last paragraph on page 3-9 has been revised as follows.

In addition to projects that provide for FTE capacity, the proposed Campus Master Plan also provides additional building space to include a new 250 room Hotel and Conference Center and guest accommodations and a new satellite power plant. Overall, the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in the construction of a net increase in non-residential building space of about 1.2 million gsf. New housing will also be constructed and converted on campus through the planning horizon of the proposed Campus Master Plan. Overall, a net increase of about 846 people.
units of new and converted housing will be provided by 2020. All of these development projects are further described in Section 3.7.3.3, Urban Design Plan, below.

Table 3-2 on page 3-10 has been modified as follows.

**Table 3-2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Capacity Identified in 2007/2008 CIP and Subsequent Projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proposed Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2007/2008 – 2011/2012</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint J. Paul Leonard Library and Sutro Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts Phase 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Arts Phase 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral &amp; Social Sciences (BSS) Classroom(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Human Services (HHS) Classroom(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gym &amp; Rec Center(^4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Future FTE Projects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities &amp; Corporation Yard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Business(^5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies &amp; Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Faculty Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom/Faculty Office &amp; University Club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL FTE CAPACITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Future Projects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satellite Power Plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL OTHER CAPACITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET NEW CAPACITY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3-2
Building Capacity Identified in 2007/2008 CIP and Subsequent Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Space to be Demolished</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Notes:
1. Existing Humanities and Social Sciences (HSS) includes BSS and HHS.
2. New BSS building includes 30,377 gsf of interdisciplinary space.
3. New HHS building includes 22,792 gsf of interdisciplinary space.
4. CIP calls for 212,000 gsf for gym.
5. Existing Business building to be converted to faculty offices.

The following revisions have been made to the last paragraph under the header Semi-Public Buildings on page 3-12.

The new University Conference Center/Hotel will be located in the northeast corner of the campus at the intersection of the realigned Buckingham Way and 19th Avenue, which will take advantage of proximity to transit and the Stonestown Galleria. The new facility will contain a small conference center with limited guest accommodations and housing for SF State affiliates, a hotel of approximately 250 rooms, and a visitor center for prospective students and families and other University guests, overlooking the valley. The new facility will contain about 35,000 square feet of conference space with limited ground-floor retail and restaurant, along with a combination of guest rooms (approximately 80 rooms), and University suites and apartments (approximately 50 units), and a visitor center, overlooking the valley, for prospective students and families and other University guests. The University Conference Center/Hotel will serve SF State as well as the larger community. The Conference Center will provide much-needed space for University-sponsored conferences and events and a venue—unique in this area of the city—for programs, meetings, retreats, and seminars. Campus access will be via the new pedestrian bridge linking the UPN housing on Buckingham Way with the core and through the building courtyard to the new softball field along 19th Avenue, between Hensill and Thornton Halls.

Figure 3-6 has been revised to show the reduced University Conference Center and additional housing in UPN. The revised figure is provided at the end of this section.

The following revisions have been made to the second and third paragraphs under the header Residential Buildings on page 3-13.

The Urban Design Plan identifies three sites to be redeveloped with housing in more compact and dense configurations in order to increase the supply of housing (see Figure 3-6, Master Plan Diagram). New housing is planned on the existing Sutro Library site, on a number of the UPN sites north of Cox Stadium and east of the towers, and on the block of UPS west of Cardenas Avenue, and within the proposed University Conference Center building. The Sutro Library site is a potential site slated for construction of for-sale housing for faculty and staff. Redeveloped housing in UPN and UPS will be rental housing. As indicated in Section 3.2, Project Location and Vicinity above, development on UPS will not take place until that property, currently owned by the SF State Foundation, is transferred to SF State. The new buildings will be mostly 4-story stacked flats over structured parking with a maximum height of 50 feet. An exception would be
for the interior site in UPN west 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 3-4-bedroom units that the University can rent either by bed (to upper division students) or by unit. Overall, the new housing construction in UPN (including that provided on the Sutro Library site) and UPS would provide for a total of about 988 542 new and replacement housing units (a net increase of 657 new units).

Additionally, as indicated in Section 3.3.1, Built Environment above, 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). 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. Therefore, the conversion of existing housing units to SF State uses will likely result in about 354 247 additional units of housing being available for SF State uses through the planning horizon. This accounts for the anticipated demolition of about 205 331 units that would be required to allow for the proposed construction of new units in UPN and UPS. The number of student beds in the campus core will decrease by about 49 37 units (about 148 beds), due to the conversion of Village Building C to Student Services. Overall, a net increase in about 846 1,198 units of new and converted housing would be provided by 2020 (see Table 3-3). For the purposes of this EIR, it is assumed that students would occupy approximately half of the 846 1,198 additional units and faculty and staff would occupy the remaining units.

The following revisions have been made to Table 3-3 on page 3-14.

Table 3-3
Net Increase in On-Campus Housing Through 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOUSING SITE</th>
<th>UNITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing UPS/UPN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Units Occupied by SF State Affiliates(^1)</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Remaining Units Occupied by SF State Affiliates by 2020(^2)</td>
<td>542 535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Increase</td>
<td>354 247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Construction UPN/UPS</td>
<td>542 988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Housing</td>
<td>-49 -37(^3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NET INCREASE</td>
<td>846 1,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Notes:
1. Currently, about 30% of existing 960 UPS and UPN units are occupied by SF State affiliates.
2. 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 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 also accounts for the demolition of about 205 331 units that will result from the proposed new construction in UPN and UPS by 2020.
3. 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.
The following revisions have been made to the fourth paragraph, second bullet on page 3-19.

- **Paving.** The proposed Campus Master Plan recommends a hierarchy of paving categories to distinguish pathways, intersections, building entries, and gathering spaces throughout the campus. A simple palette of materials will be used, reserving distinctive visual and tactile effects to highlight areas of importance and to help with wayfinding. 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. The paving categories are further described in the proposed Campus Master Plan.

The following revisions have been made to the fifth and sixth paragraphs on page 3-21.

The proposed Campus Master Plan 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. This minimal increase in storm water runoff is due to the fact that the vast majority of new development would consist of redevelopment of existing building sites, and therefore the overall amount of impervious surfacing will be minimized.

**Overall,** due to the new open storm water system the quantity of storm runoff directed to the San Francisco combined sewer system will be decreased by approximately 12-20 percent, due to the new open storm water system, for a net reduction of 10-18 percent from the runoff rate and quantity of the existing campus. The open 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.

It should be noted, however, that the net reduction of runoff directed into the City’s system of 10-18 percent, does not account for the reduction of runoff volume that will occur with the infiltration of storm water into the ground water table via the proposed project-specific design elements (e.g., rain gardens). Therefore, the actual reduction is likely to be greater than that estimated above.

The following revisions have been made to the first sentence on page 3-23.

These facilities will be marked with pavement marking and 8-15 mph bicycle speed signs at the entrance to the campus. However, the speed limit in parking lots will be limited to 10 mph.

The following revisions have been made to the second paragraph, eighth bullet on page 3-27. Additionally, a new bullet item has been added following the eighth bullet.
• **Hotel and Conference Center.** This facility will provide 440 new parking spaces on 2 levels of structured, underground parking beneath a new hotel/conference center at the corner of Buckingham Way and 19th Avenue.

• **Winston Drive.** A new surface parking lot with an additional 220 spaces will be located on Winston Drive, just west of the Stonestown Galleria.

**Figure 3-12** has been revised to show the additional parking lot location on Winston Drive. The revised figure is provided at the end of this section.

### 3.4 SECTION 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING, IMPACTS, AND MITIGATION

Table 4.0-1 has been made to the text on page 4-4.

**Table 4.0-1**

Pending or Approved Reasonably Foreseeable Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Size (gross square feet / units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balboa Park Station Area Plan1</td>
<td>Residential and commercial (mixed-use transit-oriented development)</td>
<td>1,780 new residential units 104,680 sq ft commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Brotherhood Way</td>
<td>Single- and multiple-family units</td>
<td>127 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon</td>
<td>Residential and commercial</td>
<td>195 residential units 272,000 sq ft commercial 7,900 15,000 retail 3,150 childcare (Replaces 30,800 sq ft commercial building)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473 Eucalyptus</td>
<td>Indoor Recreational Facility</td>
<td>20,000 sq ft YMCA building (Replaces 10,000 sq ft building)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, Notice of Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and Notice of Public Scoping Meeting, Case No. 2004.1059E – Balboa Park Station Area Plan, July 2006. This project will require amendments to the *San Francisco General Plan and Planning Code* related to zoning districts and height and bulk controls.

**Figure 4.0-1** has been revised to accurately locate the 77 Cambon project. The revised figure is provided at the end of this section.

### 3.5 SECTION 4.1 AESTHETICS

The following revisions have been made to the first paragraph on page 4.1-12.

... development in this portion of the campus. The height limit will be 70 feet along Centennial Walk consistent with the existing Humanities and Village buildings. This limit will also apply to the Gym/Recreation-Wellness Center, consistent with or lower than existing campus development in UPN. The 70-foot limit will also apply along most of 19th Avenue to reinforce the campus’s urban frontage. This height limit is consistent with or lower than existing campus development in...
these portions of the campus, such as Thornton and Hensill halls, and Centennial Village and Towers. A 100-foot height limit will apply to the hotel tower and high-volume spaces in the Creative Arts buildings. This height limit is consistent with other prominent campus development, such as the Student Center, and others listed above.

The following revision to Mitigation AES-3 has been added on page 4.1-12.

Mitigation AES-3: Expand the proposed Campus Master Plan to provide for Develop appropriate architectural and urban design guidelines that apply specifically to the proposed redevelopment of a portion of the existing University South Park (UPS) buildings. These guidelines will require that any proposed new structures in UPS respect the existing visual characteristics of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood. The guidelines should consider building color and design, exterior treatments and design details, and building heights/massing such that the proposed new development is visually compatible with the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood.

The following revision to the third paragraph has been made on page 4.1-13.

Campus development as viewed from the Stonestown shopping center may appear denser with the new and replacement development anticipated in the proposed Campus Master Plan. The Hotel and Conference Center will be visible from the Stonestown Galleria shopping center. This facility will replace a portion of the existing apartment buildings currently located in UPN. As indicated above, this building will be similar lower in height to the adjacent Hensill and Thornton halls, which are also currently visible from the Stonestown shopping center. Just to the east of the Hotel and Conference Center, additional buildings in UPN will be replaced with new, higher density buildings. This redeveloped portion of UPN will also be visible from the Stonestown shopping center. However, these new buildings will be limited in height to 50-feet and 70-feet and will be comparable in height to other adjacent buildings in UPN. Specifically, the new buildings will be substantially lower than the 10-story tower apartments in UPN and somewhat higher than the 2- and 3-story apartment buildings in UPN. According to the proposed Campus Master Plan, Buckingham Way will be designated as one of two campus village main streets, and will be planted with rows of tightly spaced street trees with a high canopy, such as London Plane trees or Brisbane Box. This will soften the appearance of the new campus development in this portion of campus.

The following revision to Mitigation AES-4A has been added on page 4.1-15.

Mitigation AES-4A: New campus lighting will be consistent with the most recent LEED-NC guidelines for light pollution reduction. These guidelines require that directional and other lighting methods be used to minimize light trespass from buildings and outdoor areas. Available methods, include
but are not limited to: directional and design methods to reduce spillage, automatically controlled turn off of interior spaces during non-business hours, lighting exterior areas only for safety and comfort, and using lower intensity lights.

**Mitigation AES-4B:** Revise the proposed Campus Master Plan architectural and urban design guidelines to indicate that reflective metal, mirrored glass, or any other reflective building materials shall not be used as primary building materials for facades.

### 3.6 SECTION 4.2 AIR QUALITY

The following revision to the first line of Mitigation AIR-1 has been added on page 4.2-15.

**Mitigation AIR-1:** The Campus shall apply the following feasible control measures as required by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District (BAAQMD):

The following revision to Mitigation AIR-2A has been added on page 4.2-15.

**Mitigation AIR-2A:**

- The SF State campus will work with the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) to ensure that campus growth associated with the proposed Campus Master Plan is accounted for in the regional population forecasts.

The following revisions have been made to the first paragraph on page 4.2-17.

Muni and other transit providers; (4) the expansion of campus shuttle services between the campus and the Daly City BART station; (5) the development of a carshare program; and (6) the continuation of parking demand management programs on campus. Mitigations TRA-1A and TRA-2A and 2B through 2C will ensure that needed Transportation Demand Management programs and adequate transit services to and from the SF State campus will be provided (see Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking). Additionally, SF State will ensure University representation on transportation matters to facilitate transit, parking program, and bicycle improvements off-campus that will help to facilitate the use of alternative modes of travel to the campus. See Chapter 3, Project Description and Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking for further information about these measures.

### 3.7 SECTION 4.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The following revisions have been made to the third paragraph on page 4.3-5.

Lake Merced is also an important recreational resource, providing for boating, fishing, golfing, jogging, bicycling, birding and nature study, etc. The San Francisco Public Utilities Commission also uses the lake as an emergency water supply resource.
The following revisions have been made to the first two paragraphs on page 4.3-6.

Table 4.3-1 includes a list of these special-status plant and wildlife species, per the six criteria identified above, with both scientific and common names, legal status, description of habitat preference, and the recorded occurrence in the project vicinity. The potential for occurrence of special-status species on the SF State campus is also provided in this table, based on an assessment of habitat provided on campus in the plan area. Many of the special-status species are not expected to occur on the campus or have a low potential for occurrence because the habitat elements they require either were never present or are no longer found on the managed and modified lands associated with the campus.

A number of species, however, occur or may occur in the adjacent Lake Merced area. Unless indicated otherwise, information about special-status or sensitive species occurrences in the Lake Merced Area is based on the Significant Natural Resource Areas Management Plan recently completed by the San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department in February 2006. This document assesses the current status of special-status and sensitive species occurrences in the Lake Merced Natural Area. While Table 4.3-1 identifies recorded occurrences in the vicinity of the campus in general, it does not specifically document and repeat the detailed information for Lake Merced area that is provided below.

The following revisions have been made to the fourth paragraph on page 4.3-7.

**Special-Status Birds.** Double-crested cormorants (*Phalacrocorax auritus*) have nested in eucalyptus groves on the western side of South Lake and on the northwest edge of North Lake since at least 1997. Great blue herons are also known to nest in these eucalyptus groves. Recently, cormorants were also observed nesting on the north shore of East Lake in the eucalyptus grove below the Mesa. According to the Golden Gate Audubon Society, great blue herons were also documented nesting for the first time in 2007 in a eucalyptus grove on the Mesa (Golden Gate Audubon Society, 2007). Great blue herons are also known to nest in these eucalyptus groves. Bank swallows (*Riparia riparia*) currently nest at Fort Funston and forage over the lake. The common yellowthroat (*Geothlypis trichas*), has been observed feeding young and singing at several locations throughout the Lake Merced area. They are believed to nest in the tule marsh vegetation around the edges of the lakes (San Francisco Recreation and Parks Department, 2006). As indicated above, other sensitive bird species are known to breed at the lake.

The following revisions to Mitigations BIO-1A through BIO-1D have been made on pages 4.3-10 through 4.3-11.

**Mitigation BIO-1A:** The new path connection and the new seasonal creek inlet in the East Lake area shall be located in consultation with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission and any other agency with jurisdiction over the management of Lake Merced. The new path connection shall be sited to minimize loss of wetland and other sensitive habitats (including bulrush marsh and willow scrub areas along the lake edge) to
the extent feasible, and the path will also be sited to avoid bringing people into sensitive bird habitat.

Mitigation BIO-1B: All wetland or other sensitive habitat in Lake Merced temporarily disturbed/removed during the construction of the bridge underpass, path connection and/or seasonal creek inlet shall be replaced and restored in accordance with the SFPUC through its subsequent approval process and all regulatory permit requirements. Prior to any work that could disturb jurisdictional or other wetland habitat, appropriate permits shall be obtained as required from ACOE and/or RWQCB. Consultation with all of these agencies shall govern how the disturbance of wetlands and other sensitive habitats will be mitigated, including the location and extent of wetland restoration and creation, and planting and management specifications (e.g., success criteria, monitoring, reporting, etc.).

Mitigation BIO-1C: At the time that the path connection and/or seasonal creek inlet in the East Lake area are proposed, a clearance-level plant survey shall be performed for these projects to determine the presence or absence of special-status or sensitive plant species. If such species are found and will be either directly or indirectly affected by proposed construction an appropriate replacement and/or mitigation plan shall be developed and implemented in consultation with the California Department of Fish and Game, and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and/or any other agency with jurisdiction over the management of Lake Merced, as appropriate. Such a replacement and/or mitigation plan would include, but would not necessarily be limited to:

- Replacement of removed vegetation at a defined replacement ratio and/or restoration of existing habitat via new plantings, removal of exotic species, etc.
- Monitoring and maintenance of any newly planted areas for a specified time period
- Specification of success criteria
- Specification of reporting requirements

Mitigation BIO-1D The design and engineering of the creek corridor and the Lake Merced Boulevard underpass/bridge shall ensure that these facilities do not cause erosion along the sand banks in the Lake Merced area, which could degrade localized sensitive habitat values. Erosion of sand banks in Lake Merced could be avoided by providing for adequate stormwater detention on campus and appropriate design elements (e.g., check dams, slope stabilization, etc.) to ensure that the longitudinal creek profile and channel cross-section are stable.
Residual Significance:  Less than significant

The following revisions have been made to Impact BIO-1 in paragraphs three through six on page 4.3-12.

The construction of the proposed underpass/bridge at Lake Merced Boulevard, and the creek inlet and path connection in the East Lake portion of Lake Merced could result in permanent and/or construction-related disturbance of wetlands or other sensitive habitats, as further described below.

If not properly sited in accordance with the final Campus Master Plan, the proposed path connection into the East Lake area could result in the permanent removal of wetland or other sensitive habitat around the margin of the lake, a potentially significant impact. Bulrush marsh and willow scrub exist along the eastern edge of the lake (see Figure 4.3-2, East Lake Vegetation). The implementation of Mitigation BIO-1A will ensure that the new path connection will be sited, in consultation with the SFPUC and as generally described in the final Campus Master Plan, to avoid wetlands or other sensitive habitats, to the extent possible. If habitat were removed in order to construct the path, it will be replaced in accordance with Mitigation BIO-1B. With implementation of these mitigation measures, the impact related to the siting of the proposed path would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The construction of the new underpass/bridge at the Lake Merced Boulevard and the new creek inlet and path connections could potentially affect wetlands or other sensitive habitats temporarily during construction, as construction-related activities and associated disturbance could potentially affect these habitats. The construction of the new seasonal creek inlet to East Lake would likely remove/disturb some wetland and other sensitive habitats around the margin of the lake. However, the loss of wetland vegetation would only be temporary as a result of grading required to create the creek bed and it is anticipated that the wetland vegetation would reestablish once the construction of the creek inlet is complete. The construction of the new underpass/bridge could potentially result in disturbance to wetland or other sensitive habitats if grading and other construction activities on the Lake Merced Boulevard roadway embankment extend into these habitats.

As the design and construction plans for these project components are not yet known, it is difficult to further define the extent of temporary disturbance that could occur. The extent of removal of wetlands and other sensitive habitats shall be determined on a project-specific basis when these project elements are proposed. In addition, the extent and quality of wetlands may change over time, so impacts and mitigation must be assessed close to the time that the impacts will occur. However, the implementation of Mitigation BIO-1B will ensure that any disturbed habitat will be successfully replaced and restored through the appropriate consultation and permitting by lead and responsible agencies. Additionally, Mitigation BIO-1D will further ensure that project-related erosion does not affect post-construction vegetation replacement efforts or cause degradation of habitat values. It should also be noted that the proposed Campus Master Plan storm water management and landscaping plans would result in the creation of new wetland-type habitat along the creek that will run through the valley portion of the campus. The new
creek will consist of a riparian corridor, including plants typical of coastal creeks in the area with a predominance of willow in low areas and hardwoods as the banks of the creek begin to rise. The connection of the new creek to the East Lake portion of Lake Merced will connect this riparian corridor to the lake habitats, which will increase overall habitat diversity in the area.

The following revisions have been made to Impact BIO-1 in the last sentence of the third paragraph on page 4.3-13.

Mitigation BIO-1D C above, which would ensure that special-status or sensitive species are appropriately identified and compensated for, in consultation with the appropriate regulatory agency.

The following revisions to Mitigations BIO-2A thought BIO-2C have been made on pages 4.3-14.

Mitigation BIO-2A: If project construction on campus is scheduled during the typical avian nesting season (March 1 – February 15 to August 1 – 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 or within or immediately adjacent to the Lake Merced Natural Area (i.e., the bridge replacement site, the path connector site, and the creek inlet site).

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 (September 1 – February 28 to August 1 – February 15).

Mitigation BIO-2B: For construction off-campus in the Lake Merced area, construction-phase mitigation measures for the protections of nesting special-status birds shall be developed in consultation with the SFPUC through its subsequent approval process to ensure that substantial effects on nesting birds do not occur. Measures could include, but would not be limited to: provisions for pre-construction surveys, prohibitions on initiating construction during certain times of the year (e.g., typical nesting season), and/or buffer distances from active nest sites.

Mitigation BIO-2B C: 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 discourage 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.

The following revisions have been made to the third and fourth paragraphs on page 4.3-15.

There could potentially be a temporary loss of nesting habitat for special-status birds in the Lake Merced area associated with the construction of the new seasonal creek inlet. As indicated in Impact BIO-1, bulrush marsh and willow scrub would likely be removed as a result of that project, which is identified in Figure 4.3-3 as important bird habitat. However, Mitigation BIO-1B would ensure that this removal is avoided to the extent possible, that all disturbed areas would be restored, and any removal would be compensated for appropriately, in consultation with the applicable lead and regulatory agencies. Therefore, the direct loss of nesting habitat for special-status birds in the Lake Merced would be reduced to a less-than-significant level with the implementation of this mitigation.

Under the proposed Campus Master Plan, depending on project funding, demolition of existing structures and construction of new buildings and other structures would occur almost continuously over the 13-year plan period. Construction activities would result in construction noise and activity on the campus for up to 24 months in duration for each major building project. If construction activities under the proposed Campus Master Plan were to occur during the nesting season (March 1 through August 31), noise from construction activities could result in the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status bird species, which would be a potentially significant impact. This impact could result from construction on the campus, or within immediate proximity to Lake Merced (e.g., the construction of a new underpass/bridge at the Lake Merced Boulevard crossing of the new creek). The increased noise and activity at the specific construction site potentially could affect birds that may be nesting in trees nearby and/or in wetland vegetation in the case of Lake Merced, and therefore could interfere with breeding success. Under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 United States Code 703–711), all migratory birds are protected. The act requires that bird nests and nest trees be protected from human disturbance. Mitigation BIO-2A will be incorporated into and implemented in conjunction with every campus construction project that is within 150 feet of mature trees. Additionally, Mitigation BIO-2B will be implemented for construction projects in the Lake Merced area and/or wetland vegetation in the case of Lake Merced. Implementation of these mitigation measures will reduce this potentially significant impact related to construction activities to a less-than-significant level.

The following revisions have been made to the third paragraph on page 4.3-16.

The increase in people in this area could potentially disturb special-status and sensitive birds during nesting and breeding period, if the path is not sensitively designed in conjunction with the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department and San Francisco Public Utilities Commission.
and any other agency the agencies in charge of managing Lake Merced. However, with the implementation of Mitigation BIO-1A would ensure that the new pedestrian connection would not be sited in the bulrush marsh or willow scrub vegetation around the eastern edge of East Lake, which are the two most important habitats for nesting birds and other wildlife (San Francisco Recreation and Park Department, 2006). Additionally, Mitigation BIO-2B will require that appropriate signage and other design features (e.g., fencing) are installed as deemed appropriate by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, to keep people on the connector path. These measures will ensure that disturbance to nesting birds will be minimized from the new path connection and associated additional people in this area. Therefore, with the above mitigation measures, the implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan connector path into East Lake would not result in substantial adverse indirect impacts to nesting special-status and sensitive bird species in the adjacent Lake Merced due to the increased presence of people.

3.8 SECTION 4.4 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The following revisions have been made to fourth paragraph on page 4.4-5.

A records search for the SF State campus as well as a 1/2-mile radius around it was conducted March 7, 2006 at the Northwest Information Center (NWIC) of the California Historical Resources Information System (CHRIS), NWIC File No. 05-770. The search area includes the neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the campus (e.g., the Villas Parkmerced neighborhood). The record search, which looked for previously recorded archaeological sites and historic built environment features, and for previous archaeological surveys, revealed that there have been previous cultural resource surveys within the SF State campus. The NWIC reports one archeological site and one building as previously recorded within the boundaries of the campus. The archaeological site (P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25) is described as a possible sand midden with some shell and no charcoal. A stone pestle was also reportedly taken from the site. The other site (P-38-004381) is Mary Ward Hall, a 6-story concrete building on the SF State campus constructed in 1960. The site was listed as 6Y2, which means that it was not determined not to be eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) at the time it was evaluated. There are no other sites listed on the California Office of Historic Preservation Property Directory, or California Inventory of Historical Resources within the search area. In addition, the City of San Francisco List of Designated Landmarks was reviewed to determine whether any of the buildings on the campus, the Stonestown Apartments, or the Villas Parkmerced are designated as landmarks by the City. None of these buildings are on the City’s Designated Landmarks List.

The following revisions have been made to Mitigation CULT-1A on page 4.4-12.

Mitigation CULT-1A: During the planning and environmental review of specific development projects under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the campus shall follow the following protocol:

- If the project site is within 200 feet of archaeological site P-38-
000025/CA-SFR-25, the campus shall have a qualified archaeologist conduct subsurface testing in order to determine whether buried archaeological materials are present and if so the extent of the deposit relative to the project’s area of disturbance. In the event that an archaeological resource is encountered during subsurface testing, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B. At the completion of the archaeological testing program, the archaeologist will prepare written findings. No surveys or subsurface testing is necessary at project sites in the rest of the campus.

- The campus shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract, which requires that in the event that an archaeological resource is discovered during construction (whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease, and the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B below.

### 3.9 SECTION 4.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

The following revisions have been made to Mitigation HAZ-1 on page 4.7-5.

**Mitigation HAZ-4:** SF State will develop procedures regarding the demolition of laboratory space to ensure compliance with all applicable State regulations. These provisions will ensure the removal of hazardous materials; the decontamination of surfaces and equipment; proper characterization, storage and shipment of hazardous materials removed from laboratories; and proper worker training and safety procedures. These procedures should provide for the following:

- Removal of all hazardous materials
- User inspection for contamination
- Performance of a site audit to determine likelihood of chemical spills
- Performance of sampling for potential chemical contamination, if site audit finds that this is warranted
- Use of survey meters or wipe samples to detect lingering radioactivity, if radioactive materials were present
- Performance of sampling for potential chemical contamination, if site audit finds that this is warranted
- Communication with workers to ensure any remaining risk and
health and safety procedures are understood and followed during demolition

- Following proper procedures for characterizing, storing, and shipping hazardous wastes, if necessary

### 3.10 SECTION 4.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The following revisions have been made to Mitigation HYDRO-1 on page 4.7-5.

**Mitigation HYDRO-1:** The campus shall conduct monitoring of storm water discharges to Lake Merced. If monitoring data indicate that the discharge of storm water from SF State to Lake Merced increases the level of nutrients in the lake, then depending on the source of the nutrient, additional measures (e.g., reduce the use of fertilizer best management practices on campus) to reduce and/or offset nutrient loads shall be implemented on campus. The protocol and specific requirements for conducting monitoring of campus storm water discharges shall be developed in accordance with the SFPUC through its subsequent approval process.

The following revisions have been made to the second paragraph under Impact HYDRO-1 on page 4.7-5.

It should be noted that the campus contains typical urban land uses such as academic and residential buildings, roads, parking lots and structures, and landscaped areas, and does not include any industrial uses. Therefore runoff from campus surfaces is expected to contain pollutants that are typically found in runoff from urban areas. To avoid an impact on surface water quality, the proposed Campus Master Plan relies on Low Impact Development (LID) concepts of on-lot infiltration and control, and distributed retention to reduce the impact of increased storm water runoff to Lake Merced. The proposed Campus Master Plan calls for a three-tier approach to managing storm water runoff from redeveloped portions of the campus. Tier one is on-lot or local control of storm water. This consists of rain gardens and small infiltration devices located immediately adjacent to developed parcels. These are designed to maximize infiltration of runoff close to where it is generated. Excess water that does not infiltrate in these facilities would go to Tier 2 treatment devices consisting of small, distributed infiltration/conveyance areas and bioswales. These Tier 2 facilities would also infiltrate and treat runoff by utilizing biological processes. Lastly, discharges from Tier 2 facilities would flow into Tier 3 retention/detention facilities before discharging into a newly constructed creek to Lake Merced (see Figure 3-9, Storm Water Management System). Overall, the proposed open storm water system incorporating LID concepts would treat surface water runoff by utilizing both physical and biological treatment processes occurring in the system’s vegetation and soils. The goal of the three-tier LID approach is to create an urban hydrologic system that mimics a natural hydrologic system. The Campus Master Plan indicates that the proposed system emphasizes on-site filtration and will be designed to meet the highest applicable standards for water quality.
Additionally, runoff from locations that could have concentrated sources of pollution (e.g., loading docks and parking lots) would not be directed into the open system, and therefore runoff from these locations would not be a potential source of surface water contamination.

The following revisions have been made to the second paragraph under Impact HYDRO-2 on page 4.7-6

Because redevelopment of existing building sites is a major component of the proposed Campus Master Plan, the plan would not result in a substantial increase in impervious surfaces on the campus. The increase in impervious surfaces would not substantially reduce the recharge of the groundwater basin. Furthermore, the proposed Campus Master Plan includes a storm water drainage system that incorporates LID concepts, as described in detail above in Impact HYDRO-1. These LID concepts would maximize the infiltration of new runoff into the campus lands, and most of the new runoff that is generated would infiltrate, evaporate or be discharged into Lake Merced. In some areas, the modified storm water drainage system would divert existing runoff from the storm drain system into infiltration areas. Overall, implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan would add more water to the groundwater basin.

As indicated in Impact HYDRO-1, the proposed open storm water system incorporating LID concepts would treat surface water runoff by utilizing physical and biological treatment processes. These facilities would not only treat surface water runoff, but also would treat water that infiltrates into the groundwater basin. Further, as runoff from locations that could have concentrated sources of pollution (e.g., loading docks and parking lots) would not be directed into the open system, they would not be potential sources of groundwater contamination.

In summary, the proposed project would not reduce groundwater recharge or adversely affect water quality in the groundwater basin. No mitigation is required.

### 3.11 SECTION 4.8 LAND USE AND PLANNING

The text in the fourth through sixth paragraphs on page 4.8-8 has been revised as follows.

Additionally, providing for taller building heights in order to increase density is consistent with housing initiatives that San Francisco is pursuing under its Citywide Action Plan (CAP). The CAP promotes housing by increasing densities in areas well served by transit, which is the case at the SF State campus, by using specific strategies such as increasing height limits (see Section 4.10, Population and Housing for additional information about CAP). Therefore, the proposed redevelopment of a portion of UPS will generally conform with the existing use and height districts in this area and will not otherwise result in a significant land use impact. It should also be noted that a 50-foot height limit will also apply in most of UPN with an interior block near the towers having a 70-foot height limit, which is consistent with San Francisco’s 65-foot height limit in this portion of the campus.

The height limit will be 70 feet along Centennial Walk and in Centennial Village consistent with the existing Humanities and Village buildings. This limit will also apply to the Gym/Recreation-Wellness Center. The 70-foot limit is lower than San Francisco’s 130-foot height limit for the western portion of the campus.
The 70-foot limit will also apply along most of 19th Avenue to reinforce the campus’s urban frontage. While this limit is higher than San Francisco’s 40-foot height limit for the portion of the campus south of Buckingham Way. However, it is generally consistent with San Francisco’s 65-foot height limit north of Buckingham Way, and is also consistent with or lower than existing campus development in that area, such as Thornton and Hensill Halls. Moreover, new development along 19th Avenue will not otherwise result in a significant land use impact, such as compatibility with existing adjacent uses, as further described below.

The text in the first paragraph on page 4.8-9 has been revised as follows.

A 100-foot limit will apply to the Hotel tower and high-volume spaces in the Creative Arts buildings. This limit for the Creative Arts buildings is consistent with the San Francisco’s 130-foot height limit for this portion of the campus. It is also consistent with the building heights associated with the Villas Parkmerced towers to the south. While the 100-foot limit for the Hotel will be higher than San Francisco’s 40-foot and 65-foot height limits for this portion of the campus, it is consistent with existing campus development in that area, such as Thornton and Hensill Halls. Moreover, this facility will not otherwise result in a significant land use impact, such as compatibility with existing adjacent uses, as further described below.

3.12 SECTION 4.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

The text starting in the sixth paragraph on page 4.10-9 through page 4.10-11 has been revised as follows.

**New Housing.** As indicated in Chapter 3, Project Description, the new housing in UPN (including that provided on the Sutro Library site) and UPS provide for a total of about 542,988 new and replacement units. Additionally, the proposed Campus Master Plan acknowledges that the number of SF State affiliates in the existing UPN and UPS units will likely increase over time as units become available to SF State through attrition (i.e., as existing tenants voluntarily vacate their units). For the purposes of this EIR, it is projected that about 85 percent of the total units would be occupied by SF State affiliates by 2020. Therefore, the conversion of existing housing units to SF State uses would result in about 354,247 additional units of housing being available for SF State uses through the planning horizon. Overall, there would be a net increase of about 846,1198 units on the campus by 2020, taking into consideration this conversion of UPS/UPN housing, construction of new units, and the loss of 49,37 units of housing in the campus core that will be converted to faculty offices under the proposed Campus Master Plan. Table 3-3 in Chapter 3, Project Description, summarizes the amount of existing and projected on-campus housing through 2020.

The proposed Campus Master Plan does not indicate how these units will be allocated to students, faculty, and staff. For the purposes of this EIR, it is assumed that faculty and staff will occupy about 50 percent of the additional 846,1198 units with an average occupancy of 2 people per unit (one SF State employee and one non-SF State person) and students will occupy about 50 percent
of the units with an average occupancy of 3 students per unit. This assumption is reasonable given the campus’s desire to provide housing for faculty and staff to assist with recruitment. Moreover, it provides for a conservative analysis of the effects of campus population growth in San Francisco and the region, because it is assumed that for the faculty and staff units only 1 person would be a SF State affiliate. Therefore, fewer of the new SF State affiliates could be accommodated on campus than would be the case if more units were allocated to students. This will result in more SF State affiliates seeking housing elsewhere in San Francisco and the region.

Based on the above assumptions, the new student units on campus will accommodate about 1,270 new SF State students. Therefore, overall the proposed new and converted housing on campus would accommodate about 4,270 SF State students and 423 SF State faculty and staff for a total of about 4,693 SF State affiliates, or 49 percent of the net new population in the study area, assuming full occupancy of the new and converted housing (see further information below). Table 4.10-5 below summarizes this information.

**Table 4.10-5**

New SF State Affiliates in the Study Area Accommodated in On- and Off-Campus Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total New SF State Population</th>
<th>Net New SF State Population in the Study Area</th>
<th>New SF State Population Accommodated in New On-Campus Housing</th>
<th>New SF State Population Seeking Housing Off-Campus</th>
<th>Number of Units Needed Off-Campus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>5,517</td>
<td>2,760²</td>
<td>4,270 1,797</td>
<td>4,499 963</td>
<td>745 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty &amp; Staff</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>711¹</td>
<td>423 599</td>
<td>288 112</td>
<td>288 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-SF State Employees</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,291</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,471</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,693 2,396</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,778 1,075</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,033 594</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The numbers provided are based on the following: A total of 846 1,198 new and converted units of housing will result during the planning horizon. It is assumed that about 50% of this housing will serve students with an occupancy of 3 students per unit and 50% will serve faculty and staff with an occupancy of 2 people per unit, but only 1 SF State employee.
2. About 50% of the total new students are expected to be new to the study area.
3. 100% of the total new faculty and staff are expected to be new to the study area, as faculty are more likely to be recruited from outside the area.
4. Non-SF State employees on campus are related to the proposed Hotel and Conference Center.
5. The number of off-campus units required is based on the assumption of one SF State employee per housing unit and 2 students per housing unit.

**Distribution of SF State Population.** To estimate the distribution of the new SF State-related people that would live on and off campus, the following assumptions were used:

- **Housing Occupancy.** The 846 1,198 new and converted units would have 100 percent occupancy. This is a reasonable planning assumption because, based on past occupancy data, the occupancy levels of on-campus housing have been close to 100 percent of capacity.
• **New Students.** Of the total 2,760 students that will be new to the study area, about 1,545 students (56 percent) will live in San Francisco, based on current residential patterns (see Section 4.10.1.4 above for additional information). Given that 1,270 1,797 new SF State students would be accommodated in on-campus housing, about 275 no additional new SF State students would live off-campus in San Francisco with and the remaining 1,215 963 students (44 percent) would live elsewhere in the Bay Area region.

• **Faculty and Staff.** Of the total 711 new faculty and staff that will be new to the study area, about 400 employees (56 percent) will live in San Francisco, based on current residential patterns (see Section 4.10.1.4 above for additional information). Given that 423 599 new SF State employees would be accommodated on campus, it is expected that no additional SF State employees would live off-campus in San Francisco, and the remaining 288 112 employees (about 44 percent) would live elsewhere in the Bay Area region.

• **Conclusion.** Therefore, as shown in Table 4.10-5, a total of about 1,778 1,075 new SF State affiliates would seek off-campus housing in the study area.

**New Non-SF State-Related Population**

New employment generated by development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would include new staff and faculty positions, and new student positions, both of which are accounted for in the population numbers identified above. Some of the new jobs created however would not be filled by SF State affiliates, but rather by members of the general public. The Hotel and Conference Center is likely to involve new jobs that would be filled by some members of the non-SF State population. As shown in Table 3-1, in Chapter 3, Project Description, the new employment associated with this use is conservatively assumed to be 200 65 new employees. However, it is expected that people already living in San Francisco would fill the vast majority of these jobs. Therefore, this new employment would not result in substantial new population in the City or the demand for new housing.

Jobs related to the other semi-public uses and neighborhood retail would also likely be filled by SF State students or by other people already living in San Francisco. Therefore, this new employment would also not result in substantial new population in the City or the demand for new housing.

The text on page 4.10-12 through page 4.10-13 related to Impact POP-1 has been revised as follows.

Growth of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan would directly increase the study area population by about 5,427 4,741 people as a result of new SF State affiliates and their dependents (see Table 4.10-6).

Table 4.10-6 below presents the distribution of the Campus Master Plan-related population in the study area. Of the estimated 5,427 4,741 new people in the study area, based on assumptions listed earlier in this section, about 2,116 2,995 people are expected to reside on the campus, about 413 no people are expected to live off-campus in San Francisco, and about 2,598 1,746 people are
expected to live elsewhere in the Bay Area. The assumptions and methodology used to distribute the new population are described in Section 4.10.2.2, Analytical Method.

Table 4.10-6
Estimated Distribution of New SF State Affiliates and Dependents in the Study Area¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residence Location</th>
<th>SF State Students</th>
<th>SF State Employees</th>
<th>Dependents/Family Members²</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF State Campus</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>1,797</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bay Area Communities</td>
<td>1,246</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total New Population</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,760</strong></td>
<td><strong>711</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,656</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,270</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The projected new SF State -related population under the proposed Campus Master Plan excludes the daily non- SF State population (e.g., visitors, hotel conference center employees, etc.) identified in Table 3-1 in Chapter 3, Project Description, as this population is assumed to already live in the region.
2. Dependents of the new faculty and staff living off-campus are estimated based on an average household size of 2.69 persons per household (number of new employees living off campus x 1.69), which is the 2000 Census average household size for the Bay Area region. Dependents of the new faculty and staff living on-campus are estimated based on an estimated average household size of 2 persons per household (number of new employees living on campus x 1). Dependents of the new students living off-campus are estimated based on an average household size of 1.5 persons per household (number of new students living off campus x 0.5). This probably overestimates the number of dependents, as many students do not have families.

As noted earlier, this EIR conservatively assumes that the increment of growth in enrollment and employment anticipated in the proposed Campus Master Plan represents growth above and beyond the 2020 conditions forecast in Projections 2005. The increment of population that would be added to the study area as a result of SF State campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not be substantial compared to the projected population in San Francisco and the rest of the Bay Area in 2020. As Table 4.10-7 below shows, with about 5,127 new SF State-related persons living in the study area, the SF State-related new population would make up approximately 0.3 percent of the total projected population in San Francisco, and less than 0.01 percent of the projected population in the Bay Area. SF State-related population growth would make up about 4.1 percent of the projected population growth in San Francisco between 2005 and 2020, and about 0.5 percent of the projected population growth in the Bay Area as a whole. Overall, the increment of population that would be added to the study area as a result of SF State campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not be substantial, and the impact would be less than significant.
The text starting in the fourth paragraph on pages 4.10-14 through 4.10-15 related to Impact POP-3 has been revised as follows.

The proposed Campus Master Plan includes the conversion of existing housing in UPN and UPS to campus use and the construction of new campus housing for students, faculty, and staff. Specifically, the proposed Campus Master Plan would result in approximately 846 new units of on-campus housing for students, faculty, and staff. This new housing would accommodate about 49.69 percent of the net new SF State affiliates. Table 4.10-8 presents the projected distribution of students and employees by residence location (i.e., on- or off-campus), along with the estimated number of housing units that may be demanded by the proposed Campus Master Plan-related population. The assumptions and methodology used to distribute the new population are described in Section 4.10.2.2, Analytical Method.

Of the total 2,760 new students that would be added to the study area under the proposed Campus Master Plan, 1,270 would be housed on campus and the rest (about 1,490 students) would seek housing elsewhere in the study area. Of the 711 new employees, 423 would be housed on campus and the rest (about 288 employees) would seek housing elsewhere in the study area. Assuming a worst case of one SF State employee per housing unit and two students per housing unit, there would be about 1,033 new households seeking housing units off-campus in the study area.
Table 4.10-8
Number of Housing Units Needed by SF State Affiliates and Projected Supply in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of Residence</th>
<th>SF State Students¹</th>
<th>SF State Employees¹</th>
<th>Housing Units Required²</th>
<th>Projected New Housing Supply by 2020</th>
<th>Demand as % of Increase in Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF State Campus</td>
<td>1,270</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1,198</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>20,209</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bay Area Communities</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>325,620</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2,760</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>4,880</td>
<td>346,675</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Data taken from Table 4.10-6, based on assumptions provided in Section 4.1.2.2, Analytical Method.
2. The on-campus units required is based on the assumption of one SF State employee per unit and three SF State students per unit. The off-campus units required is based on the assumption of 1 SF State employee per housing unit and 2 students per housing unit.
3. The projected new housing supply in San Francisco is based on the increase in households between 2005-2020 from Table 4.10-4. The number of total units in 2020 is based on LUA 2002 (358,909 households), as this number is smaller than that projected by ABAG’s Projections 2005.
4. The projected new housing supply in other Bay Area communities is based on the projected number of households in 2020 from ABAG’s Projections 2005, as reported in Table 4.10-4.

The housing demand in San Francisco associated with new SF State affiliates in the study area would not likely create additional demand for housing in San Francisco represent about 0.7 percent of projected additional housing units by 2020. This projected supply is based on the projected number of households in 2020 from LUA 2002, as described previously in Section 4.1.1.5, Regional Housing, and shown in Table 4.10-4, as this number is smaller than that projected by ABAG’s Projections 2005. As there would likely be no increase in housing demand in San Francisco associated with new SF State affiliates, growth under the Campus Master Plan would be well within the projected supply and would not trigger shifts of demand to other parts of the Bay Area region, nor would it stimulate the need to build additional new housing above and beyond that already projected. Additionally, housing demand elsewhere in the Bay Area region associated with new SF State affiliates also would be well within the projected supply. Therefore, there would be no substantial shift in demand to more distant communities outside the Bay Area region, nor would the project stimulate the need to build additional new housing above and beyond that already projected. The impact is less than significant.

Impact of Displacement of Housing Units on Housing Supply
As described in Chapter 3, Project Description, SF State has and the SF State Foundation have acquired apartment buildings north and south of the academic core along Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue. These include the former Stonestown apartments, now called UPN, and several buildings formerly part of Villas Parkmerced, now called UPS (see Figure 3-1, Campus Master Plan Boundary). There are about 960 units in these areas of which approximately 30 percent are currently occupied by SF State affiliates. The proposed Campus Master Plan calls for new housing on a portion of the UPN and UPS sites. Redevelopment of these sites will involve the demolition of about 205 existing apartments and the construction of about 542 new units.
units, for a net gain of about 340,657 units on campus as a result of new housing construction. While the project would temporarily displace housing units, it would more than compensate for the loss, and the total housing supply in the study area would increase as a result of the proposed Campus Master Plan. Therefore, this temporary displacement of housing units will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region. The impact is less than significant. (See Impact POP-4 for a discussion of potential displacement of people as a result of the demolition and replacement of existing units in UPN and UPS.)

The text starting in the second paragraph on page 4.10-16 related to Impact POP-4 has been revised as follows.

As discussed above, it is estimated that out of the 960 existing units in UPS and UPN, about 288 units are currently occupied by SF State affiliates and by 2020, an estimated 642,535 of the existing remaining units will be occupied by SF State affiliates. This conversion would take place only as existing tenants voluntarily vacate their units and therefore this conversion would not result in displacement of people. However, the redevelopment of a few blocks in UPS and UPN would result in the removal and replacement of about 205,331 units of housing, which could displace non-SF State people that have not already voluntarily vacated their units by the time this proposed construction takes place. Assuming conservatively that 70 percent of the 205,331 units to be removed and replaced are still occupied by non-SF State renters at the time that the redevelopment projects are proposed, the plan could result in the displacement of up to 144,232 households. Because the number of units is small compared to the projected increase in housing in San Francisco and the Bay Area, this displacement will not necessitate the construction of replacement housing elsewhere, and the impact would be less than significant.

Furthermore, the campus will comply with the California Relocation Assistance Act (Government Code 7260 et seq), which applies to state entities that may displace residents and businesses. This act generally requires that public entities provide assistance and financial payments to persons who are displaced as the result of the acquisition of property for a public use. Financial assistance that may be required would include, for example, moving expenses and temporary rent subsidies. In addition to what is required by the law, SF State will provide displaced persons with the option to relocate to comparable units in other campus housing in UPN and UPS and maintain their current rent. As development in UPS would not take place until that property, currently owned by the SF State Foundation, is transferred to SF State, displacement of people in UPS will also be subject to these requirements.

The text starting in the first paragraph on page 4.10-17 through 4.10-18 related to Impact POP-5 has been revised as follows.

Impact POP-3 above presents the demand for housing that campus growth would place on the housing resources in the City of San Francisco and the rest of the Bay Area. As reported there, an estimated 138 it is likely that no additional housing units in San Francisco and about 896,594 units in the rest of the Bay Area would be needed to accommodate the new population that would be added to the study area as a result of the proposed Campus Master Plan. The cumulative
impact of this demand for housing in conjunction with demand associated with other regional growth is evaluated below for the City and County of San Francisco and the rest of the Bay Area.

**City and County of San Francisco**

According to ABAG planning forecasts, between 2005 and 2020 the population of San Francisco is projected to increase by about 61,200 persons (see Table 4.10-2). Based on a household size of 2.4 (the average household size for San Francisco per the 2000 Census), this projected growth translates into about 25,500 new households. Assuming each household requires one housing unit, these households would demand 25,500 units, which combined with the SF State-related demand for about 138 units, would amount to a total demand of about 25,638 units. As indicated in Impact POP-3, new SF-State affiliates would not likely contribute to additional demand for housing in San Francisco by 2020. Given that the estimated supply in San Francisco is about 20,209 units in 2020, based on the projected growth in households, there would be a theoretical deficit of about 5,429 units by 2020, as shown in Table 4.10-9. However, if the City’s housing stock were to grow at the rate that housing has been added to the San Francisco’s housing stock in the recent past, it is likely that housing units will be added in the City at a rate of between 1,400 and 2,000 units per year.3 This would result in the addition of 21,000 to 30,000 between 2005 and 2020. This is a reasonable assumption, as it is based on recent production information and it is also substantially lower than ABAG’s most recent goal for San Francisco of 2,700 new units per year to meet its share of the region’s projected housing demand. It should also be noted that the San Francisco General Plan Housing Element (Part I, Data and Needs Analysis) estimates that there is the potential to add 29,000 new units in San Francisco, based on an assessment of vacant and underutilized sites under current zoning. Therefore, it is possible that the total housing demand associated with regional growth and SF State-related growth could be met in 2020. However, to be conservative this EIR considers this to be a significant cumulative impact. Even if there were a deficit in supply in San Francisco in 2020, the new SF State-related affiliates would not likely contribute to this cumulative impact would be relatively small at about 2.5 percent (see Table 4.10-9) and therefore would not be considerable.

**Rest of Bay Area**

With respect to the rest of the Bay Area, according to ABAG planning forecasts, between 2005 and 2020 the population of other Bay Area communities is projected to increase by about 941,100 persons (see Table 4.10-2). Based on a household size of 2.69 (the average household size for the Bay Area per ABAG’s Projections 2005), this projected growth translates into about 349,850 new households, and a corresponding demand for housing units. This demand when combined with the SF State-related demand for about 896 units would amount to a total demand of about 350,747 units in 2020, based on the projected growth in households, there would be a theoretical deficit of about 25,127 units by 2020, as shown in Table 4.10-9. It is unclear

---

3 Between 1989-1998 the average annual housing production in San Francisco was approximately 1,400 units, according to the San Francisco General Plan Housing Element Part I, Data and Needs Analysis (2004). Between 2001-2004 the average annual housing production in San Francisco was approximately 2,000 units, according to the Housing Inventory 2001-2004 (2005).
whether such a housing deficit could occur by 2020, although it should be noted that other Bay Area communities outside of San Francisco will likely have a greater ability to add housing capacity than is the case in the San Francisco. However, to be conservative this EIR considers this to be a significant cumulative impact. Even if there were a deficit in supply in other Bay Area communities in 2020, the SF State-related contribution to this cumulative impact would be relatively small at about 3.6 2.4 percent (see Figure 4.10.9) and therefore would not be considerable.

### Table 4.10-9
**New Demand for Housing Units by SF State Affiliates and other Regional Sources between 2005-2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Projected New Housing in 2020</th>
<th>SF State – Related Demand</th>
<th>Regional Demand</th>
<th>Total Demand</th>
<th>Theoretical Supply Deficit</th>
<th>SF State Contribution to Deficit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco (Off-Campus)</td>
<td>20,209</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>25,938</td>
<td>5,291</td>
<td>2.5 0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Bay Area Communities</td>
<td>325,620</td>
<td>896 594</td>
<td>349,851</td>
<td>350,747</td>
<td>25,127 24,825</td>
<td>3.6 2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>345,829</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,034 594</strong></td>
<td><strong>375,351</strong></td>
<td><strong>375,945</strong></td>
<td><strong>30,556 30,116</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.4 2.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. From Table 4.10-8.
2. Regional demand is based on the increase in population between 2005-2020 in San Francisco and other Bay Area communities from Table 4.10-2 divided by the average household size of 2.4 in San Francisco, per the 2000 Census; and 2.69 in the Bay Area, per ABAG’s Projections 2005.
3. Equals the sum of columns 2 and 3.
4. Supply deficit is equal to total demand in column 4 minus projected new housing in column 1.

In summary, campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other regional growth in the study area, would result in a demand for housing that could potentially exceed the projected housing supply in 2020. This cumulative impact would be significant. However, because the demand generated by campus growth would not constitute a substantial portion of the total housing demand in the region (3.4 2.0 percent or less than 80 45 new units per year over the 13-year plan period), the project’s contribution would not be cumulatively considerable.

### 3.13 SECTION 4.11 TRAFFIC, CIRCULATION AND PARKING

The following revisions have been made to the fourth paragraph on page 4.11-2.

The existing conditions are described below based in part on information gathered through these surveys. Overall, these surveys indicate that for the total journey to campus, which for some travelers involves multiple legs and modes, transit is the most popular mode of transportation with 58 percent of those surveyed indicating they used transit or the SF State shuttle for some
portion of their commute. Walking was reported by 27 percent of survey respondents, making it the second most common transport mode. About 50 percent of SF State affiliates relied on an automobile at some point in their journey to campus (about half of these drove alone and half utilized high occupancy vehicles). Commuting by bicycle is fairly uncommon, with only 3 percent of respondents indicating that they traveled by bicycle. If only the last leg of the journey arriving to the SF State campus is assessed the transit/shuttle mode continues to be the most common at 43 percent of those surveyed, followed by people driving alone (30 percent), pedestrians (13 percent), high occupancy vehicles and motorbikes (12 percent), and bicycles (2 percent). Data from these surveys are reported as appropriate. For further details about these surveys, please see Existing Conditions Analysis prepared in conjunction with the Campus Master Plan (WRT, 2006).

The following revisions have been made to the second paragraph on page 4.11-3.

The SF State campus is served by two primary roadways: 19th Avenue and Lake Merced Boulevard. In addition Brotherhood Way and Alemany Boulevard provide access to the SF State campus from Interstate 280. Key off-campus streets that are used by traffic associated with the campus are shown on Figure 4.11-1 and are briefly described below:

19th Avenue is a six-lane major arterial street extending north-south from Junipero Serra Boulevard to Lincoln Way. 19th Avenue is major commuter and visitor route providing regional access between Interstate 280 and 101 in the City and County of San Francisco. 19th Avenue is a part of Highway 1 and is under the jurisdiction of Caltrans.

The following revisions have been made to the third and fifth paragraphs on page 4.11-10.

Parking is also available on city streets near the campus. Free, unrestricted parking exists along both sides of 19th Avenue to the east of the campus, and there is metered parking on Tapia and Holloway Avenue along the south side of the campus. However, much of the parking to the east and south of the campus is subject to two-hour parking restrictions imposed by the City and County of San Francisco’s residential permit parking program. The City of San Francisco issues Parking Permit E to those living in Villas Parkmerced to park on the street without time restriction (WRT, 2006) and Parking Permit H to those living immediately east of 19th Avenue. Several of the streets in Area H have one-hour time limits in an effort to discourage use of these streets by SF State students (Robbins, 2007).

Demand for parking is affected by a number of factors, which include the cost of parking and convenience of parking locations. During the intercept surveys, respondents were asked questions regarding the location and cost of parking. Of the 276 respondents who answered the questions about parking location and cost, 26 percent parked on the campus and 67 percent parked on city streets near the campus, and the remainder at other locations such as the BART stations. Even though there is a 1- or 2-hour limit on some parking on residential streets to the east and south of the campus imposed by the residential permit program, a high proportion of SF State affiliates park on nearby city streets because on-street parking is free (WRT, 2006).

The following revisions have been made to the fourth paragraph on page 4.11-11.
To the west of the campus, pedestrian access is provided along a wide, dedicated off-street path along the perimeter of Lake Merced. This path is connected to Font Boulevard and State Drive. However, at the intersections of both these streets with Lake Merced Boulevard, pedestrian crossing is poor because pedestrian signals are either missing or in disrepair (WRT, 2006). However, based on a field investigation conducted during the preparation of the Final EIR, pedestrian signals do, in fact, exist and are in good repair at the intersections of Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive. Further, there are no other deficiencies related to the pedestrian crossing at these two intersections.

The following revisions have been made to the fifth paragraph on page 4.11-11.

According to a survey conducted in conjunction with the preparation of the Campus Master Plan, only 3 percent of campus affiliates currently commute to the campus by bicycle. This low percentage reflects the deficiencies in bicycle facilities in and around the campus. The main bicycle corridor to the north is along 20th Avenue where due to low vehicular traffic volumes and high street connectivity, conditions for bicycle access are very favorable. The one exception is the area of portion of 20th Avenue, between Winston and Eucalyptus Drives, through the Stonestown Mall, as there are no bicycles lanes along this privately owned portion of this street. To the south of the campus, a dedicated on-street bike lane is available along Holloway between Font Boulevard and 19th Avenue but is absent between 19th Avenue and Junipero Serra. To the east, the main bicycle route is along Holloway east of Junipero Serra and along portions of Ocean Avenue. To the west of the campus, bike access is provided along a dedicated off-street route along Lake Merced (WRT, 2006).

The following revisions have been made to the second bullet on page 4.11-14.

- If a signalized intersection operates at LOS E or F under cumulative without project conditions, and the following conditions occur: (1) project-related traffic contributes 5 percent or more of the total traffic at the intersection, and (2) the project-related traffic contributes 5 percent or more of the cumulative growth in traffic volumes at the affected intersection.

The following revisions have been made to the first paragraph on page 4.11-16.

intersections were projected by applying a growth factor of 1 percent per year to the existing peak hour turning movement volumes at the study intersections per “Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines,” published by City and County of San Francisco. In addition to the growth in general traffic, peak hour trips from approved and pending projects were estimated and added to the projected Year 2020 peak hour turning movement volumes. The list of approved and pending projects in the vicinity of the project was provided by the City and County of San Francisco. The approved and pending projects included in the Year 2020 proposed trip generation are summarized in Table 4.11-7. It is estimated that the approved and pending projects will generate approximately 15,241 daily trips with 1,626 occurring during the PM peak hour. The projected 2020 without Project peak hour turning movement volumes at the study intersections are illustrated in Figure 4.11-7. Lastly, peak hour traffic volumes associated with the pending
Table 4.11-6 has been revised as follows on page 4.11-17.

**Table 4.11-6**  
Summary of Level of Service Analysis for Existing plus Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Existing plus Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Delay</td>
<td>V/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Junipero Serra Boulevard/19th Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Holloway Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Winston Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/Portola Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td>1.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 19th Avenue/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 19th Avenue/Eucalyptus Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 19th Avenue/Winston Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue</td>
<td></td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lake Merced Boulevard/John Daly Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard</td>
<td></td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lake Merced Boulevard/North State Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lake Merced Boulevard/Middlefield Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Delay is reported in seconds per vehicle and LOS is based on the delay. Bold font indicates unacceptable LOS.

Tables 4.11-7 and 4.11-8 and related text have been revised as follows on pages 4.11-18 and 4.11-19.

Table 4.11-7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Daily Trips***</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour***</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>800 Brotherhood Way Residential Project*</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon Drive – Residential*</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>10.75</td>
<td>1,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon Drive – Commercial Retail – Work **</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>ksf</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>10,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon Drive – Retail – Non Work **</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>ksf</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon Drive – Childcare</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>ksf</td>
<td>79.26</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>473 Eucalyptus – YMCA</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>ksf</td>
<td>22.88</td>
<td>229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total New Trips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,241</td>
<td>2,077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ITE Trip Generation Manual, 7th Edition, unless otherwise noted.

* Trip Generation Rate from Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for City and County of San Francisco, dated October 2002.
** Trip Generation for 77 Cambon Drive was provided by Fehr & Peers.
*** Daily Trips and PM Peak Hour Trips are in vehicle-trips.

Balboa Park Station Area Plan project were added to one of the study intersections that is common to the study areas of both that project and the Campus Master Plan.

Table 4.11-8 summarizes the results of level of service analysis for Year 2020 without Project Conditions. Under Year 2020 without Project Conditions, the seven study intersections projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service under Existing and Existing plus Project Conditions are projected to continue to operate at unacceptable levels of service. Two additional intersections, (1) Junipero Serra Boulevard/Ocean Avenue, and (2) 19th Avenue/Ocean Avenue are projected to operate at an unacceptable level of service with the addition of traffic generated by regional growth, and approved and pending projects.
Table 4.11-8
Summary of Level of Service Analysis for Year 2020 without Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour</th>
<th>Delay</th>
<th>V/C</th>
<th>LOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Junipero Serra Boulevard/19th Avenue</td>
<td>242 441 72 1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Holloway Avenue</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Winston Drive</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/Portola Drive</td>
<td>479.3</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard</td>
<td>466 413 64 1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 19th Avenue/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>69.3 38 8 1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 19th Avenue/Eucalyptus Drive</td>
<td>28.6 26 4 0.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 19th Avenue/Winston Drive</td>
<td>436 116.8 4.48 3.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue</td>
<td>473 143 3 2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lake Merced Boulevard/John Daly Boulevard</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard</td>
<td>1102 52 9 1.32 1.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F/D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lake Merced Boulevard/North State Drive</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lake Merced Boulevard/Middlefield Drive</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Delay is reported in seconds per vehicle and LOS is based on the delay. Bold font indicates unacceptable LOS. The numbers in parentheses indicate mitigated traffic conditions.

**Year 2020 with Project Conditions.** Level of service analysis for the study intersections was conducted for Year 2020 with Project Conditions. Peak hour turning movement volumes from the proposed project were added to the peak hour turning movement volumes at the study intersections under Year 2020 without Project Conditions. The projected peak hour turning movements at the study intersections are illustrated in Figure 4.11-8. Table 4.11-9 summarizes the results of level of service analysis for Year 2020 with Project Conditions. Similar to Year 2020 without Project Conditions, under Year 2020 with Project Conditions the nine eight study intersections projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service under Year 2020 without Project Conditions are projected to continue to operate at unacceptable levels of service. In addition, the intersection of Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive is projected to operate at unacceptable levels of service under Year 2020 with Project Conditions. Table 4.11.10 summarizes the project related traffic contribution at the study intersections.
Tables 4.11-9 and 4.11-10 have been revised as follows on pages 4.11-20 and 4.11-21.

### Table 4.11-9
Summary of Level of Service Analysis for Year 2020 with Project Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Year 2020 without Project Conditions</th>
<th>Year 2020 with Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delay (V/C) LOS</td>
<td>Delay (V/C) LOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Junipero Serra Boulevard/19th Avenue</td>
<td>212.4 (172.5) 1.33 1.22 F</td>
<td>213.7 (174.0) 1.34 1.22 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Holloway Avenue</td>
<td>44.8 0.92 D</td>
<td>45.8 0.95 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Winston Drive</td>
<td>106.1 1.28 F</td>
<td>107.1 1.28 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>78.0 1.23 E</td>
<td>78.4 1.23 E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/Portola Drive</td>
<td>479.3 1.38 F</td>
<td>487.3 1.38 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard</td>
<td>166.4 136.4 1.65 1.56 F</td>
<td>167.7 137.6 1.65 1.57 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 19th Avenue/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>603 38.8 1.24 1.15 E D</td>
<td>613 39.3 1.24 1.15 B D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 19th Avenue/Eucalyptus Drive</td>
<td>28.6 26.4 1.05 0.99 C</td>
<td>29.1 26.3 1.05 0.99 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 19th Avenue/Winston Drive</td>
<td>135.4 116.8 1.45 1.37 F</td>
<td>139.0 117.3 1.45 1.37 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue</td>
<td>173.6 143.1 1.45 2.08 F</td>
<td>177.2 193.0 2.52 2.44 F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lake Merced Boulevard/John Daly Boulevard</td>
<td>37.8 0.73 D</td>
<td>41.2 0.75 D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Lake Merced Boulevard/Brotherhood Way</td>
<td>21.9 0.94 C</td>
<td>24.3 0.96 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard</td>
<td>110.2 102 (52.9) 1.32 1.32 (1.03) F (D)</td>
<td>139.0 (38.8) 1.43 (0.95) F (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive</td>
<td>33.1 1.04 C</td>
<td>59.0 (42.8) 1.17 (1.01) E (D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Lake Merced Boulevard/North State Drive</td>
<td>16.5 - C</td>
<td>17.5 - C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Lake Merced Boulevard/Winston Drive</td>
<td>22.7 0.87 C</td>
<td>34.4 0.92 C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lake Merced Boulevard/Middlefield Drive</td>
<td>16.4 0.86 B</td>
<td>19.4 0.89 B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Delay is reported in seconds per vehicle and LOS is based on the delay. Bold font indicates unacceptable LOS. Data in parentheses show delay, V/C ratio, and LOS after mitigation.
Table 4.11-10
Project Traffic Contributions at Intersections Operating at LOS E or F in 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th>Intersection Volumes</th>
<th>Contribution to Total</th>
<th>Contribution to Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>Year 2020 without Project Conditions</td>
<td>Project Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Junipero Serra Boulevard/19th Avenue</td>
<td>7,865</td>
<td>9,163</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Winston Drive</td>
<td>3,744</td>
<td>4,304</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>4,722</td>
<td>5,431</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/Portola Drive</td>
<td>4,989</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Junipero Serra Boulevard/Sloat Boulevard/Portola Drive</td>
<td>4,989</td>
<td>5,735</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 19th Avenue/Sloat Boulevard</td>
<td>7,902</td>
<td>9,216</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 19th Avenue/Ocean Avenue</td>
<td>5,536</td>
<td>6,496</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 19th Avenue/Winston Drive</td>
<td>6,019</td>
<td>7,048</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 19th Avenue/Holloway Avenue</td>
<td>5,759</td>
<td>6,620</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Lake Merced Boulevard/Font Boulevard</td>
<td>3,800</td>
<td>4,368</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lake Merced Boulevard/South State Drive</td>
<td>3,882</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Delay is reported in seconds per vehicle and LOS is based on the delay. Bold font indicates significant impact.

* Rounded numbers are reported in this table. The actual project contribution to growth at this intersection is 4.6 percent and therefore the impact at this intersection is less than significant per the significance criteria identified in Section 4.11.2.1.
The text on pages 4.11-22 through to the top of 4.11-24 regarding the transit analysis methodology have been revised as follows.

**Transit Service Impact Analysis**

A detailed transit analysis was conducted for this EIR (URS, 2006 and URS, 2007). A summary of the methodology is presented below.

Based on existing travel patterns of campus affiliates and class schedules at campus, it was determined that the highest transit use by campus affiliates occurs in the PM peak hour when campus employees are leaving and the students for evening classes are arriving at the campus. Therefore, the transit impact analysis was conducted for the weekday PM peak hour, defined as the time period from 5:00-5:59 PM.

The analysis done for the EIR looked at the impact of new trips on local and regional transit services during the standard weekday PM peak hour ("standard peak hour"), defined as the time period from 5:00-5:59 p.m. This is the time period defined by the San Francisco Planning Department’s *Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review*, as the peak period to be analyzed for EIRs.

A secondary analysis of the impacts of the Campus Master Plan was also conducted on the peak hour for SF State travel, which is different than the standard peak hour described above. This was done as Universities may not have travel patterns that conform to the traditional peak periods. A review of the transit load data for the SF State vicinity revealed that the time period when peak travel to SF State occurs is actually from 8:00-8:59 a.m. ("campus peak hour"), and thus this time period was also studied.

**Estimation of Project-Related New Transit/ Shuttle Riders.** The campus anticipates that compared to existing conditions, by 2020 there would be approximately 6,490 new persons on campus. To determine the number of new persons traveling during the peak hours, the new persons were grouped by campus affiliation (students, faculty/staff, hotel employees and visitors) and further sub-divided into new on-campus ("non-commuters") and new off-campus ("commuters") populations. Assumptions on the percentage of commuters traveling during the peak hours for each campus group were directly applied to each of the new SF State off-campus commuter groups traveling during the peak hour. The campus-affiliated population distribution assumptions are applicable to both standard and campus peak hours. This yielded a total of 867 new peak hour commuters using transit or other forms of travel (4,030 new student commuters, 276 new faculty/staff commuters, 50 new hotel conference center employee commuters, and 6 new visitor commuters).

Under existing conditions, approximately 42% percent of commuter trips are made by transit or campus shuttle. For purposes of providing a conservative analysis of the impact on transit, the analysis assumed that there would be no increase in automobile trips so that by 2020 transit trips would increase to be 45 percent of all campus-related commute trips. Therefore, the total number of new transit/shuttle trips was calculated by applying a 45 percent transit/shuttle mode split to the new peak hour commuters. New visitors were not factored into the transit/shuttle mode split.
calculation since only three new visitors are projected to take transit or the shuttle during the peak hour. Therefore, it is estimated that 640,387 new peak hour commuters will use some form of transit or take the Campus Shuttle. This consists of 463,335 new student commuters, 424,45 new faculty/staff commuters, and 23,7 new hotel conference center employee commuters traveling during the peak hour.

These new transit/shuttle riders were then distributed by transit operator; assuming that the new ridership distribution would be the same as the transit/shuttle ridership distribution under existing conditions. Also, given that the nearest BART station is located approximately 1 mile from the campus, it was assumed that the 209,133 new BART riders would either transfer to/from Muni or to/from the free Campus Shuttle for their last leg of travel, and they were redistributed 25 percent and 75 percent respectively. Therefore, the 640,387 new campus peak hour commuters were redistributed among transit operators as follows for purposes of the screenline analysis: 272,172 Muni riders, 343,192 Campus Shuttle riders, 20,13 SamTrans riders, and 16,10 AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain riders.

**Impact Evaluation Methodology – Muni.** A Two separate screenline analyses were performed to determine Muni service capacity during the standard PM peak hour and campus peak hour under 2020 conditions. Four screenlines were defined around the campus (north, northeast, east, and south) and the following six Muni lines crossed at least one of the established screenlines: Route 17 - Park Merced, Route 18 - 46th Avenue, Route 28 - 19th Avenue, Route 28L - 19th Avenue Limited, Route 29 - Sunset and M-Line - Ocean View. The lines in each screenline were further subdivided by travel direction, based on Muni-established inbound and outbound directions.

Muni transit service capacity utilization for 2020 was based on the sum of peak hour ridership demand under existing conditions and new passengers under cumulative conditions, added by the proposed project. According to Muni projections, bus ridership demand system-wide is expected to decrease in the future. Therefore, conservatively existing ridership demand was used to represent background (non-campus) peak hour demand in 2020. A growth factor was applied to the existing background ridership to establish cumulative conditions in 2020. This growth factor was added before adding the new SF State riders in the Muni screenline analysis, to account for expected incremental ridership growth between the existing year (2005) and cumulative year (2020) conditions. A background growth factor of 0.156 percent was applied to existing year data before new 2020 riders were distributed among the Year 2020 screenlines. This factor was based on the SFCTA Countywide Plan modeling data, which assumes a 3.9 percent increase in Muni ridership over a 25-year period (from 2000 to 2025). This background growth yields an annual growth rate of 0.156 percent.

In order to establish existing year peak hour ridership demand numbers, ridecheck data for each line was obtained from Muni (average loads, daily actual trips and number of Muni boardings by route ridership at campus ridecheck points based on Muni-established inbound and outbound directions). Since Muni ridecheck data was collected during time periods that spanned several hours, ridecheck data was converted to peak hour values.
Ridecheck data was available for all lines except for the M-line; therefore, existing year hourly ridership for the M-line could not be established. Furthermore, because no data are available for loads and boarding on the M-line, no quantitative capacity analysis is possible. As a result, only new riders added by the proposed project for the M-line were analyzed under Year 2020 cumulative conditions relative to existing capacity. New riders include both SF State affiliates and those associated with background growth, as defined above.

New passengers added by the proposed project traveling during the standard and campus peak hours under cumulative conditions were calculated by distributing the 272 new Muni riders among the screenlines based on the directional travel patterns of each campus group.

It was assumed that no new peak hour capacity will be added to the Muni lines under 2020 cumulative conditions (that is, capacity per vehicle and the number of vehicles was held constant from existing conditions). The capacity per vehicle for each line was based on Muni’s 85 percent Load Standard outlined in the 2006 Muni Short Range Transit Plan. Once the existing plus project Year 2020 hourly ridership and hourly capacity data was established, Muni Capacity Utilization Rates for existing plus project conditions Year 2020 cumulative conditions for the lines in each screenline were calculated by dividing hourly ridership by hourly capacity.

**Impact Evaluation Methodology – BART.** A separate analysis was performed for the standard and campus peak hour periods. For the standard peak hour, the analysis calculated the number of new campus-affiliated BART commuters who travel from the SF State vicinity through the Transbay Tube and commuters who travel from the SF State vicinity to the Peninsula. In contrast, the campus peak hour analysis looked at the number of new campus-affiliated BART commuters who travel to the SF State vicinity by way of the Transbay Tube and commuters who travel to the SF State vicinity from the Peninsula. To assess potential impacts of the project on BART capacity, by specifically analyzing the number of new campus-related BART commuters that would travel through the Transbay Tube. Transbay Tube is the main BART segment with capacity problems.

Calculations for inbound and outbound distributions of new campus-related BART commuters were based on available zip code data from the Existing Conditions Analysis intercept survey conducted for the Campus Master Plan (WRT, 2006). Since the intercept survey only provided the origin splits of existing campus-related BART commuters, it was assumed that future campus-affiliated BART riders are commuters and that they would have similar origin and destination patterns. The directionality splits established that 80 percent of respondents using BART for part of their trip had origins or destinations in the East Bay, 12 percent in the Peninsula, 6 percent in San Francisco, and 2 percent in the North Bay. The origin directionality splits from the intercept survey were applied to the 133 new BART riders.

Using zip code data from the intercept survey conducted for the Campus Master Plan, it was established that 80 percent of respondents using BART for part of their trip had origins or destinations in the East Bay. Therefore, out of the 209 new campus-related BART peak hour riders, it was assumed that 80 percent would be East Bay residents. This translates to 167 new
East Bay BART riders. It was also assumed that 20 10-car BART trains travel from the campus vicinity through the Transbay Tube during the peak hour (based on the current BART timetable). Therefore, the proposed project would generate approximately eight new BART passengers per train in the peak hour (167 new BART passengers / 20 BART trains = 8 new BART passengers/train). It was also determined that new campus-related BART riders would represent approximately 0.6 percent of the total passenger capacity per BART train in the PM peak hour. This was based on the assumption that the total capacity for a 10-car BART train is 1,275 passengers.

**Impact Evaluation Methodology – Other Transit Services.** Based on the methodology presented above, it was estimated that the proposed project would generate approximately 20 13 new SamTrans transit users, and a combined 16 10 transit users for AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain.

The text of Mitigation TRA-1 has been revised as follows on page 4.11-24.

**Mitigation TRA-1:** The campus shall implement the following monitoring and mitigation program:

- As a first step, the campus shall conduct a new baseline cordon survey no less than 18 months following the certification of this EIR. Alternatively, the campus may use the 2006 cordon survey as a baseline.

- Next, at intervals of no more than every three years, and no later than the addition of each 1,000 students in enrollment, the campus will hire an outside transportation planning or data analysis firm to conduct a statistically significant cordon survey of campus commuters during the PM peak hours. The cordon survey will cover all major entrances to the campus and will examine the travel behavior of SF State affiliates. The survey will be conducted during typical days while classes are in session, excluding final examination, national holiday or orientation weeks.

- If cordon surveys show that the PM peak period auto trips to and from campus are greater than 5 percent above the baseline, the campus shall conduct the cordon surveys annually until such trips fall below 5 percent above the baseline for 2 years in a row. If and when this occurs, cordon surveys will continue in accordance with the second bullet above.

- If the cordon surveys show an increase in PM peak period auto trips sufficient to result in project impacts at the two affected intersections, the campus will increase the level of TDM
programs until the project impacts associated with traffic increases are mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

- If the campus fails to reduce its traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level for more than two years in a row, it will contribute its “fair share” (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.

The text in the second paragraph on page 4.11-27 has been revised as follows.

**Campus Housing**

Currently, there are 2,252 student beds and about 290 apartments on the campus that are occupied by SF State affiliates. Under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the total housing stock on campus would increase by about 846 1,198 units. As a result, approximately 1,693 2,396 new SF State affiliates would live on campus (for more information regarding on-campus residential population, see Section 4.10, **Population and Housing**). Based on the current mode split (38 percent of campus commuters currently arrive at the campus in an automobile) and assuming 10 percent of these 1,693 2,396 persons would travel to the campus during the peak hour, approximately 64 90 peak hour vehicle trips are eliminated by the provision of additional housing on the campus. This represents approximately 5 7 percent of the total estimated peak hour vehicle trips (see Table 4.11-5).

The text in the fifth paragraph on page 4.11-28 has been revised as follows.

As noted above under Scenario 1, to ensure that the automobile traffic levels remain at their current rates through 2020, the campus will implement Mitigation TRA-1 which includes the following monitoring and mitigation program:

- As a first step, the campus shall conduct a new baseline cordon survey no less than 18 months following the certification of this EIR. Alternatively, the campus may use the 2006 cordon survey as a baseline.

- Next, at intervals of no more than every three years, and no later than the addition of each 1,000 students in enrollment, 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 cordon survey will cover all major entrances to the campus and will examine the travel behavior of SF State affiliates. The survey will be conducted during typical days while classes are in session, excluding final examination, national holiday or orientation weeks.
• If cordon surveys show that the PM peak period auto trips to and from campus are greater than 5 percent above the baseline, the campus shall conduct the cordon surveys annually until such trips fall below 5 percent above the baseline for 2 years in a row. If and when this occurs, cordon surveys will continue in accordance with the second bullet above.

• If the cordon surveys show an increase in PM peak period auto trips sufficient to result in project impacts described under Scenario 2, the campus will increase the level of TDM programs until the project impacts of traffic increases are mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

• If the campus fails to reduce its traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level for more than two years in a row, it will contribute its “fair share” of cost of 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.

The text of Mitigation Measures TRA-2A through TRA-2C on page 4.11-29 has been revised as follows.

**Mitigation TRA-2A:** The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency (MTA) and the San Francisco County Transportation Authority (SFCTA) can and should implement improvements to transit services along 19th Avenue via the implementation of MTA’s Transit Effectiveness Project and SFCTA’s 19th Avenue Project, which are in the planning stages. Improvements ultimately included in these programs could include, but would not be limited to, travel time improvements along the M-line and 28/28L lines (e.g., bus rapid transit, improved stop spacing, transit prioritization treatments, expanded Proof-of-Payment, in-lane bus stops), re-establishing a “short-run” of the M-line between the Embarcadero and the SF State stations, etc.

**Mitigation TRA-2BA:** 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 and if Muni reports that M-line average PM 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 or more years in a row, the campus will extend the Campus Shuttle service to West Portal Station on an interim basis, and this service will achieve the 85 percent combined seated/standing passenger capacity target based on the following program:

- The University will collect data from Muni to establish the baseline average peak period, peak direction passenger loading between the campus and West Portal Station.
- The University will monitor SF State peak period transit use by conducting cordon counts as specified in Mitigation TRA-1.
• If Muni reports that M line average peak period, peak direction passenger loading between the campus and West Portal Station exceeds 85 percent of combined seating and standing load capacity for two years in a row, and if the cordon surveys show that peak period transit trips on the M-line between the campus and West Portal Station are greater than 5 percent above the baseline, the University will extend campus shuttle service to West Portal Station during the peak period(s).

• This additional campus shuttle service will be operated with adequate capacity (i.e., it will not exceed achieve the 85 percent combined seated/standing passenger capacity target).

• This additional campus shuttle service will be operated until MTA’s and SFCTA’s planned transit capacity enhancements related to 19th Avenue are implemented, as described in Mitigation TRA-2A above.

Mitigation TRA-2CB: The campus shall monitor peak hour utilization of Campus Shuttle buses on an annual basis and if average PM 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.

The text for Impact TRA-2 related to transit services on pages 4.11-29 through 4.11-35 has been revised as follows to reflect the updated transit analysis included in Appendix B, Transit Impact Analysis.

As discussed under Impact TRA-1, the Campus Master Plan includes a parking strategy that would keep the supply of parking at the current level and also minimize any major increases in parking fees so that the demand would remain steady and not decrease or increase relative to current demand. In the event that this strategy is successful, the proportion of campus-related persons using transit or bicycles to commute to the campus would increase compared to existing conditions, and it is estimated that instead of the current mode split of 42 43 percent of campus affiliates using transit/shuttle, the transit/shuttle mode split would increase to 45 percent. Based on this assumption and methodology presented above in Section 4.11.2.3, it is estimated that with the growth in campus population under the Campus Master Plan, by 2020 there would be approximately 640 387 new SF State peak hour transit commuters, consisting of approximately 272 172 Muni riders, 303 192 Campus Shuttle riders, 20 13 SamTrans riders, and 16 10 AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit, and Caltrain riders. An estimated 209 133 of these 640 387 transit riders would also use BART for some part of their commute to the campus. The impact of these additional transit riders on the various transit systems is described below.
Impact on Muni Services

**Standard PM Peak Hour.** Table 4.11-11 presents Existing Conditions related to Muni lines that serve the campus area during the PM peak hour, and Table 4.11-12 presents 2020 Background plus Project Conditions Cumulative Conditions relative to ridership and capacity of Muni lines that serve the campus area during the PM peak hour. Under Existing Conditions, the capacity utilization rates for the screenline subtotals defined by inbound and outbound direction ranged from 1 percent to 54 percent. (It should be noted that 100 percent capacity utilization rate is equivalent to Muni’s 85 percent passenger load standard.) The 2020 Background plus Project Conditions Cumulative Conditions show that the capacity utilization rate for each of the screenlines defined by inbound and outbound subtotals would range from 32 percent to 61 percent. Overall, the four Muni screenlines would operate at about 22 percent capacity under 2020 Cumulative Conditions. Therefore, all four screenlines are far from approaching the Muni capacities during the standard PM peak hour (based on Muni’s passenger load standard).

Looking at individual lines, the 28-line and 29-line are closer to approaching capacity than the other lines. For instance, the existing year capacity utilization rates for the 28-line range from 38 percent (south screenline, inbound direction) to 75 percent (south screenline, outbound direction) while the 29-line capacity utilization rates range from 32 percent (north screenline, inbound direction) to 82 percent (east screenline, outbound direction). Year 2020 capacity utilization rates for the 28-line ranged from 35 percent (south screenline, inbound direction) to 71 percent (south screenline, outbound direction), while the 29-line capacity utilization rates ranged from 31 percent (north screenline, inbound direction) to 80 percent (east screenline, outbound direction). Therefore, the addition of approximately 272 new Muni riders generated by the Campus Master Plan would not substantially impact the standard PM peak hour capacity utilization at the screenlines in 2020.

**SF State Peak Hour.** When looking at the standard and campus peak hour screenline data, it is important to recognize that the peak hour of activity for the campus does not correlate exactly with the peak hour of loads on the Muni system. The peak loads on the Muni system as a whole are still between 5:00 and 5:59 p.m., and this is reflected in the screenline analysis that shows higher loads at the screenlines during the standard peak hour (5:00-5:59 p.m.) than in the campus peak hour (8:00-8:59 a.m.). However, the SF State component of the ridership and the levels of SF State activity are higher in the 8:00-8:59 a.m. period than in the 5:00-5:50 p.m. period. As a result, during the SF State peak hour the four Muni screenlines would operate at about 17 percent capacity under 2020 Cumulative Conditions, which is less than during the PM peak hour reported above. Further, none of the individual lines exceeded the threshold. (See Appendix B, Tables 7c and 7d for details.)
### Existing Year Muni Conditions: Weekday PM Peak Hours (5-6 PM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Screenline</th>
<th>Transit Corridor</th>
<th>Transit Lines</th>
<th>Hourly Ridership Demand</th>
<th>Hourly Capacity</th>
<th>Capacity Utilization (%) of Muni Load Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td># of vehicle trips</td>
<td>Ave. Load</td>
<td>Passengers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North 19th Ave-Sunset</td>
<td>18 - 46th Ave</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 - 19th Ave</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28L - 19th Ave</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 - Sunset</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18 - 46th Ave</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 - 19th Ave</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28L - 19th Ave</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 - Sunset</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Downtown</td>
<td>17 - Park Merced</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - Ocean View b</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17 - Park Merced</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - Ocean View b</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,329</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South 19th Ave-Serra</td>
<td>28 - 19th Ave</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28L - 19th Ave</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28 - 19th Ave</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28L - 19th Ave</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Balboa Park</td>
<td>29 - Sunset</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - Ocean View b</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outbound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29 - Sunset</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M - Ocean View b</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screenline Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total For All Screenlines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For ease of presentation, this table was not provided in an underline/strikeout format. Therefore, direct comparison to the Draft EIR will be required to assess the nature of the changes made in the analysis.

* Assumes no change 17-line ridership in 2020 Cumulative Conditions. No information available on the distribution of Muni Riders to SF State using the 17-line.

* Existing Conditions ridecheck data for M Line was not available. Only new M Line ridership is reflected in 2020 Cumulative Conditions.

* Note: The Muni load standard is factored into the screenline capacity utilization rate (i.e. a capacity utilization rate of 100% is equivalent to the 85% crush load standard on Muni).

* BART ridership from Existing Conditions Report has been assigned to Muni Screenlines (25%) and SF State shuttle (75%) between SF State and Daly City BART.
### Table 4.11-12

#### 2020 Cumulative Year Muni Conditions: Weekday PM Peak Hours (5-6 PM)

| Screenline          | Transit Corridor | Transit Corridor             | Additional New Passengers | New Passengers + Growth Rate | Existing Year Passengers | 2020 Total New Passengers | # of vehicle trips | Ave. Load | Passengers | Per vehicle | Passengers |
|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|-----------|------------|-------------|-------------|------------|
| North               | 19th Ave-Sunset   | Inbound 18 - 46th Ave        | 2                         | 2                             | 56                       | 59                       | 3.8               | 15.6      | 59         | 54          | 201         | 29%        |
|                     |                  | 28 - 19th Ave                | 11                        | 11                            | 178                      | 190                      | 7.1               | 26.7      | 190        | 54          | 380         | 50%        |
|                     |                  | 28L - 19th Ave               | 2                         | 2                             | 38                       | 40                       | 4.6               | 8.8       | 40         | 54          | 245         | 16%        |
|                     |                  | 29 - Sunset                  | 1                         | 1                             | 32                       | 34                       | 2.0               | 16.8      | 34         | 54          | 107         | 31%        |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **32**            | **933**   | **385**    |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | Outbound 18 - 46th Ave       | 3                         | 3                             | 27                       | 30                       | 3.5               | 8.5        | 30         | 54          | 187         | 16%        |
|                     |                  | 28 - 19th Ave                | 14                        | 15                            | 277                      | 292                      | 8.3               | 35.4      | 292        | 54          | 442         | 66%        |
|                     |                  | 28L - 19th Ave               | 2                         | 2                             | 36                       | 39                       | 2.9               | 13.5      | 39         | 54          | 154         | 25%        |
|                     |                  | 29 - Sunset                  | 2                         | 2                             | 116                      | 118                      | 3.3               | 35.6      | 118        | 54          | 177         | 67%        |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **478**           | **959**   | **59%**     |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | **Screenline Total**         |                           |                               |                          |                          | **860**           | **1,292** | **42%**     |             |             |            |
| Northeast           | Downtown         | Inbound 17 - Park Merced a  | 0                         | 0                             | 17                       | 17                       | 3.0               | 5.6        | 17         | 38          | 115         | 15%        |
|                     |                  | M - Ocean View b             | 15                        | 15                            | n/a                      | 15                       | 6.0               | 2.5        | 15         | 202         | 1,214       | 1%         |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **32**            | **1,329** | **2%**      |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | Outbound 17 - Park Merced a  | 0                         | 0                             | 45                       | 45                       | 3.0               | 14.9       | 45         | 38          | 115         | 39%        |
|                     |                  | M - Ocean View b             | 19                        | 20                            | n/a                      | 20                       | 6.0               | 3.3        | 20         | 202         | 1,214       | 2%         |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **64**            | **1,329** | **5%**      |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | **Screenline Total**         |                           |                               |                          |                          | **96**            | **2,657** | **4%**      |             |             |            |
| South               | 19th Ave-Serra   | Inbound 28 - 19th Ave        | 29                        | 30                            | 103                      | 133                      | 7.1               | 18.7       | 133        | 54          | 380         | 35%        |
|                     |                  | 28L - 19th Ave               | 2                         | 2                             | 28                       | 30                       | 4.6               | 6.6        | 30         | 54          | 245         | 12%        |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **163**           | **625**   | **26%**     |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | Outbound 28 - 19th Ave       | 22                        | 23                            | 293                      | 316                      | 8.3               | 38.3       | 316        | 54          | 442         | 71%        |
|                     |                  | 28L - 19th Ave               | 2                         | 2                             | 31                       | 33                       | 2.9               | 11.5       | 33         | 54          | 154         | 21%        |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **349**           | **595**   | **59%**     |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | **Screenline Total**         |                           |                               |                          |                          | **512**           | **1,220** | **42%**     |             |             |            |
| East                | Balboa Park      | Inbound 29 - Sunset          | 7                         | 7                             | 33                       | 40                       | 2.0               | 20.1       | 40         | 54          | 107         | 38%        |
|                     |                  | M - Ocean View b             | 19                        | 20                            | n/a                      | 20                       | 6.0               | 3.3        | 20         | 202         | 1,214       | 2%         |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **60**            | **1,321** | **5%**      |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | Outbound 29 - Sunset         | 5                         | 5                             | 136                      | 141                      | 3.3               | 42.8       | 141        | 54          | 177         | 80%        |
|                     |                  | M - Ocean View b             | 15                        | 15                            | n/a                      | 15                       | 6.0               | 2.5        | 15         | 202         | 1,214       | 1%         |
|                     |                  | **Subtotal**                 |                           |                               |                          |                          | **156**           | **1,391** | **11%**     |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | **Screenline Total**         |                           |                               |                          |                          | **216**           | **2,711** | **8%**      |             |             |            |
|                     |                  | **Total For All Screenlines**| 172                       | 177                           |                           |                          | **1,624**         | **8,481** | **19%**     |             |             |            |

* For ease of presentation, this table was not provided in an underline/strikeout format. Therefore, direct comparison to the Draft EIR will be required to assess the nature of the changes made in the analysis.

* Assumes no change in 17-line ridership in 2020 Cumulative Conditions. No information available on the distribution of Muni Riders to SF State using the 17-line.

* Background Growth Rate (0.165% over 15 years), based on the SFCTA Countywide Transit Plan (internal SF trips applied to Muni) = Additional New Passengers(1+0.00165)15.

* Note: The Muni load standard is factored into the screenline capacity utilization rate (i.e. a capacity utilization rate of 100% is equivalent to the 85% crush load standard on Muni).

* BART ridership from Existing Conditions Report has been assigned to Muni Screenlines (25%) and SF State shuttle (75%) between SF State and Daly City BART.
M-Line Conclusions. Based on Muni route distribution data from the intercept survey, there should be 407 68 new SF State M-line riders during the peak hour by 2020. However, given the unavailability of M-line ridecheck data, it was not possible to calculate current ridership and load data or projected future ridership and loads for the M-line in the screenline analysis. As a result, the 407 68 peak hour trips could not be added to existing or projected future trips to determine if the M-line is or would be over capacity. Under existing conditions, M-line total capacity at the campus in the peak hour is approximately 2,424 riders in both directions trips; therefore, assuming no changes in M-line capacity by 2020, the new 407 68 passengers will represent approximately 4 3 percent of M-line total capacity at the campus in the peak hour. Observations of passenger loads on the M-line platform at SF State, as well as standing loads on the M-line vehicles suggest that the addition of 407 68 peak hour riders to M-line would exacerbate the crowding and worsen the capacity problems on this line.

The City and County of San Francisco has already identified this problem, and is suggesting remedies as part of two ongoing projects: (1) The San Francisco County Transportation Authority's 19th Avenue Project, and (2) The San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency's Transit Effectiveness Project (TEP). The 19th Avenue Project is considering multimodal solutions for 19th Avenue, including Bus Rapid Transit service. The TEP is looking at a variety of planning, operations and capital solutions to enhance Muni performance systemwide, but is not yet to the point of making specific recommendations at the route level.

Several ideas have been suggested to address future capacity and performance issues for the M-line. These ideas may be considered as part of the TEP or other future studies.

Short-term measures that can be implemented with minor capital expenditures

• Travel time improvements along the M-line, allowing for increased headways frequencies. This could entail installation of signal priority, exclusive transit lanes or other transit priority measures.

Medium-term measures that would require major capital expenditures

• Re-establishing a "short run" of the M-line between the Embarcadero and the SF State stations and increasing frequency of the M-line by converting slots in the subway from Castro shuttle trains to M-line short-run trains.

• Terminating the M-line at the campus and extending the J to Stonestown via the Ocean View neighborhood, allowing for better system connectivity to the campus and better car utilization for Muni. Could also result in higher frequencies on the M-line if implemented in coordination with a re-sequencing of trains in the subway.

Longer-term measures that would require major capital expenditures and coordination between numerous agencies

• Moving the M guideway to the west edge of the roadway and extending it to the Daly City BART station.
The short-term improvements could address current capacity problems experienced on the M-line and accommodate some ridership growth. The medium and long-term improvements could meet or exceed the campus’s additional transit travel demands. However, each will require extensive community work to gain public and political acceptance and significant capital funding to implement, and would be a major undertaking for MTA/Muni that would entail extensive planning, engineering and construction to accomplish.

As noted in the Campus Master Plan, campus representatives will participate in local planning efforts to advocate for prioritization and funding of improvements to transit services that serve the campus area, including the TEP and the 19th Avenue study. Specific improvements that would be sought by SF State are listed in the proposed Campus Master Plan. If the improvements listed above or in the Campus Master Plan were implemented, they would be more than sufficient to meet the campus's additional transit travel demands and the impact on the M-line would be less than significant. These measures are encompassed in Mitigation TRA-2A. However, these improvements are in the early planning stages. Furthermore, they are under the jurisdiction of Muni or SFCTA to implement and the University cannot guarantee their implementation. Therefore, the impact on the M-line is considered significant, as the implementation of Mitigation TRA-2A cannot be guaranteed by the University.

To address this residual impact, in the event that none of the improvements to enhance the M-line capacity were implemented and the capacity of the M-line is exceeded, the campus will implement Mitigation TRA-2B. Pursuant to this mitigation measure: (1) the University will collect data from Muni to establish the baseline passenger loading between the campus and West Portal Station; (2) the University will monitor peak period transit use by conducting cordon counts as specified in Mitigation TRA-1; (3) if Muni reports that M-line average pm-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 or more years in a row, and if the cordon surveys show that peak period transit trips between the campus and West Portal area greater than 5 percent above the baseline, the campus will extend the Campus Shuttle service to West Portal Station during the peak period(s); and (4) this service will achieve the 85 percent combined seated/standing passenger capacity target and will be operated until MTA’s and SFCTA’s planned transit enhancements related to 19th Avenue are implemented per Mitigation TRA-2A. Implementation of Mitigation TRA-2B would ensure that the impact on M-line would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

**Impact on Campus Shuttle**

As noted above, it is assumed that 75 percent of the 209 133 new BART riders or 452 99 new BART riders would transfer to the free Campus Shuttle. Therefore, the Campus Master Plan would generate approximately 452 99 additional new shuttle riders in addition to the 446 93 new shuttle riders calculated before the redistribution of BART riders, for a total of 303 192 new peak hour shuttle riders by 2020.

Ridership data show the Campus Shuttle buses currently operate overcapacity, with a peak hour capacity utilization rate of 131 percent of seated capacity (approximately 798 shuttle riders travel...
during the peak hour while the total shuttle system hourly capacity only accommodates a maximum of 608 seated riders). The addition of 192 new peak hour shuttle riders by 2020 would increase the total number to 990 riders, translating to a peak hour capacity utilization rate of 163 percent, assuming the total shuttle system hourly capacity is unchanged from existing conditions.

As noted in the Campus Master Plan, the campus will undertake a number of strategies to improve the capacity of shuttle services between the campus and Daly City BART station. In order to increase the capacity and efficiency of shuttle services, the campus will replace the current shuttle services with more frequent, higher-capacity services. In particular, the campus will evaluate the relative merits of doing away with its existing fleet and contracting out shuttle service to a third party provider who can provide more frequent services using larger, 40-foot, low-floor vehicles. The campus will also continue to work with Muni to improve boarding arrangements at the Daly City BART station, including co-location of the 28-Local, 28-Limited, and Campus Shuttle stops. With the implementation of the shuttle-related strategies included in the Campus Master Plan, the impact on the Campus Shuttle service would be less than significant. To ensure that additional peak hour shuttle bus capacity is added in a timely manner and that this impact remains less than significant, the campus shall implement Mitigation TRA-2CB, pursuant to which the campus will monitor shuttle bus peak hour capacity utilization on an annual basis and increase shuttle frequency or otherwise increase the capacity of the shuttle services during the peak period(s) until 85 percent of combined seated/standing passenger capacity target is met.

Impact on BART

As discussed in Section 4.11.2.3 above, the main concern with BART service is limited capacity in the Transbay Tube segment during peak hours. Out of the 133 new campus-related BART peak hour riders, 80 percent or 106 are projected to be new East Bay BART riders. This would translate into about five new BART passengers per train in the peak hour. Furthermore, these new campus-related BART riders would represent approximately 0.4 percent of the total passenger capacity per BART train in the PM peak hour. These numbers are low and indicate that campus growth under the Campus Master Plan will not substantially impact BART ridership.

The impact of new SF State transit riders on southbound BART trains from the SF State vicinity to the Peninsula was also assessed. Based on the intercept survey, it was assumed that out of the 133 new campus-related BART peak hour riders, 12 percent would be Peninsula residents. This translates to 16 new Peninsula-bound BART riders. This would translate into about 4 new BART passengers per Peninsula-bound train in the standard pm peak hour, or about 0.3 percent of the total passenger capacity per train. These numbers are low and indicate that campus growth under the Campus Master Plan will not substantially impact BART ridership during the PM peak hour. The results were similar for the SF State peak hour analysis.
Impact on Other Local Transit Services

An estimated 20 new transit riders would be added to the peak hour service provided by SamTrans and 16 new transit riders would be added to the peak hour service provided by AC Transit, Golden Gate Transit and Caltrain. These numbers are too small to significantly affect the capacity of any of these transit systems. The impact would be less than significant.

In summary, the proposed Campus Master Plan would not result in a significant impact on transit services that serve the campus, except the M-line and Campus Shuttle where the new riders added due to the project would result in overcrowding and capacity problems. With the implementation of transportation strategies included in the Campus Master Plan and mitigation measures identified above, the significant impacts on transit would be reduced to a less-than-significant level.

The text of the third paragraph and Table 4.11-13 on page 4.11-38 has been revised as follows.

The Campus Master Plan therefore proposes a phased replacement of the existing central garage with a combination of surface parking facilities and smaller perimeter parking structures in order to disperse traffic, serve hubs of activity throughout campus, and free the campus core for pedestrians. Building these new facilities will result in a steady increase in parking fees as the campus population grows, making it all the more important for these increases to be carefully and strategically managed to maintain the proper level of demand. Table 4.11-13 below presents the parking phasing program included in the Campus Master Plan. As this table shows, parking on the campus would not increase substantially from the 3,172 spaces that exist at the present time, as only a nominal amount of new spaces would be provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Calendar Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Parking Spaces Added</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Parking Spaces Removed</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cumulative Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006 through 2010-11</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>Clinical Sciences</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>Creative Arts II</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>Lot 25 (leave 155)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>3,315</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013-14</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>North State Drive</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014-15</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3,206</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015-16</td>
<td>Gym and Surface Parking</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>Garage Roof</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>3,144</td>
<td>-28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>State Drive</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>State Drive (street + lot outside garage)</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>3,234</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-18</td>
<td>Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Lot 6 (gym)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018-19</td>
<td>Winston Surface Parking</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>Garage Basement</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019-20</td>
<td>Conference Center</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>Garage Basement</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>3,188</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: WRT, 2006
The text in the first and second paragraph on page 4.11-39 has been revised as follows.

The parking strategy included in the Campus Master Plan is consistent with the City’s “Transit First” policy, and the planned supply of parking is designed to ensure that single-occupant vehicle mode split does not increase in the future and that new single-occupant vehicle trips are not generated. As discussed above under Impacts TRA-1 and TRA-2, if the campus’s strategy to change the mode split for transit/shuttle from a current split of 42\% to a future split of 45 percent is successful, approximately 45 percent of the campus commuters would use transit in 2020 and new vehicle trips would not be generated. A shift in trips to transit services in particular would be in keeping with the City’s “Transit-First” policy. The City’s Transit-First Policy established in San Francisco’s Charter Section 16.102 provides that “parking policies for areas well served by public transit shall be designed to encourage travel by public transportation and alternative transportation.” Therefore, the proposed project would not have a significant impact related to parking. Furthermore, pursuant to Mitigation TRA-1, the campus will conduct cordon counts every three years or if necessary every year, and make additional improvements to its TDM program to ensure that new trips are not generated. Therefore, the demand for parking will not exceed the projected supply.

With respect to parking in the residential neighborhoods near the campus, the Campus Master Plan acknowledges that a large number of campus affiliates currently park in residential areas, and that if the price of on-campus parking is not managed carefully, additional campus affiliates could potentially choose to park off-campus in residential areas. To address this, the parking strategy in the Campus Master Plan has been designed to avoid sharp increases in the cost of parking on campus that could occur if too much parking is provided on the campus. However, the campus cannot control commuter parking behavior, and it is expected that some proportion of campus affiliates will continue to park off campus. Recognizing this possibility, the proposed Campus Master Plan states that campus representatives will participate in local planning efforts relating to on-street parking programs in the vicinity of the campus. This involvement will aim to ease local neighbors’ concerns and ensure that changes in local parking permit programs are implemented in an appropriate manner to accommodate campus needs. For example, SF State students living in UPS might be restricted from participating in the Parkmerced Residential Parking Permit program, in order to reduce student “spillover” parking into the surrounding neighborhood. The City may consider other adjustments to surrounding Residential Parking Permit policies, such as reducing the two hours of free parking currently provided on most residential streets to one hour or less. (It should be noted that parking is already limited to one hour on several residential streets, as described in the Environmental Setting section.) A “Parking Benefit District,” currently being studied for other San Francisco neighborhoods, could also be considered by the City; in such programs, a limited number of neighborhood permits are sold to commuters, with the net revenue being dedicated to local neighborhood improvements.

Figures 4.11-7 and 4.11-8 have been revised to reflect the updated 2020 level of service analyses. The revised figures are provided at the end of this section.
3.14 SECTION 4.12 UTILITIES AND PUBLIC SERVICES

The following revisions have been made to the fourth paragraph on page 4.12-2, which continues on page 4.12-3.

Currently the system delivers an annual average of about 267 mgd to customers in its service area under normal water conditions. All of this average annual demand can be met with existing resources (SFPUC, 2005). However, prolonged droughts can lower system capacity. With current demand in the service area, a 25 percent shortage in supplies can be expected 15 to 20 percent of the time, during multiple-year droughts. To address these shortages during drought conditions, the SFPUC is undertaking the Water System Improvement Program (WSIP), which will implement capital improvements to enhance the ability of the SFPUC to provide water to its customers (SFPUC, 2005). Planning efforts for the WSIP gained momentum in 2002 with the passage of San Francisco ballot measures Proposition A and E, which approved financing for the water system improvements. The water supply source options being investigated in the WSIP include:

- Conjunctive Use Program: South Westside Groundwater Basin. This program will use surface water “in-lieu” of pumping groundwater in this basin, located in San Mateo County, in normal and wet years, in order to allow for recharge to increase the volume of groundwater in storage that could be used during droughts.

- Water Transfers: Tuolumne River. This program will purchase additional Tuolumne River water as well as water from other willing sellers with Delta water rights.

The following revisions have been made to the first paragraph of Impact UTL-1 on page 4.12-10.

The SF State campus currently receives water supply from the San Francisco PUC via piped connections to its system. Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in about 1,700 new on-campus residents in about 1,198 newly constructed or converted housing units and a net increase of about 1.2 million square feet of academic, support, and semi-public space in new and replacement buildings. The daily non-residential campus population will also increase associated with the proposed enrollment ceiling increase and associated increases in faculty and staff. The effect of this growth on the campus water supply distribution system and on San Francisco’s water supply system is described below.

The following revisions have been made to the fourth paragraph on page 4.12-11.

Off-site improvements to the distribution piping or other facilities near the campus would not be required to serve the estimated increase in demand for potable water (Yu, 2007). However, the SFPUC indicated that it is unclear whether or not off-site improvements (e.g., line or pump upgrades) would be required to provide for adequate fire flows (Yu, 2007). As indicated in the Environmental Setting, the SFPUC supplies water to the campus at two points of connection, located in 19th Avenue and Lake Merced Boulevard. These connections are equipped with turbine meters to maximize available water flow and pressure. Within the boundaries of the SF
State campus, beyond these points of connection with the City’s system, the University has its own water system that it manages.

According to the Campus Master Plan Existing Conditions Analysis (WRT, 2006), while no major upgrades to the campus water system are known to be needed at this time, it is possible that if a given proposed building has a substantially larger flow requirement than existing development, upsizing of existing campus piping may be required. Given the pressure and flow provided by the turbine meters, however, improvements to the off-campus system to provide for adequate fire flows are not anticipated by the University.

While such off-campus upgrades are not expected to result in significant environmental effects due to the urban context, if they are required the SFPUC can charge the SF State campus for these upgrades under Government Code Section 54999, which authorizes public utilities to charge the campus a limited capital facilities fee under certain circumstances. This fee (i.e., a non-discriminatory charge to defray the actual cost of that portion of a public utility facility actually serving the campus) covers SF State’s fair share of the construction cost, including the cost of mitigation measures to address environmental impacts, if any. However, it should be noted that any such upgrades would not be expected to result in significant environmental effects due to the urban context. Therefore, for the above reasons, the proposed project will not require the construction of new water supply facilities or new water supply entitlements off campus that could cause significant environmental effects. The impact is less than significant.

The following revisions have been made to the text of Impact UTL-2 on pages 4.12-12 through 4.12-13.

**Impact UTL-2:** Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction or expansion of wastewater and/or storm water distribution or treatment facilities.

**Significance:** Less than significant

**Mitigation UTL-2:** As each future building project is proposed, SF State will verify that it can achieve a net zero increase in combined wet weather flow to the City’s combined sewer system. If a net increase in such flows would occur campus wide, SF State will coordinate with the SFPUC to determine whether such an increase will require downstream system capacity improvements. Mitigation not required

**Residual Significance:** Less than significant

The SF State campus currently pipes its wastewater and stormwater to the San Francisco combined sewer system. Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in about 1,700 new on-campus residents in about 846 newly constructed or converted housing units and a net increase of about 0.9 million square feet of academic, support, and semi-public space in new and replacement buildings. The daily non-residential campus population will also increase associated with the proposed enrollment ceiling increase and
associated increases in faculty and staff. The effect of this growth on the campus wastewater distribution system and on San Francisco’s combined sewer system is described below.

Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in an increase in the generation of wastewater on the campus that will be piped via existing and replacement sewer mains into San Francisco’s combined sewer system. Specifically, development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will increase wastewater generation to about 200,000 gpd (700 gpm) up from 150,000 gpd (500 gpm) under existing conditions, which will represent an increase of about 33 percent. It should be noted that continuation of the campuses’ water conservation practices over the planning horizon will minimize the increase in wastewater generation with growth and development under the plan.

Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will also result in an increase in the generation of storm water on the campus. The proposed Campus Master Plan calls for the connection of some of the proposed new and replacement facilities to San Francisco’s combined sewer system, as well as the development of a new open storm water management system that will direct some of the campuses storm water to Lake Merced. Overall, development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will increase storm water generation to about 270 cfs up from 265 cfs under existing conditions, based on a 10-year event and 10-minute duration, which will represent an increase of about 2 percent. This increase in storm water runoff is not substantial because most of the proposed development constitutes replacement and/or densification projects, which will not result in substantial increases in impervious surfacing. Moreover, with the proposed new open storm water management system on campus the amount of storm water directed into San Francisco’s combined sewer system will be reduced by approximately 20 percent, for a net reduction of 18 percent from the runoff rate and quantity of the existing campus. The open 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, as compared to existing conditions. Of the total post-project storm water volume of 270 cfs, about 32 cfs will be directed to Lake Merced by 2020, via the new open storm water management system. This will therefore result in a net reduction in the amount of storm water directed to San Francisco’s combined system of about 18 percent by 2020. It should be noted, however, that the net reduction of runoff directed into the City’s system of 18 percent, does not account for the reduction of runoff volume that will occur with the infiltration of storm water into the ground water table via the proposed project-specific design elements (e.g., rain gardens). Therefore, the actual reduction is likely to be greater than that estimated above.

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.

While a net zero can be achieved during wet weather conditions, there would still be a net increase in wastewater flows during dry weather conditions. As indicated above, wastewater generation will increase by about 50,000 gpd. While these flows could not be offset by storm water flows during dry weather, they are not expected to result in system capacity problems, as these dry weather flows would fall well within the total capacity of the existing combined system, which is based on wet weather conditions. Further, the City has indicated that sewer lines on Font Boulevard and Holloway Avenue and further downstream may need to be enlarged to accommodate higher combined peak wet weather flows (Shrestha, 2007). As the campus is planning to meet a net zero increase in combined flows both over the long term and incrementally, off-site improvements to the downstream sewer system should not be required.

Off-Campus Impacts

As indicated in the Environmental Setting section, the City is undertaking a comprehensive wastewater master plan update process to identify projects necessary to address existing deficiencies (e.g., odor control, aging infrastructure, etc.) and to ensure the long-term sustainability of its system.

While major off-site improvements to the wastewater distribution system are not anticipated to serve growth at the campus, as described above, it is possible that project-specific improvements to San Francisco’s distribution piping or other facilities (e.g., line or pump upgrades) near the campus may be required if the campus does not achieve the objective of having a “net zero” increase in combined sewer flows. Specifically, the City has indicated that sewer lines on Font Boulevard and Holloway Avenue and further downstream may need to be enlarged to accommodate the increase in wastewater generation from the project. While such upgrades are not expected to result in significant environmental effects due to the urban context, the SFPUC can charge the SF State campus for these upgrades under Government Code Section 54999, which authorizes public utilities to charge the campus a limited capital facilities fee under certain circumstances. This fee (i.e., a non-discriminatory charge to defray the actual cost of that portion of a public utility facility actually serving the campus) covers SF State’s fair share of the construction cost, including the cost of mitigation measures to address environmental impacts, if any. Therefore, the proposed project will not require the construction of new wastewater facilities off campus that could cause significant environmental effects. The impact is less than significant.
The following revisions have been made to the first paragraph of Impact UTL-3 on page 4.12-14.

- Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in about 1,700 new on-campus residents in about 846 newly constructed or converted housing units and a net increase of about 1.2 million square feet of academic, support, and semi-public space in new and replacement buildings. The daily non-residential campus population will also increase associated with the proposed enrollment ceiling increase and associated increases in faculty and staff. The effect of this growth on the campus power generation system, heating hot water system, and associated distribution facilities is described below. The effect of this growth on PG&E’s system is also contemplated given the possibility that the campus may choose to increase its power capacity via the regional power grid.

The following revisions have been made to the first paragraph of Impact UTL-4 on page 4.12-16.

The SF State campus currently receives police protection services from the SF State Police Department and fire protection and emergency medical services from the San Francisco Fire Department. Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in about 1,700 new on-campus residents in about 846 newly constructed or converted housing units and a net increase of about 1.2 million square feet of academic, support, and semi-public space in new and replacement buildings. The daily non-residential campus population will also increase associated with the proposed enrollment ceiling increase and associated increases in faculty and staff. The effect of this growth on the facilities of the SF State Police Department and the San Francisco Fire Department is described below.

The following revisions have been made to the last paragraph of Impact UTL-5 on page 4.12-17 and 4.12-18.

Parks and Recreational Facilities

The proposed Campus Master Plan calls for the construction of a new replacement Gym/Recreation-Wellness Center just north of North State Drive and a replacement softball field just north of Hensill and Thornton Halls. These facilities will not result in substantial physical effects on the environment above and beyond those already evaluated in this EIR. Given the presence of the existing and planned recreational facilities on campus, the anticipated new on-campus residential population (about 1,700 people) under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not result in a significant increase in use of off-campus parks or recreational facilities. Therefore, the proposed new on-campus population will not result in the need for new off-campus parks and/or recreation facilities, or substantial physical deterioration of existing off-campus facilities. While the proposed Campus Master Plan calls for a new Lake Merced Boulevard underpass and trail connection into the Lake Merced area it is not expected that new campus use of the trails in this area will lead to substantial physical deterioration of such trails.

As the Campus Master Plan would likely not result in substantial new residential population, the new SF State-related population that will reside off-campus in San Francisco (about 400 people) will not result in a significant increase in the use of park and recreational facilities in San Francisco. As a result, significant impacts to such facilities in San Francisco will not occur as a
result of implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan. Therefore, the impact is less than significant. Please see Section 4.10, Population and Housing for assumptions about the number of new on-campus and off-campus residents in San Francisco that will result with the proposed Campus Master Plan.

### 3.15 CHAPTER 5.0 ALTERNATIVES

The following revisions have been made Tables 5-1 and 5-2 on page 5-8.

#### Table 5-1

Summary of Project Characteristics for Campus Master Plan Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>New Students (FTE)</th>
<th>Net Increase in Non-Residential Building Space (million gsf)</th>
<th>New Housing Construction in UPN/UPS (Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
The increase in non-residential building space under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative would be smaller because the Hotel and Conference Center would not be built.

#### Table 5-2

SF State Affiliates Accommodated in New and Remaining On-Campus Housing Under Each Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Net Increase in Remaining UPS/UPN Units Occupied by SF State by 2020</th>
<th>New Housing Units Constructed in UPS/UPN by 2020</th>
<th>Net Increase in Housing Unitsdemolished in Core by 2020</th>
<th>Net Increase in New and Remaining On-Campus Housing Occupied by SF State by 2020</th>
<th>Net Increase in SF State Affiliates Housed in New and Remaining On-Campus Units by 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>544 247</td>
<td>542 988</td>
<td>-49 -37</td>
<td>846 1,198</td>
<td>1,693 2,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-49 -37</td>
<td>679 691</td>
<td>1,352 1,382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>-288</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>-49 -37</td>
<td>1,507 1,519</td>
<td>3,013 3,038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
1. The number of remaining units is based on the total of existing units (960 units), minus the number of units that would be demolished under the alternative, if any, and minus the number of units currently occupied by SF State affiliates (288). Existing SF State affiliates housed is based on an estimate that about 30 percent of the existing 960 units in UPN and UPS are occupied by SF State affiliates, most of them students. The total SF State affiliates housed in remaining units by 2020 is based on the assumption that about 85 percent of the remaining units in UPN and UPS under the alternative would be occupied by SF State affiliates.

2. Data taken from Table 5-1.

3. The amount of core housing would be reduced under most alternatives by 37 units to allow for the development of new faculty offices.

4. The net increase is equal to the sum of columns 1 through 3.

5. The total net increase in SF State affiliates housed in new units by 2020 is based on the total number of new and remaining in column 4. It is assumed that about 50 percent of these units would be occupied by students at 3 students per unit and about 50 percent would be occupied by SF State employees at 1 employee per unit.

The following revisions have been made to the third paragraph on page 5-9.

Overall, this alternative will result in about 1,135 SF State affiliates being housed on campus in comparison to about 1,693 under the proposed Campus Master Plan, or about a 20 percent reduction. This alternative will also result in a reduction in the total square footage of non-residential building space as a result of not building the Hotel and Conference Center. The net increase in academic, support, and semi-public space that would result under this alternative would be about 0.8 million gsf of space, or a reduction of about 30 percent as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. The main change in the footprint of development compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan is that there would be no new development of housing or the Hotel and Conference Center in UPN and UPS, as noted above. Figure 5-2, Reduced Housing Growth Alternative, shows the footprint of development on the campus under this alternative.

The following revisions have been made to the second and third paragraph on page 5-13.

As this alternative will reduce the amount of new on-campus housing, fewer new students, faculty, and staff will be accommodated in on-campus housing under this alternative, and a greater proportion of new SF State affiliates will seek housing off-campus. Therefore, the alternative’s impact on housing supply (Impact POP-3) and the alternative’s contribution to the cumulative housing supply deficit in the study area by 2020 (Impact POP-5) will be greater than the proposed project. Specifically, the contribution to the cumulative housing supply deficit in San Francisco (Impact POP-5) will increase to about 5.7 percent under this alternative, compared to 2.5 percent under the proposed Campus Master Plan. In contrast to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the contribution to the cumulative impact on San Francisco housing supply will be considerable under this alternative and will result in a significant unavoidable impact.

**Traffic, Circulation, and Parking**

As the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will reduce the number of SF State affiliates that can be accommodated in on-campus housing by about 20 percent, total daily and peak hour trips generated under this alternative are expected to be higher, as a greater number of people will be traveling to the campus in automobiles. However, the Hotel and Conference Center would not be built and the trips associated with that facility will be avoided. Therefore the net new daily...
and peak hour traffic under this alternative would be fairly similar to that under the proposed project. Therefore, the worst-case vehicular traffic impact (Impact TRA-1) would be similar and Mitigation TRA-1 will be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, as is the case for the proposed project.

The impact on transit under this alternative (Impact TRA-2) would be slightly greater, as more people will live off campus and therefore will travel to the campus via transit (note that the proportion of Hotel/Conference Center visitors using transit is small and therefore elimination of the Hotel/Conference Center under this alternative would not reduce transit trips to offset the increase in transit trips from additional SF State affiliates living off campus under this alternative). Therefore, significant impacts on Muni and SF State shuttle would slightly increase under this alternative, and implementation of Mitigations TRA-2B and TRA-2C will be required, as is the case for the proposed project.

The following revisions have been made to the last paragraph on page 5-14, which continues on page 5-15.

Overall, this alternative will result in about 3,013 SF State affiliates being housed on campus in comparison to about 1,693 under the proposed Campus Master Plan, or about 78 percent increase. This alternative will result in the same amount of total square footage of non-residential building space as proposed Campus Master Plan (1.2 million gsf of building space), as the Hotel and Conference Center would also be constructed under this alternative. The main change in the footprint of development compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan is that under this alternative all of the existing housing in UPS and UPN will be redeveloped to provide for higher density housing and to provide for the Hotel and Conference Center. Figure 5-3, Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, shows the footprint of development on the campus under this alternative.

The following revisions have been made to the third paragraph on page 5-18.

As the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative will increase the number of SF State affiliates that can be accommodated in on-campus housing by about 78 percent, total number of daily and peak hour vehicle trips generated under this alternative 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 this alternative. However, the reduction in peak hour vehicle trips will not be large enough to reduce the worst-case significant traffic impacts at two study intersections to a less-than-significant level, and Mitigation TRA-1 will still be required, as is the case for the proposed project. Also similar to the proposed project, under the worst-case traffic scenario, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

Additionally, the demand for transit will also decrease under this alternative (Impact TRA-2), as more people will live on campus and fewer will travel to the campus via transit. However, this impact is still expected to be potentially significant and Mitigations TRA-2B and TRA-2C.
will also need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level, as is the case for the proposed project.

The following revisions have been made to the last paragraph on page 5-19.

Under this alternative, however, the existing units in UPN and UPS would continue to turn over to SF State uses as existing tenants vacate their units through the planning horizon. By 2020, this alternative will result in about 1,056 new SF State affiliates being housed on campus in comparison to about 1,693 under the proposed Campus Master Plan, or about a 63 percent decrease.