Comment Letter 8

PRO-PARKMERCED RESIDENTS’ ORGANIZATION

We, the undersigned, do not believe that the San Francisco State University Draft EIR for the campus master plan is accurate, and does not truly represent the negative impact it will have on this neighborhood. We also wish to be notified in writing by USPS mail of any meetings regarding these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>San Francisco CA 94132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Powell</td>
<td>405 Serrano Dr E</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Book</td>
<td>150 Font Blvd 112</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesley Neustein</td>
<td>350 Arballo # 9C</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard O’Flynn</td>
<td>50 Chumasero Dr 8T</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosemary Rende</td>
<td>5 Josefa Ave</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emma Beuer</td>
<td>100 Font</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonna Anderson</td>
<td>310 Arballo Dr G</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie da Silva</td>
<td>310 Arballo Dr F</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Pulaski</td>
<td>55 Chumasero # Dr</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Dozier</td>
<td>55 Chumasero 4J</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emmanuel Nsabihaye</td>
<td>125 Cambon Drive # ME</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evangela Yueno</td>
<td>150 Font Dr 1#A</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter 8

Response to Comment 8-1. The petition signed by members of the Parkmerced Residents Organization is acknowledged for the record.
PRO-MERCED RESIDENTS' ORGANIZATION

We, the undersigned, do not believe that the San Francisco State University Draft EIR for the campus masterplan is accurate, and it does not truly represent the negative impact the masterplan will have on this neighborhood. We also wish to be notified in writing by USPS mail of any meetings regarding these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Print Address</th>
<th>San Francisco CA 94132</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DONNA NELSON</td>
<td>749 Gonzalez Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DONNA NELSON</td>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LINH LE</td>
<td>56 Serrano Drive</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHU PHAM</td>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce L. Yeap</td>
<td>100 Foot, 1 K</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joyce L. Yeap</td>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MELVIN BURGER</td>
<td>20, Vドラ-drive</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY D. MARTINI</td>
<td>441 Gonzalez Dr</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MARY D. MARTINI</td>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIZARA OLSEN</td>
<td>50 Chumash Rd</td>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAIZARA OLSEN</td>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PRO-PARKMERCED RESIDENTS' ORGANIZATION

We, the undersigned, do not believe that the San Francisco State University Draft EIR for the campus masterplan is accurate, and it does not truly represent the negative impact the masterplan will have on this neighborhood. We also wish to be notified in writing by USPS mail of any meetings regarding these issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Print Name</th>
<th>Print Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WALTER DEVAUGHN</td>
<td>101 BUCDRIL DRIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
<td>Print Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
<td>Print Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
<td>Print Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
<td>Print Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
<td>Print Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print Name</td>
<td>Print Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco CA 94132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please Sign Above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Response to Comment Letter 9

Response to Comment 9-1. The petition signed by members of the Parkmerced Residents Organization is acknowledged for the record.
Mr. Jason Porth  
Associate Director, Community Relations  
San Francisco State University  
1600 Holloway Avenue  
San Francisco, CA  94132  

March 26, 2007  

Dear Mr. Porth:  

Many thanks to you and your colleagues for your informative presentation to our Endorsement Committee on March 21st.  

The San Francisco Housing Action Coalition (SFHAC) supports the general approach of San Francisco State’s new campus master plan, with its focus on increasing urbanization, improving connections to surrounding neighborhoods, and increasing the supply of on-campus housing.  

However, the SFHAC strongly encourages the university to consider increasing the housing element of the master plan. Considering that the university is planning to increase its student body by five thousand, at a time when housing for students is already in short supply across the city of San Francisco, we feel that the plan’s allowance for a net increase of only a few hundred units of new on-campus housing is much less than desirable. We urge the university to plan to provide its students, faculty, and staff with the maximum feasible on-campus housing supply. We believe that a greater density in on-campus housing would benefit the urban fabric of the campus and culture of the university, while also helping the city to address its ongoing housing crisis.  

We also question whether student housing would truly require parking at a 1:1 ratio. If, as seems likely, many students living on campus would not require their own automobiles, then perhaps resources otherwise dedicated to providing parking at a 1:1 ratio could be better utilized to realize other aspects of the master plan. We hope that the university will carefully consider this question.
Mr. Jason Porth  
March 26, 2007  
Page Two

Please keep us informed of developments with the campus master plan. We look forward to working with you as this plan moves forward, and hope that it will ultimately meet SFHAC's criteria for endorsement.

Sincerely,

Tim Colen  
Executive Director
Response to Comment Letter 10

Response to Comment 10-1.  Comment noted.

Response to Comment 10-2.  The final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) has been refined to increase the amount of on-campus housing (see Chapter 2, Project Refinements and Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR). Please also see Master Response 3, Need for More On-Campus Housing and Master Response 14, Regional Housing Supply Impacts.

Response to Comment 10-3.  The final Campus Master Plan assumes a 1:1 ratio of parking for all new housing units. These units are envisioned as a flexible mix of faculty and staff as well as graduate and upper division student housing, depending on need. As an example, a unit could house one faculty member or four students; in either case, one parking space per unit would be provided. Therefore, the Campus Master Plan does not provide parking for every new on-campus resident.
Richard Macias  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction  
San Francisco State University  
1600 Holloway Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94132-4021

Re:  Response to Comments on the SFSU Master Plan Draft EIR

Dear Mr. Macias:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) issued by San Francisco State University (SFSU) in connection with its proposed Master Plan for the expansion of SFSU. Stellar Management has the following comments and questions on the DEIR. The bulk of our comments pertain to Chapter 4.

1. The proposed retail development on Holloway and Buckingham is not analyzed because the DEIR states it will not generate vehicle trips. However, there may still be additional walking, transit and bicycle trips to these campus serving retail locations, therefore including the commercial space with an appropriate modal split may be warranted. (DEIR pp.4.11-1).

2. If we are correct in assuming that the conference facility is assumed to include only hotel guests and/or students and faculty, perhaps this assumption should be stated expressly. Are parking facilities provided at the hotel and conference center (DEIR pp.4.11-1)? We also recommend reconfirming the data for the hotel in accordance with the San Francisco Guidelines. (DEIR pp.4.11-15).

3. The discussion of roadway descriptions should note that 19th Avenue is a part of Highway 1 and therefore under the jurisdiction of Caltrans. In addition, the text should also note that Brotherhood Way and Alemany Boulevard provide access to the campus from I-280 (DEIR pp.4.11-3).

4. We suggest noting that the practical capacity of any parking facility is about ninety percent (90%) and that targeting occupancy of more than 90% is difficult to achieve. We would also suggest that the off-site (i.e.: on street) demand figures be added to the on-site demand for a complete analysis of the parking demand within the campus. (DEIR pp.4.11-10).
5. It would be helpful to include more backup information regarding the Level of Service (LOS) analysis in an appendix, and include assumptions about pedestrian volumes, pedestrian crossing times, transit signal preemption and roadway capacity (DEIR pp.4.11-10).

6. The modal split information provided may be better understood if it is applied against each land use category, rather than a 62 percent non-vehicle modal split across all categories. (DEIR pp.4.11-15).

7. Please provide additional details on the development of the trip distribution percentages and the traffic assignments, including how the percentages in Figure 4.11-4 were calculated. Were the distributions obtained from the San Francisco Guidelines, existing counts, or the campus surveys? Further, it is not clear where the 23 percent on Brotherhood Way go; do they connect to 19th Avenue or to Alemany Boulevard? (DEIR pp.4.11-4).

8. We commend the DEIR's mitigation measures for "Scenario 2", which as we understand it, commits to (1) perform a new baseline analysis within eighteen months of certifying the EIR and (2) to evaluate the actual performance of intersections based on further surveys and (3) to mitigate as appropriate by further TDM measures and payment of fair share toward traffic improvements. We urge SFSU to base its findings on Scenario 2, which we view as a more probable outcome. We also urge SFSU to further strengthen this mitigation measure by performing the baseline analysis at all seventeen intersections and based on the information obtained through the baseline survey, analyze on an annual basis all affected intersections. Mitigation and further analysis should not be limited to the two intersections called out in mitigation measure TRA-1, but should cover the intersections that the baseline survey and follow-up survey data shows are impacted. (DEIR pp.4.11-28-29).

9. It would be helpful if the routes used in the assessment of the Muni screenlines were illustrated in a figure.

It is stated in the text that Muni transit capacity utilization for 2020 was based on the existing riders, plus the project's estimated ridership. In addition, other growth for the next 15 years, including from the projects listed as background growth, should be added. Information regarding future transit ridership levels could be obtained from the SFCTA travel demand model, or a background growth rate could be applied (as was done with the traffic volumes). In addition, information for the M-Ocean View should be obtained from MTA or the San Francisco Guidelines and included in the analysis.

Also, please provide additional details regarding the methodology and assumptions for the screenline analysis, including an explanation of how the peak period ridecheck data was converted to peak hour information. (DEIR pp.4.11-23).
Mr. Richard Macias
April 2, 2007
Page 3 of 3

10. Please confirm the inbound/outbound distribution for BART ridership. In
addition, BART does have a relatively higher ridership to the South Bay in the PM peak
hour. The project’s contribution to the ridership in this direction should also be assessed.
(DEIR pp.4.11-23).

11. The University should consider adding additional shuttle trips, based on
increased number of students. (DEIR pp.4.11-29 to 32).

Again, thank you for this opportunity to comment on the DEIR.

Sincerely,

STELLAR MANAGEMENT

Seth Mallen
Response to Comment Letter 11

Response to Comment 11-1. Please see Master Response 4, *Village Main Streets*. The pedestrian level of service analysis provided in the Draft EIR (see Impact TRA-3, page 4.11-36) is based on the total 2020 campus population. The analysis is not based on pedestrian modal splits for individual land use categories, as it would not make sense to do so given the high level of internal pedestrian trips among the various proposed land uses.

A quantitative level of service analysis for bicycle trips was not performed as part of the Draft EIR, nor is such an analysis typically performed for EIRs under CEQA. The existing off-campus bike routes are designed and constructed based on the adopted standards by City and County of San Francisco. The Draft EIR analysis of bicycle use is provided in Impact TRA-4 (Draft EIR page 4.11-37). Additionally, given that the proposed retail uses would serve the campus community and surrounding neighborhoods, it is not likely that the retail uses, in and of themselves, would generate additional transit trips. Therefore, the transit analysis did not specifically estimate transit trips from campus retail uses.

Response to Comment 11-2. The additional trips from the Conference Center/Hotel identified in the Draft EIR were based on trip generation rates from the City’s Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines (refer footnote “b” of Table 4.11-5 of the Draft EIR). While the project’s trip generation identified in Table 4.11-5 identifies the hotel, the trip generation rates for this use provided in the guidelines assumes the presence and use of conference facilities. Therefore, while a separate rate for conference attendees was not developed, vehicle trips from these users are estimates as part of the hotel use. Please also see Response to Comment 1-2.

Additionally, parking will be provided at the proposed Conference Center as described in the Draft EIR (page 3-27). It should also be noted that the proposed Conference Center and related parking have been substantially reduced in size. Please see Master Response 2, *Need for Conference Center*, and Chapter 2, *Project Refinements*, for additional information.

Response to Comment 11-3. Comment acknowledged. Text on page 4.11-3 of the Draft EIR has been revised. See Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*.

Response to Comment 11-4. A practical parking utilization limitation of 90 percent is included in the parking supply and demand analysis, both for current conditions as well as future needs, as suggested by the Draft EIR text: "campuses target a 90 percent utilization level for parking before adding new spaces" (Draft EIR page 4.11-10). The Campus Master Plan Existing Conditions Analysis includes a detailed analysis of the off-campus parking patterns of SF State commuters (WRT, 2006). To be conservative, the future parking demand analysis for on-campus parking assumes no change in the number of SF State commuters parking off campus; in fact, without additional parking management measures on City streets, higher prices for on-campus parking may result in more SF State commuters parking off-campus. Please also see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts*, for additional information.
Response to Comment 11-5. Please see Appendix A, Traffic Technical Appendix, and Appendix B, Transit Impact Analysis, for additional background information about the traffic and transit analyses conducted for this EIR. Please also see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, for revised traffic and transit analyses.

The pedestrian analysis is provided in the Draft EIR (see Impact TRA-3 on page 4.11-3). Please also see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts.

Response to Comment 11-6. The cordon count surveys conducted for the Campus Master Plan (see WRT, 2006) were not designed to develop modal splits for individual land use categories, nor would it make sense to do so given the high level of internalized trips among the various uses.

Response to Comment 11-7. There are three major access points to the SF State campus: 19th Avenue, Junipero Serra Boulevard and Lake Merced Boulevard. Trip distribution was not obtained from the San Francisco Traffic Impact Analysis Guidelines. Rather, the total number of vehicles entering and exiting the campus was calculated based on existing traffic volumes, which were counted in the field. Distribution percentages were then established for the additional traffic projected to be generated from the implementation of the Campus Master Plan. This is an appropriate approach for developing trip distribution, as it is based on actual traffic volumes. Also, the 23 percent of trips on Brotherhood Way are projected to access the SF State campus via Interstate 280/Highway 1 based on existing turning movements collected.

Response to Comment 11-8. The proposed Mitigation TRA-1 (Draft EIR page 4.11-24) calls for baseline and on-going cordon surveys of campus commuters during the PM peak hours. Cordon surveys collect, via roadside interviews and/or survey cards, travel pattern information at the perimeter of an area, such as the SF State campus. A cordon survey was conducted as part of the development of the proposed Campus Master Plan (see description provided on Draft EIR page 4.11-2). The cordon surveys will provide on-going information about the travel behavior of SF State affiliates, including whether PM peak period auto trips are increasing. As stated in Mitigation TRA-1, cordon surveys will be conducted annually if the PM peak period auto trips-to and from the campus are greater than 5 percent above the baseline. Mitigation TRA-1 does not call for collecting vehicle volume data at any of the seventeen study intersections, since there is no way to discern SF State from non-SF State traffic. Rather, a cordon survey is a better tool for estimating changes in vehicle trips over time from campus uses.

Response to Comment 11-9. Please see Appendix B, Transit Impact Analysis (Appendix B), for a figure of the screenlines.

Response to Comment 11-10. Please see Appendix B, Transit Impact Analysis. This revised analysis contained in this analysis does apply a background growth rate based on the SFCTA travel demand model.
Ridecheck data was available for all Muni lines except for the M-Ocean View line; therefore, existing year hourly ridership for the M-Ocean View line could not be established. According to the Muni Service Planning/ Scheduling Departments, ridecheck data on the M-Ocean View line will not be available until July 2007 at the earliest. Given the unavailability of the M-Ocean View line data, a quantitative analysis of the 68 new M-Ocean View line riders was not possible. Please see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts*, for a discussion of transit impacts identified in the Draft EIR.

**Response to Comment 11-11.** Please see Appendix B, *Transit Impact Analysis*, for information on methodology and assumptions used in the screenline analysis.

**Response to Comment 11-12.** Please see Appendix B, *Transit Impact Analysis*, for additional analysis conducted for BART to the south. Please also see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revised analysis related to BART.

**Response to Comment 11-13.** EIR Mitigations TRA-2B and -2C identify conditions under which the campus will extend shuttle services to the West Portal Station and/or increase shuttle frequency or add higher capacity services between the campus and the Daly City BART station (see Draft EIR page 4.11-29). Please see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*, for revisions to these measures.
SummerHill Homes

777 California Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94304
Tel: 650 857 0122
Fax: 650 857 1077

March 16, 2007

U.S. Mail

Richard Macias
Capital Planning, Design & Construction
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

Re: SFSU Campus Master Plan Draft EIR

Dear Mr. Macias:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Draft Environmental Impact Report (“DEIR”) for the San Francisco State University (“SFSU”) Campus Master Plan. I write on behalf of SummerHill Homes, the applicant for the proposed Mixed-Use Project at Cambon Drive (called out as 77 Cambon Drive in the SFSU DEIR), to address three errors that occur in Figure 4.0-1, Table 4.0-1, and most significantly, in Table 4.11-7 of the SFSU DEIR.

Figure 4.0-1 “Reasonably Foreseeable Future Projects”
The 77 Cambon Drive project is not shown on the correct parcel. Please see the attached map for the correct location.

Table 4.0-1 “Pending or Approved Reasonably Foreseeable Projects”
The 77 Cambon Drive program components listed in the table are inaccurate. The project components are 195 residential units and 15,000 sq. ft. of retail space. There are no commercial or childcare components to the project.

Table 4.11-7 “Proposed Trip Generation for Approved and Pending Project”
The table lists four separate uses for 77 Cambon Drive (Residential, Commercial, Retail & Childcare) when, in fact, there are only two (Residential & Retail).1 There is no 241,200 square-foot commercial space or 3,150 square-foot childcare space planned for the project. Consequently, the 10,607 daily trips listed for those uses—or approximately 70% of those projected for proposed projects in the surrounding area—cannot properly be attributed to 77 Cambon Drive. Also, although Table 4.11-7 accurately lists for the number of residential units, it assumes in the 1.73 trip generation rate that all units are two-bedrooms. The table below, prepared by Fehr & Peers Transportation Consultants of San Francisco, lists accurate, corrected

---

1 Table 4.11-7 “Proposed Trip Generation for Approved and Pending Projects.”
Trip Generation estimates for 77 Cambon Drive (corrected figures appear in highlighted, boldface type). Additionally, Fehr & Peers has prepared a memo enclosed herein outlining the required corrections.

<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></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon Drive - Residential 2+ BR</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>4,190</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon Drive - Residential 1 BR</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77 Cambon Drive - Retail</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>ksf</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>4,680</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table lists person-trips—many of which will be made by transit, walking, or bicycle—so additional adjustments should be made to convert these figures to vehicle trips. Also, the proposed project will create fewer net new trips projected above because existing uses and their associated traffic generation will be eliminated by the proposed project.

**Corrections**

The DEIR grossly overestimates—by over 300%—the traffic that 77 Cambon Drive could reasonably be expected to generate in the future. Understanding that the above mentioned references and figures may have been mistaken, they need to be corrected before publication of SFSU's final EIR so as to accurately represent the 77 Cambon Drive project on file.

Sincerely,

Katia Kamhang
Sr. Vice President, SummerHill Homes

Cc: Jason Porth, Associate Director, Community Relations, San Francisco State University
Enclosures
March 13, 2007

Katia Kamangar
Summerhill Homes
777 California Avenue
Palo Alto, California 94304

Re: San Francisco State University (SFSU) Master Plan
Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR)

Dear Katia:

Fehr & Peers has reviewed the SFSU Master Plan DEIR, with a particular focus on the analysis of Cumulative Conditions and the associated assumptions for the 77 Cambon Drive project. Our review suggests that the cumulative traffic forecast estimates used in the SFSU Master Plan DEIR, particularly the trip generation forecasts associated with the 77 Cambon Drive project, are inaccurate for the following reasons:

- The SFSU Master Plan DEIR included 241,2 ksf of commercial space and a 3.15 ksf childcare center that are not part of the current 77 Cambon Drive proposed project. (Note that the SFSU Master Plan DEIR assumed only 7.9 ksf of retail space, while the current project calls for 15 ksf, a slight increase in retail space).

- The SFSU Master Plan DEIR assumed that all 195 residential dwelling units would be 2+ bedrooms, while the current proposed project includes 76 1-bedroom units, which have a lower trip generation rate than 2+ bedroom units, based on the City Planning Department's Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for Environmental Review (SF Guidelines).

- The SFSU Master Plan DEIR miscalculated the inbound/outbound traffic ratios for the retail land uses, resulting in a higher level of increase in certain directions. In reality, the inbound/outbound split will be more even than assumed in the DEIR, resulting in a better balance of traffic.

- No credit was taken for traffic generated by existing uses at the 77 Cambon Drive site.

- The trip generation forecasts for approved and pending projects presented in Table 4.11-7 in the SFSU Master Plan DEIR (including forecasts for the 77 Cambon Drive project) are in terms of person-trips. It is unclear from the DEIR whether these were adjusted to vehicle trips for analysis purposes. The number of new vehicle trips should be lower than the number of person-trips.

Table 1 presents revised trip generation forecasts for the current proposed project at 77 Cambon Drive and a comparison of the revised estimates with trip generation estimates from the SFSU Master Plan DEIR for 77 Cambon Drive project. As shown in the table, the cumulative conditions analysis for the SFSU Master Plan DEIR was incorrect in its assumptions for the 77 Cambon Drive project.
It should be noted that the information in Table 1 are in terms of person-trips. Additional adjustments should be made to account for the substantial portion of trips made by transit, walking, and bicycles in San Francisco. Further, since the existing uses at the site generate some traffic, additional adjustments should be made before determining the number of net new vehicle trips expected to be generated by the 77 Cambon Drive project. Thus, the number of new vehicle trips is likely to be lower than shown.

<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>Residential (2+ Br)</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential (1 Br)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Ksf</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFUS Master Plan DEIR Assumptions for 77 Cambon Drive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
77 Cambon Drive – Estimated Person-Trip Generation

Note: Additional adjustments should be made to convert person-trips to vehicle trips. Also, the number of net new trips will be lower because existing uses on the 77 Cambon Drive site (and their associated traffic generation) will be eliminated with the proposed project.

Source: SFUS Master Plan DEIR, SF Guidelines, and Fehr & Peers

March 2007

We hope this information is useful in correcting the DEIR’s inaccuracies. Please do not hesitate to call if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

FEHR & PEERS

Chris Mitchell, PE
Associate
SF06-0267
Response to Comment Letter 12

Response to Comment 12-1. Figure 4.0-1 has been revised in response to this comment. See Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR.

Response to Comment 12-2. Table 4.0-1 has been revised in response to this comment. See Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR.

Response to Comments 12-3 through 12-11. The trip generation for the proposed project at 77 Cambon Drive has been revised to reflect the proposed sizes of the different land uses and the level of service analysis for 2020 conditions has been rerun as part of the Final EIR. As the 77 Cambon Drive project is now much reduced from the original project characteristics received from the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department, the overall trip generation for all approved and pending projects was reduced to about 2,077 daily trips, down from about 15,241 daily trips reported in the Draft EIR. The level of service analysis was rerun to ensure that additional project impacts would not be triggered, as the project’s share of 2020 total traffic at the study intersections would increase with the decrease in trip generation associated with the proposed project at 77 Cambon Drive. The revised trip generation and results of the updated level of service analysis have been included in revised Tables 4.11-7 through 4.11-10. See Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, for revised tables.

The updated analysis indicates that overall traffic volumes at some intersections would be reduced under both Year 2020 without Project Conditions and Year 2020 with Project Conditions. In particular, the intersection of 19th Avenue and Ocean Avenue would improve to an acceptable LOS of D in 2020 with and without the project, whereas, the original analysis indicated that an unacceptable LOS of E would occur at this intersection with and without the project. While traffic conditions would improve, the project would continue to exceed the significance thresholds at the intersections of Lake Merced Boulevard and Font Boulevard and at Lake Merced Boulevard and South State Drive. As indicated in revised Tables 4.11-9 and 4.11-10, the project would not trigger impacts at any other intersections, as: (1) it would not result in the degradation of level of service from LOS D to E or F, or from E to F at other intersections; or (2) it would not contribute 5 percent or more of the total cumulative traffic and cumulative growth in traffic volumes at other intersections. Therefore, the overall conclusions of the traffic analysis provided in Impact TRA-1 (Scenario 2) provided in the Draft EIR remain unchanged as a result of this additional analysis.

It should also be noted that the additional level of service analysis for 2020 conditions did not reflect the project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). As these refinements would reduce project trips due to the provision of additional on-campus housing, the analysis provided in the Draft EIR and updated in the Final EIR was determined to constitute a conservative worst-case analysis of the likely effects of the project on vicinity traffic conditions.
Dear Richard Macias,

When you look at Lath Avenue with all the traffic, and you want all this expansion it concerns me. Some of your other plans with the re-routing of the M-Oceanview way very troubling. Park Merced is an historic housing complex. Only 4 such places were built in the United States by Metropolitan Life Insurance. New York City with Cooper Village/Stuyvesant Town and Fairfax in Fairfax, Virginia (rental condo in 1978) and Park LaBrea in Los Angeles, CA.

San Francisco State wants to tear down existing housing in Park Merced and build more housing which will create much more traffic and noise for all the Tenants of Park Merced. Parking will be even more difficult than it is right now.

San Francisco State has lots of land within its University and you want to keep your own Space, but yet your building plans in Park Merced is going to take away our open space.

Within San Francisco State there is plenty of land to build up and build all the additional student housing that you would need, you even have torn down a mall student housing building on your property because you want more open space for your University.

This whole land and development scheme is Big Government, and the use of Public Funds for expanding, and trumping on Private Industry and the rights of Private Citizens will not be tolerated. We have enough problems with big corporations, and private interests enmeshing in big construction projects, but certainly not Public Funds, and Taxpayer Dollars harming the lives of Private Taxpaying Citizens.

My feeling is that you should sell the land that you bought from Park Merced, and work with the land that you already have. Expecting Taxpayers to pay for your Big Government University, and takeover of more land is clearly wrong. Use the money that you make from the sale of the Park Merced Property to build what you need to build within the land you already have, instead of your project costing more money than it really should cost, and then having to raise college tuition, and going to the taxpayers to ask for a voice in taxes to pay for this Big Government College with more Government workers to hire, because you now own more land, which means more Government Salaries, more Government Teachers, more Government Police, no property taxes being paid for on the land you bought.

Robert Pender
President of PRO
S. Josephs
San Francisco, CA 94132

Thomas Agee
PRO Board Member
106 Crespi Drive
San Francisco, CA 94132
Response to Comment Letter 13

Response to Comment 13-1. The traffic impacts of the Campus Master Plan are evaluated in Draft EIR Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking. Please see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts for additional discussion of traffic issues.

The Campus Master Plan and its EIR include no specific plans for the rerouting of the M-Line. Rather, the Campus Master Plan suggests a variety of long-term transit improvements that the City might consider in future planning efforts. These improvements are entirely within the jurisdiction of the City and Caltrans. Furthermore, the EIR does not assume any transit route changes. Please also see Response to Comment 2E-24.

Response to Comment 13-2. Please see Master Response 13, Parkmerced Historical Resource Impacts.

Response to Comment 13-3. The noise and transportation impacts of the Campus Master Plan are evaluated in Draft EIR Section 4.9, Noise and Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking. Please see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts for a discussion of traffic and parking issues. Please see Master Response 3, Need for More On-Campus Housing for information on why additional housing is not being proposed in the campus core. Additionally, with the exception of the proposed Creative Arts Building, the Campus Master Plan locates all future buildings on existing building sites or parking lots thereby increasing density without reducing valuable open space.

Response to Comment 13-4. Please see Response to Comment 13-3 above. The commenter also references the student residence that was demolished in March 1999. Until the Loma Prieta earthquake in 1989, Verducci Hall served as a 760-bed high-rise residence hall for students at SF State. After the earthquake, the building was deemed structurally unsound and was closed. During the next nine years, SF State officials were engaged in negotiations with the Federal Emergency Management Association (FEMA) as to Verducci’s fate. In May 1998, SF State and FEMA agreed to demolish Verducci and build a new student residence—the Village at Centennial Square —to replace the beds Verducci provided. On March 28, 1999, Verducci Hall was imploded, on the same day that ground was broken for construction of the Village, which first opened for student housing in 2001.

Response to Comments 13-5 and 13-6. As indicated in Master Response 3, Need for More On-Campus Housing, building additional housing within the campus core is not considered viable. As a result, the University purchased the areas known as University Park South (UPS) and University Park North (UPN). All of UPN and most of UPS were purchased using California State University systemwide revenue bonds that are repaid over a 30-year period with income generated from rents. Four blocks of UPS were purchased by the San Francisco State University Foundation and later transferred to state ownership. In both cases, no public funds were used to purchase the property.
Please also see Master Response 6, *Proposed Enrollment Increase*, which indicates that the proposed facilities growth is driven by enrollment. Using recent enrollment trends along with state-wide demographic projections, the Campus Master Plan provides for a flexible blueprint for serving the anticipated population of future students. Providing adequate on-campus housing is important as well because it reinforces the academic mission of the campus by providing for opportunities for student-faculty interactions, greater access to resources and assistance, etc. On-campus housing is also important as it minimizes vehicle trips to the campus. It should also be noted that on-campus housing is self-funded. That is, it is paid for by the residents who occupy the units and therefore tax-payer money and increased tuitions are not used to pay for such housing.
January 30, 2007

Office Of The President:

Sir:

I am your neighbor, have been so for 40 yrs. When we moved in this area it was a single family home area. I am concerned and writing this letter because the properties all around me are being sold and being made into rooms a home that was a two bed room home is now a six room place to rent, and your State University students are moving in so now more cars are on the streets for they have no place to park.

So now we are calling parking traffic often some could get into correct lane.

Please in your planning sir, build on your campus enough housing to accommodate the students so they won’t have to move into these rooms with no place to park.

Thank you,

Mabel E. Bailey
Response to Comment Letter 14

Response to Comment 14-1. Please see Master Response 3, *Need for More On-Campus Housing*, which indicates that more on-campus housing is being provided for in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). Please also see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts*, which discusses parking in the adjacent neighborhoods.
To: jporto@fsu.edu, maciesr@fsu.edu
Subject: Fwd: SFSU parking invades local neighborhood

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Filtered: true
X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Result: Ao8CAFAko0XYG7+S/2dsb2JtbACltag
X-Deliver-To: info@fsusmasterplan.org
X-Originating-IP: 127.0.0.1
Date: Tue, 9 Jan 2007 14:13:33 -0800 (PST)
Subject: SFSU parking invades local neighborhood
From: robert@phantommediainc.com
To: info@fsusmasterplan.org
User-Agent: SquirrelMail/1.4.7
X-Assp-Delay: delayed for 6m 40s; 8 Jan 2007 14:19:21 -0800
X-Assp-Bayes-Confidence: 0.00000
X-Assp-Spam-Prob: 0.00000
X-Assp-Envelope-From: robert@phantommediainc.com
X-SFSU-VirusScanner: Found to be clean

To whom it may concern,
I grew up at 530 Gellert Dr, and for 50 years ever since these homes were built back in 1950 we have enjoyed uncluttered parking. However over the last few years, maybe because of increased student enrollment, or lack of sufficient parking, our last block of Gellert before the school zone has become a "free" parking lot for SFSU. Of course its not really free, because it cost us a privilege and convenience, they have "taken away from us" something that we've enjoyed for 50 years. During regular school operations there is "NO" parking in front of my house and all of my neighbors, NONE! Nowhere in your masterplan do you refer to the residential neighbors in any significant way. You talk about working with Stonetown and other commercial interests, but not the affect you have been having, burdening our neighborhood with your parking needs. All we can do is petition the city to put a two hour limit on parking but that punishes us as well.

I would like you to reconsider the amount of parking you allow within your property. You need to increase it, significantly!! Forced sustainability by decreasing parking and increasing fees doing what you think will put people on bikes and MUNI, is ill-conceived and will only make our residential neighborhood your "free" parking lot. We don't want our parking, which has been stolen by SFSU, to be ignored by your masterplan.

Very Sincerely,
Robert Bovill
(415) 681-8026
Response to Comment Letter 15

Response to Comments 15-1 and 15-2. Please also see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts*, which discusses parking in the adjacent neighborhoods.
Hello,
I wasn't able to attend yesterday's presentation, but would like to share my thoughts and suggestions:

- I didn't see bike parking outside HSS. There is a high demand for bike parking as evidenced by bikes locked to all railings, etc.

- It is essential to have more than one bike barn. The existing barn is fine for those who have classes in that area, but completely out of the way for those who don't. I'd suggest converting the parking lot adjacent to AUM into a staffed bike parking area.

- I support the concept which includes bike access through the center of campus. North/South AND East/West.

- I didn't see enforcement of the existing bike lane on Holloway mentioned. This bike lane is better than nothing, but often rendered unusable due to the rampant double-parking. I'd suggest removing parking on Holloway, and creating a separated bike path, rather than painted bike lane, adjacent to the sidewalk.

Thanks and please keep me update on this process.

Mary Brown
Student

Do you Yahoo!
Everyone is raving about the all-new Yahoo! Mail.

Office of Public Affairs & Publications
San Francisco State University
Phone: (415) 338-1665
Fax: (415) 338-1498
http://www.sfsu.edu/news.htm
Received: from iron1.sfsu.edu ([130.212.10.35])
    by smtp02.sfsu.edu (Lotus Domino Release 7.0HF314)
    with ESMTP id 2006110210173204-768886
    Thu, 2 Nov 2006 10:17:32 -0800
Response to Comment Letter 16

Response to Comment 16-1. Please also see Master Response 7, *Bicycle Parking/Lanes*, which addresses these comments.
To: maciasr@sfsu.edu  
Subject: New Clinical Science Building

Dear Mr. Macias,

With respect to the plans to build a new Clinical Science Building next to the Humanities Building at SFSU, I would politely like to make my voice heard. I am an Associate Professor in the Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures and have heard that the plans for the new building would block needed light to the Humanities Building and further result in the growth of toxic mold. For my own health and safety—as well as those of my colleagues and co-workers—I am most concerned about the negative effects that the new building would have. I favor a change in the plans as they stand and would applaud alterations to the positioning and placement of the proposed building vis-a-vis the Humanities Building. Therefore, I would like to go on record as being firmly in opposition to the current plan to build the new 5-story Clinical Science Building next to the Humanities Building at SFSU.

Sincerely,

Christopher Concolino, Ph.D.  
Associate Professor of Italian  
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures  
College of Humanities
Response to Comment Letter 17

Response to Comment 17-1. Please see Master Response 5, Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building, which addresses this comment.
To:        
From: Richard Macias <maciasr@sfsu.edu>  
Subject: Fw: HUMANITIES BLDG.: HAZARDOUS HEALTH ISSUE W/CONSTRUCTION: EI HEARING TOMORROW  
Cc:  
Bcc:  
Attached:  

HUMANITIES BLDG.: HAZARDOUS HEALTH ISSUE W/CONSTRUCTION: EI HEARING TOMORROW

THIS MESSAGE CONCERNS EVERYONE WHO WORKS IN THE HUMANITIES BUILDING!

SIGNIFICANT DISEASE RISK FOR US IF CONSTRUCTION GOES FORWARD!

The Environmental Impact hearing on the University's master plan for new construction will be tomorrow at 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. [Details below message]

The construction of the new Clinical Sciences bldg. will cause serious health problems for employees and students in the Humanities Bldg. The current plan is to construct the CS bldg. right up against the Pacific-facing side of the Humanities bldg. (the faculty wing) with a small gangway in between the 2 buildings.

This new CS building will cause all sunlight to be eliminated on the side of the Humanities building which houses all floors of the faculty offices. The Humanities building has already had a history of mold and very expensive mold removal treatment over the course of 2 years. The mold problem will return if all sunlight is blocked by CS. This will cause a serious health hazard in violation of OSHA if this plan goes ahead. Please come to the EI hearings tomorrow and make this issue known.

What we need is a delay in the construction of the CS building so that it can be re-designed and/or re-oriented and not cause a serious health hazard for many years to come!

FACULTY, STAFF & STUDENTS HAVE TO WORK IN THIS BUILDING FOR MANY YEARS--THE MOLD, MILDEW, AND SPORES WILL CAUSE UPPER RESPIRATORY DISEASE IF THIS CONSTRUCTION GOES AHEAD AS PLANNED.

The details of the hearings are as follows:

Public hearings on the EIR will be held at 3 p.m. and 6 p.m. Tuesday, March 6, in Jack Adams Hall in the Cesar Chavez Student Center.

The draft EIR is available at the J. Paul Leonard Library and at the main branch and nearby area branches of the San Francisco Public Library. It can

Printed for Richard Macias <maciasr@sfsu.edu>
No Recipient, Fw: HUMANITIES BLDG.: HAZARDOUS HEALTH ISSUE W/CONSTRUCTION: EI HEARIN

also be found at: www.sfsumasterplan.org/eir.html

Written comments on the draft EIR may be sent by campus mail to Richard Macias,
Capital Planning, Design & Construction.

Following public review, a final EIR will be prepared that will respond to oral
and written comments. The CSU Board of Trustees will review and consider the
final EIR prior to any decision to approve, revise or reject the Campus Master Plan.

For details, contact Macias at ext. 8-3838.

In union,
Dr. Linda Ellis

President, California Faculty Association, SFSU Chapter (2005-07)
www.calfac.org

Professor & Director, Museum Studies Program
San Francisco State University
www.sfsu.edu/~museumnst/
Response to Comment Letter 18

Response to Comment 18-1. Please see Master Response 5, Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building, which addresses this comment.
Comment Letter 19

San Francisco State University Campus Master Plan EIR

Comment Card:

I would like the following comments on the Draft EIR to be considered during the preparation of the Final EIR for the proposed San Francisco State University Campus Master Plan:

I have mixed feelings about the proposed development and expansion of San Francisco State University. My Aunt, Catherine Faulkner Murphy—who recently celebrated her 92nd birthday—was a pre-World War II graduate of SF State's teachers program. I was a personal friend of the late Dr. S. I. Hayakawa, former S.F. State President and later a California U.S. Senator. I attended his 70th birthday party in Mill Valley, which was visited by his mother who was already in her 90's.

As a member of the Parkmerced Residents Organization (PRO) Board, the proposed SF State "MASTER PLAN" over-develops the historical area around northern Parkmerced. Governor Gaspar Portola and Father Junipero Serra marched over Parkmerced in 1776 on the way to establish the first Spanish Camp in the future San Francisco at Pine Lake ("Laguna Puerca") in present-day Sigmund Stern Grove. The street names in Parkmerced are based on the history of Spanish California: Bucaresi was King Charles III's Visitor General of New Spain (Greater Mexico), who ordered Portola and Serra to move north into Alta California. They were earlier based in Loreto, the old capital of the Californias (founded by Father Kino in the 1690's).

Name: Dr. Terence Faulkner, Rd Date: March 6, 2007
Response to Comment Letter 19

Response to Comment 19-1. Please see Master Response 13, *Parkmerced Historical Resource Impacts*, which addresses this comment.
Aaron Goodman  
405 Serrano Dr. Apt#11-H  
San Francisco, CA  
94132

Richard Macias  
Capital Planning Design & Construction  
1600 Holloway Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94132-4021

RE: SFSU Draft EIR Comments  
Based on the Campus Master Plan Environmental Impact Report  
SCH# 2006102050

March 4, 2007

To Whom It May Concern:

The initial size of the draft EIR for a typical person would be too lengthy to digest especially even with the extended period of time noted by the SFSU team. The two meetings currently being held on campus for the draft EIR comment are similar to prior initially held design and concept meetings that were held at the beginning of the process. Too little and small a time frame, being mostly during working hours on one date. And limiting in terms of the methods that this information has been dispersed throughout the community and the city in general. This project's scope is discussing the future of the city of the western districts and impacts it will have on the surroundings, including municipal services, parks, transportation, traffic, and housing. To limit the discussion in any way regardless of it being a CSU project is a disgrace to the citizenry of the city in general. Although Jason Porth has attempted to inform and communicate the issues in a more vocal manner to me surrounding community the average local citizen has neither heard or been informed of the drastic and enormously transforming proposal this project will have and induce in terms of impacting the surrounding communities. I will attempt to in this letter review the issues I have found within this document that are contentious, and have been "washed" over in the document. The city and county of San Francisco have been remiss in their duties to protect and enforce the general plan of the city of San Francisco, and have allowed a sale of property and the ensuing development proposal.
from SFSU to occur with little or no regard for the overall impacts it has had. The city of San Francisco should be sued, or at least forced to develop a realistic plan for rental housing and development in the city, the purchase of the UPS and UPN from the university or exchange for other city property should be considered. The county and state should be involved due to numerous related CSU and UC system litigation that continues due to a lack of involvement by politicians to control the university system sprawl in this state. And the SFSU masterplan the whole process frozen until a proper development plan with real sustainable teeth, can be developed with a solid affordable rental housing and infrastructure transit development program for the citizens of San Francisco comes into place. The SFSU proposal should be rejected, and the Draft EIR rejected by the CSU as insufficiently researched, and infeasible in its size and scope of not having been reviewed in all possible scenarios, and mitigation factors, to the level required by CEQA.

Sincerely,

Aaron Goodman
Response to Comment Letter 20

Response to Comment 20-1. The length of the Draft EIR is fairly typical for a programmatic evaluation of a long-range university development plan. While the document is extensive, as the commenter notes, that is the nature of such documents, as it is necessary to evaluate the full range of topics required under CEQA at the level of detail needed to provide for an appropriate programmatic evaluation. As the document is lengthy, Chapter 2, Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures, does provide a summary of the project description, project objectives, alternatives evaluated, and a summary of impacts and mitigation measures. As noted in the comment, SF State did provide an extended public review period of 60 days, which is longer than the 45-day public review period required under the CEQA Guidelines.

Information about the various meetings conducted for this project is provided below. A summary of media coverage on the project is also provided.

Campus Master Plan Meetings. SF State held eight open houses during the development of the Campus Master Plan in 2006. Most recently, two open houses were held off campus in December 2006 to provide a forum for questions to be answered and ideas to be shared for those living in the communities most proximate to campus (Parkmerced, Lakeside, and Lake Shore Acres). The University sent a letter to each residential and business address in the 94132 zip code and to numerous other addresses in a neighboring zip code inviting neighbors to attend the open houses in December 2006. The Campus Master Plan and events surrounding it have also received frequent coverage in the Campus Memo.

EIR Scoping Meetings. Under CEQA, the EIR scoping process is intended primarily to gather input on the scope of the Draft EIR from other agencies that may have involvement in the project. Therefore, the Notice of Preparation (NOP) is sent to such agencies either directly or via the State Clearinghouse. Scoping meetings are not required unless a project is of statewide, regional or areawide significance, in which case the CEQA Guidelines indicate that at least one scoping meeting should be held. For this project, two EIR scoping meetings were held on October 24, 2006; one during the day (3:00 pm) so that agency personnel would have the opportunity to attend and one in the evening (6:00 pm) so that interested members of the public could also attend.

Under CEQA, notice of this meeting is to be provided to involved agencies and any organization or individual who has filed a written request for notice. As the campus had not received any such requests, individual notification of members of the public was not conducted. However, while not required, the availability of the Notice of Preparation (NOP), which included notice of the scoping meeting, was announced/advertised in the following manner:

- Campus Memo, a University newsletter published by the Office of Public Affairs, which provides news, information and campus event listings, included notice of the scoping meetings on two occasions (October 16 and 23, 2006).
Draft EIR Public Hearings. While CEQA does not require that public hearings be conducted, two such hearings on the Draft EIR were held on March 6th; one during the day (3:00 pm) so that agency personnel would have the opportunity to attend and one in the evening (6:00 pm) so that interested members of the public could also attend. The availability of the Draft EIR for review and the information about the public hearings was announced in the following manner:

- San Francisco Chronicle advertisement in the Public Notices section (February 1, 2007).
- San Francisco Examiner news brief regarding public hearings (March 5, 2007).
- Campus Memo notice of the upcoming release of the Draft EIR (January 22, 2007).
- Paper notices were sent out to those that had previously signed up to be on the CEQA distribution list for this project.
- Email notices were also sent out to the campus’ database of interested individuals and agencies. (This database is a compilation of names of everyone who has expressed an interest in the plan and/or EIR and provided their name and contact information to the campus. It includes anyone who submitted any comments, attended any of the scoping sessions or open houses, provided any feedback via the web, or anyone who has asked to be contacted about the master plan or EIR.) If interested individuals had not provided an email address, but rather a mailing address, letters were sent via first class US mail.
- SF State Master Plan Website provided the notice of the public hearings on the Draft EIR (http://sfsumasterplan.org/eir.html).

It should also be noted that all people in attendance at the scoping meetings and public hearings that wanted to speak were given the opportunity to speak before the meetings were closed. Therefore, the length of the meetings did not impinge of the public’s ability to make oral comments. Further, written comments on the scope of the EIR could be provided at any time during the 30-day scoping period and comments on the Draft EIR could be provided at any time during the 60-day public review period on the Draft EIR.

Media Coverage and Other University Outreach. The Campus Master Plan and EIR process has been extensively covered in the media and many articles included interviews with campus representatives. Coverage in city-wide papers included San Francisco Examiner, San Francisco Chronicle, and the San Francisco Bay Guardian. Coverage in neighborhood papers included the Sunset Beacon, Richmond Review, West Portal Monthly, and the Xpress (on-campus).

President Corrigan sent a letter to all addresses (commercial and residential) in zip code 94132, which encompasses the campus and the proximate neighborhoods, as well as the majority of 94127, which is the next most proximate zip code. Overall, a total of 13,635 letters were sent to the University’s neighbors. The letter indicated that the University is engaged in planning for its future, that its neighbors’ ideas and
opinions are important to the University in the planning process, and that additional information about the plan, as well as information about how to provide feedback on it is available through the Campus Master Plan web site, or by attending one of several open houses. The letter included an invitation to three different open houses—two of which where held off campus.

University representatives have also attended meetings of all active neighborhood organizations, including the Parkmerced Residents’ Organization, the Ingleside Terraces Homeowners Association, the Lakeside Property Owners Association, the Greater West Portal Neighborhood Association, the West of Twin Peaks Central Council, Lake Shore Acres Improvement Club, Ocean View-Merced Heights-Ingleside Terraces Neighbors in Action (OMI-NIA), the Ocean Avenue Revitalization Collaborative, and the San Francisco Police Department’s Taraval Station Monthly Community Meeting. University representatives have made presentations to local planning organizations, such as the San Francisco Planning and Urban Research Association (SPUR), and the San Francisco Housing Action Coalition. University representatives have also met with local elected officials, and the City’s Planning Department, County Transportation Authority, and the Municipal Transportation Agency. Moreover, the campus is working through the Mayor’s Office to develop a Memorandum of Understanding with the City regarding anticipated off-campus impacts. Please also see Master Response 14, Regional Housing Supply Impacts, Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts, and Master Response 16, Water and Wastewater Impacts for additional information.

Response to Comment 20-2. The City and County of San Francisco does not have jurisdiction over growth and development on the SF State campus. Please see Master Response 8, Local Control Over Campus Land Uses. Please see Master Response 14, Regional Housing Supply Impacts, which discusses the issue of displacement of existing residences. Please also see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts, which discusses issues related to transit services.
To whom it may concern:

CEQA per the introduction notes “Identifies feasible means of avoiding or substantially lessening significant adverse impacts, and evaluates a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project.”

Initial questions I need to raise regarding the Draft EIR include:

a) why is there no further proposals for densification of housing on and within the original campus boundaries?

b) UPN + UPS is noted as 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. Does the state of California condone having the SFSU foundation work in conjunction with the property manager and executive director of the Parkmerced community to constructively evict tenants, circumventing rent control laws of the city of San Francisco, removing limited rental housing stock from the market, through unnecessary construction, buy-out letters, working with well known lawyers who assist apartment complexes with removing tenants, inundating the community with students, and questionable sales of the limited San Francisco, rental housing communities of property within a possible landmark historic “district” without public or state review or comment as an under the table deal with the SFSU foundation for the university so they could become “landlords.”

c) Program EIR evaluates at a program level the effects of the maximum growth (the expanded growth density), why is the documentation on impacted communities not a part of the design information included such as ratios of students to renters since 1989?

d) [2+] design meetings held without full community input prior to scoping meetings? (Why was the community not involved completely in the initial work?)
(2) EIR scoping meetings held in October 24th 2006 held in the afternoon and evening during work hours on a difficult to reach corner of campus where
only through notifications from PRO members was the meeting informed to surrounding communities only due to protest at these and prior PRO meetings were memos sent to surrounding direct neighbors to SFSU on further meetings. (Why was the community not informed to participate in a more general and open setting?)

(2) draft EIR meetings held today on similar limited campus setting, that were through efforts of Jason Porth a new PR head appointed due to local groups dismay over communication prior between the university and neighborhood groups, in their complaints about non-control of students in surrounding communities by the university. This was distributed slightly more widely but not city-wide to multiple community groups, neighboring districts and business and municipal organizations, including news organizations, and major publications similar to the SFSU Downtown center advertisement?

e) Why has this item not been published formally in city publications or addressed in conjunction with statewide similar concerns with the state legislature? Due to similar protests currently noted statewide to UC and CSU projects by citizens living in surrounding communities to the universities? Assemblyman John Laird submitted a request for the Santa Cruz community in relation to university development, and the CSU system should be reviewed in a similar vein by the state of California due to campus impact(s) on numerous areas of the state.

f) In specific relation to the document, section 2.3 of project objectives notes a "vibrant on-campus community" Redefining Holloway and Buckingham as college main streets with 4 story residential over retail is a land-use, and zoning change that is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhoods, and would require major changes in the zoning and height and bulk of buildings proposed in this prior "family and residential" district, PRO noted our community is a residential neighborhood and district as originally planned, vibrant campus life was not a part of the zoning or original development. Can we also find out the addresses of the SFSU foundation members and turn their backyards into "vibrant on-campus communities" instead? We would only have to increase the housing density on their backyards by 100+ students per member?

g) Has the plan ever noted that the proposed "strengthening" of the university's connections to lake merced and the surrounding neighborhoods, may not be wanted, Parkmerced and LakeMerced both have strong identifying boundaries, and edges and do not need any "strengthening". Holloway street is a fine example of an urban edge to a residential district, why is this being proposed to be removed by UPS purchase and development?

h) Improving public transportation should come 1st, it's already at the point of breaking down, and SFSU has not contributed significantly to the mass transit solutions that are needed to support this size of growth. Muni M-line has not been funded significantly since 1989 or 2000 purchase of UPN and UPS. Why has the university not contributed to this development and transit improvement in a timely fashion?

i) Parking "decentralization" and claiming the campus "core" for pedestrians and bicycles, pushes all impact onto the surrounding communities and natural areas. Evening classes, and events are not mentioned in relation to new "sporting" events pavilion's placed. Overflow parking at parkmerced is a tsunami currently during campus operating hours. Numerous students that share units on Parkmerced have their own cars. Students that can't afford to live in the vicinity, often sleep in their cars on holloway and side streets. And
circle the neighborhood throwing refuse, and parking like zombies. Why is parking decentralization being considered due to comments from PRO members that "ALL-students drive?"

j) Placing the semi-public uses at the corners of campus including non-prior SFSU property, does not engage the surrounding community it bull-dozes it, and ignores it. Lot 42 promotes a private use of a public space that is a portion of Parkmerced's activity space, and would be a loss of use if converted to a building site. Why has this not been discussed as a Parkmerced site, and only as SFSU property? The Creative Arts Center proposed eliminates a Parkmerced feature/use of this site

k) A continuous green belt and "expanded recreational fields" used on campus and linking to lake-marcy. This only opens the watershed to disaster, look how students treat the Parkmerced area and you will see why we ask you if the "expanded recreational fields, for sporting events, wont impact the landscape and traffic, due to "EVENTS"?

l) Linking the university to its residential districts is not wanted, having roving bands of students on and off campus is bad enough. Why is the border of Parkmerced not seen as significant? Why are the original restrictive boundaries of the campus, being subverted by the SFSU Foundation by their purchase of land on UPN and UPS "under the radar"?

m) Holloway and font provide very clear visual barriers to the campus in the original design and layout, and should remain as such. Lake-marcy and 19th avenue also provide similar barriers to such growth. Why have other sites and/or densification designs not been shown to the level of the proposed expanded alternative shown?

n) As a campus that wants to model sustainability would this proposed expansion not be seen by an architect as urban "sprawl", why does it not make efficient use of campus redevelopment sites, nor does it discuss trade-offs for development both downtown and in blighted urban districts that SFSU has been chasing courting after in its "super-sunday" programs, international recruitment, and MySpace development. Higher density housing and walkable retail could be done by only densifying the eastern edge of campus on 19th avenue, removing sport fields and the unsightly administration building.

o) The alternative mentioned only include

Alternative 1 reduced housing growth only shows biased view and still proposed growth on UPS and UPN

Alternative 2 expanded housing growth, shows drastic growth scenario

Alternative 3 No project, only a green-house (sustainable)

These schemes do not show the alternatives of an urban downtown campus, a sister-city exchange campus scenario also internationally between foreign cities, online campus development, a development in a more blighted area, that could benefit from the development of buildings in close range to the surrounding neighborhood, nor a proposal that shows the effects of a densification of the original campus existing pre-purchase of UPN and UPS properties. Why are these not considered reasonable alternatives?
Other noted items cited below from the original draft document:

Section 2.5 notes that the superior alternative is the expanded housing growth alternative. This should be looked at carefully as growth inducing, as the proposal, ends up opening the doors on parkmerced to further development and selling off of parcels. The university already is known to have attempted buying the entire property. The original designs presented by WRT showed much more expensive development of blocks on the UPS sites. And states further in a seemingly derogatory tone that the additional areas that would be redeveloped (UPN and UPS) under this alternative are already "highly disturbed" if this is to mean we are all deranged people that should be put in an asylum, or that the already noted impact of the students documented by the university as causing major disturbance in the residential community would be alleviated by further development is a joke. The development and impact induced already should be documented as a part of the EIR, including obtaining correct factual information from surrounding rental properties UPN and UPS of the effects the growth of campus has had on the rental market since 1989-2007

Table 2-1 Summary Table

AES-3 is not Potentially Significant if it is Significant, the only mitigation measure that should be proposed is prohibiting development on parkmerced property including UPS purchased blocks by the university. These sites should be used as-is. Should be a significant impact.

AES-5 in conjunction with other site development is noted in mitigation as LS and mitigation not required. Prior campus development such as Century Village, 820 Brotherhood Way, 77 Cambron Drive, and even downtown site impacts on transportation to and from this district on the M mun line should be reviewed. Should be a significant impact

AIR-3/4 should both be seen as significant and mitigation required as traffic is a major problem, with backups along Holloway and lakeshore boulevard occurring daily. Should be a significant impact

BIO-1 sensitive habitats at new path will be obliterated by students in a rush to bike around the lake, and see if the bullrush and willow scrub is smokable. Enough marijuana plants are smoked by students off campus that the entire parkmerced area is threatened as students find that this area is an easily accessible urban plantation for their personal use. Should be a significant impact

BIO-2 ad-hoc trails on parkmerced can be seen on the towers and surrounding landscape, as well as ad-hoc party routes, and ad-hoc garbage disposal areas, during moving in and off-campus and in neighborhoods. Should be a significant impact

BIO-4 to state the university increase will not have a biological effect is bull-shit. Increased noise, traffic, recreational use, and population inducing increases will change and insite further development by the university. Should be a significant impact

CULT-2 historical building or structure or alteration of the site. Cult-2A and Cult-2B would require typically under CEQA 15064.5 evaluation of the district of parkmerced by a qualified architectural historian such as DOCOMOMO organization, and its review by the
city of san francisco’s landmark and preservation board prior to any further decisions on
UPS development. It should not only be looked at in terms of the history of CSU system,
but in terms of the city of san francisco’s development, history of racial discrimination in
rental housing developments, united nations history, city history people who lived here,
and state and national history, as one of only four rental garden apartment communities
developed in the united states of America. Should be a significant impact +++

Cult-2b (2) also notes that SFSU plan shall consider measures that would enable the
project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. Preserving units,
use as-is, or other measures that would not alter the buildings. Should be a significant
impact +++

Cult-2b (4) notes that if cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, campus shall
reconsider project plans allowing structure to remain intact, which can include project
re-design, relocation or abandonment. Should be a significant impact +++

Cult-5 cumulative damage that could contribute, through further development, and
impacts of total implementation of this proposal. Parkmerced would be drastically
impacted, and initial design intent by WRT showed further development plans, that also
were documented by Alliance realty (current owner of parkmerced) who had been
discovered to be looking at the overall re-development of parkmerced in conjunction
with S.O.M. an architectural firm downtown. There is no proof besides the initial
development documents from WRT that further development was in the pipeline. Should
be a significant impact +++

Hydro-1 not only storm run-off but debris and refuse from campus should be seen as
significant detrimental factors to lakemered, Should be a significant impact

HYDRO-4 in conjunction with reasonably foreseeable development in project vicinities,
should take into account possible further development plans shown by SFSU on
parkmerced property, and other development intent of Parkmerced property owners.
Alliance Realty. Should be a significant impact

LU-1 this will divide and or impact significantly the parkmerced community a 50 foot
building along sereno drive and foot next to 20 foot buildings is a significant adverse
affect and incompatible with current zoning and land-use. Should be a significant
impact

LU-2 conflicts with general plan of san francisco that protects rental housing stock, and
the current zoning which is RM-1 of these properties. Should be a significant impact

LU-3 these proposed changes will instigate or induce further development plans in
surrounding areas and further impact the conditions. Should be a significant impact

NOIS-I did not investigate issues of disturbance of residential neighborhoods due to
roving campus parties, and problems tenants have noted of late night noise, racing cars
and engines, which typically occur outside of sound measurement times noted, and
occur sometimes in towers which would not be perceptible base on the locations noted
where sound levels were taken.

POP-1 will cause population growth and impact the area, SFSU is actively seeking
increased enrollment, overseas and online through “myspace” website for SFSU, which
will increase numbers of students living in or around campus significantly more than what area can hold. SFSU does not provide on its campus significant densification within its own original boundaries for student dormitories, and is relying on surrounding rental housing stock to be available for student use. This impacts families and working renters within the area. Should be a significant impact.

Pop-3 Induces huge growth and will impact overburdened infrastructure such as mass transit, parking, street traffic, housing, and pollution.

Pop-4 This development will create a demand for housing based on their marketing efforts that will exceed the current supply. And has already displaced numerous residents, this has not been documented through analysis, either of parkmerced or Stonestown apartments, and should be required documentation to show the impacts on the increase in population prior and currently on these communities. Should be a significant impact.

Pop-5 This development as noted has displaced residents at Stonestown Apartments, UPN and Parkmerced UPS, and documentation has not been provided as to the effects on the community based on numbers since 1989 through 2007 and the overall effects that this growth of SFSU has had on the area. Should be a significant impact.

Pop-6 They argue it will exceed supply but should not be considered not having a cumulative effect on the area. There is limited housing rental stock in the area surrounding West Portal which is the entry point for the KLM lines to the downtown area. Should be a significant impact.

TRA-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 should all be considered significant +++ as the area is highly congested and a main thoroughfare southbound to 280 from the northbay, increased development and density, with proposed limited transit improvements will create a deadlock of traffic southbound and northbound in this vicinity. Should all be a significant impact. "Fair-share" of intersection improvements and mass transit improvements should be immediately addressed in payment and development by the university SFSU prior to any further proposed development. The system s at the brink of collapse, and substandard service already exists on the M-Muni line downtown inbound and outbound. Parking is a nightmare on and off campus. The proposed elimination of the main garage, will swamp neighborhood communities already at the limits with student parking off-campus.

UTIL-1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 should all be considered significant +++ as the last major infrastructure work was in 1992 and has not taken into account the impacts of the last 20+ years to 2007 from 1989 masterplan document.

Alternatives (Section 5)

Notes: "CEQA requires an EIR to describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project."

Examples of the comments are not given and refuted on these various grounds. These other options should be seen as alternatives and should be documented by the Draft EIR report.
A) Building densification on pre-existing boundaries of SFSU prior to UPN and UPS, showing options that densify the eastern edge of campus with its “dual” connections to the stoneway and Holloway muni stops was not proposed.

B) Regional centers downtown, and options that show possible urban or blighted area development downtown such as on market street were not shown or proposed.

C) Alternative development locations such as increased “online” campus, and international “sister-city” campus developments that would promote the discussed exchange of people without the proposed growth impacts shown by this plan.

Under Section 5.2 the limitation of the range of alternatives shown, is improper considering the overall program aspect of this draft EIR document. The analysis should be broad and open to design suggestions, and proactive in looking at the remote, or speculative alternatives to mitigate the significant impacts due to its long term timespan of development on the city. The “decision-makers” being the SFSU Foundation and the Board of Regents for CSU are ignoring the impacts on the city and surrounding neighborhoods and natural features of Lakemmerced. The prior boundaries of the SFSU site were limitations that should not have been allowed to be “over-stepped”. The lack of governmental oversight on the CSU state developed expansion plans, does not show proper oversight by the city or state agencies and should be put on hold till a thorough and effective review of the current and prior situation and the reasons some transactions were not reviewed by the state, to come to light.

This section also notes most of the impacts as reducible which is again “bull-shit” and notes that only CULT-2 NOIS-1 and TRA-1 will be the only significant and unavoidable issues thereby noting that the “expanded growth alternative” is the best solution per the EIR document author. This is again an improper and contested point. The issues that have been raised by community members both in strongly written and vocalized issues at both meetings and during prior submission periods should dictate that the issues noted prior should be all considered significant.

Section 5.3 notes items as infeasible the suggestions made by local groups. The expansion of the “valley” at the expense of surrounding neighborhoods and “URBAN SPRAWL” by the university is unacceptable. The preferred selection noted came about after extreme negative comment on the Options A,B,C,D and still induce negative comment by numerous surrounding groups even with the changes made.

Section 5.3.2 Off-Campus Alternatives, the university notes they don’t own any land which could be rectified by discussion with city and local planning groups to acquire land in exchange for UPS and UPN downtown and in blighted or development districts downtown such as the market street corridor, the bayview hunter’s point district, and other international, or surrounding bay area developments or campuses similar to a satellite campus structure. Off campus alternatives should be evaluated based on impacts to surrounding rental neighborhoods and impacts noted above.

Section 5.3.3 notes the high costs or rehabilitation etc. as an excuse not to develop on campus. An extensive and more investigative approach to densification should be used due to the noted “SFSU intent” to provide “green-and sustainable” development. Existing buildings such as the wasted effort on the science building on the east edge of campus should be looked at as these areas and the parking lot and center valley and sports-
facilities proposed are not the critical developments needed for growth of an urban campus. Housing is, and should be, the proposed building developments similar to Century Village on campus. The impacts of this development on neighboring areas was not even included in the document.

Section 5.4 notes the alternatives evaluated in detail but no mention of the suggested alternative of "NO development on Parkmerced property or known as UPS" was evaluated. The 'expanded housing growth alternative' does not discuss the reasons certain blocks were selected, nor was it discussed the possible induced development on the reduced schemes that were noted in prior presentations by WRT and Toro, on proposed plans by Alliance Realty (current owners of Parkmerced). No mention of the retail and housing components were discussed in detail. Images of the prior proposed street development included a museum and gateway from the center of San Juan Bautista circle at the heart of Parkmerced to the campus with SF State development on either side of Fuerite Ave.

The backing of the development by the SF State Foundation brings into question the motives and profit seeking by universities statewide. In purchasing and running the rental areas out of town, by turning these areas to for-profit developments for the university's "foundation" group.

Section 5.4.1.1 notes that the replacement of existing housing on campus with higher density such as "Mary Park Hall" is not feasible. However there was significant money available for the new housing and student centers on the southwest portion of campus. The money for the library expansion/renovation was easily obtained, so housing and development of existing units should be reviewed.

Section 5.4.1.2 Aesthetics of the impact on AES-3 in terms of zoning housing and the Historic Character of the Parkmerced District is not taken seriously. Therefore the city and state of California in the interests of the rental communities in urban areas, should take the lead in reviewing the district as a historical resource being only 1 of 4 rental garden community developments in the USA. This area of Parkmerced should be protected, and reviewed properly given time to have a full analysis undertaken by a professional organization to obtain a landmark-district status and protect the buildings and district from further/future development plans. Mitigation AES-3 does not make the impact less than significant in level. Under section 5.4.2.2.

Section 5.4.2.1 notes that "no other land beyond these properties to the north and south were considered in this alternative (eg. Other locations within Villas Parkmerced)" is an out and out lie, and perjury charges should be filed against SF State Foundation, WRT and UPS, as original attempts to purchase the Parkmerced property by SF State Foundation failed when Alliance bought the property. The original plans of the university were to convert the entire Parkmerced property into dormitories. Already the towers at Arboreal drive are being stuffed with students. Alliance residential company is pro-actively wooing students with allowing them to sign multi-tenant leases sometimes with up to 4 students signing a lease and living in 2-bedroom units on parkmerced property. The original WRT documents showed further development on parkmerced site. And information was obtained as noted prior that Skidmore Owings and Merrill a well known architectural firm in the bay area was reviewing design proposals for a masterplanning of the parkmerced site. Whether this was in conjunction with SF State Foundation or just by Alliance there has already been proven verbal and written communications between Alliance and SF State that point to the "cooperative" effort to develop the UPS site and development of those properties and possible future "LONG-TERM" partnering on further future developments.
This section further notes:

**Land-use planning issues** in one sentence with no impact as noted prior this also is incorrect and significant impacts occur based on the current zoning maps, which would require major changes in land-use in the area.

**Population and housing** notes the cumulative impacts as not considerable.
I invite the entire CSU board to meet with residents of Parkmerced in the areas to find out the impacts this document disregards. People have been displaced, no documentation on their moving out was shown for UHR and UPS, the increased students in the towers and garden units is readily visible, and its effects have been documented and written to SFSU for years.

**Transit Circulation and Parking** impacts are enormous, and without proper infrastructure improvements such as the grade-crossing near Stonestown over 19th Avenue, increased train lengths and frequency on the Muni line, the impacts on parking and traffic will multiply significantly. The elimination of the on-campus parking and expecting students to walk and take transit and bike is nonsense, as can be documented during day and night classes along Holloway, daily, and in the Parkmerced neighborhood, or during the cramming and rush hour madness that ensues during and between classes when students have to shift their cars, to find a new spot and avoid a ticket. Students sleep in their cars, they park throughout the parkmerced campus and this is a major impact on the neighborhood of parkmerced.

**Section 5.5** is the GRAND-Daddy “bull-shit” statement of them all. As it notes the “EXPANDED HOUSING GROWTH ALTERNATIVE” is the best solution. This right here is the culmination of negligence on the part of the University and the Foundation in doing their “homework” on the surrounding neighborhoods and the proposed effects of their “mandated” campus growth per CSU standards/proposals. They note population driven as the major cause of the impacts, but not in their mitigation factors this discussed or mentioned in how to alleviate and mitigate with the City of San Francisco, this urgently pressing issue. The expanded alternative ignores all the prior mentioned conflicts surrounding neighborhoods have mentioned. It ignores all issues cited prior in the document.

To state that knocking down possible historic districts for the benefit of campus’s needs to re-establish their pristine garden valley center by pushing all developments both north south east and west in whatever shape and form possible is NUTS. I don’t think we as tenants are “highly disturbed” as mentioned in the last paragraph, although the effects of all prior development since 1989 and the push of students forcibly or inadvertently through not developing proper housing for students on campus has as noted “Disturbed” neighborhoods such as Parkmerced. Nor was this neighborhood disturbed when Leona Helmley managed the property and kept the facilities in working order. Residents were mainly families, and thus the SOTA site being proposed to sell to SFSU, also comes into question when we decide such development as school sites are extremely hard to acquire and usually end up costing cities millions.

Only based on the poor later management by Carmel Properties, Olympic View Realty and the Current Alliance Realty Executive Director Bert Polacci who instigated the sale, and downhill trend of the Parkmerced site, was this sale of UPS pushed through under the
table/radar. To date no lawsuit, or legal-protest to the sale of this land was ever made even though it effects the City rental stock and tax base and the City of San Francisco. In the history of Parkmerced always backing the protection of these units based on the initial development and intent of allowing Met-Life to build the units. The proposals for Expanded Growth in Parkmerced would never have occurred if this area was a protected landmark district. The current push to develop 77 Cambon and 800 Brotherhood (currently in litigation) as a way to encroach further onto the parkmerced area, and the overall impact of development. The lack of political push to preserve this area, and the difficulty obtaining landmark status for a “district” should be taken into consideration by all parties reviewing this letter. The benefit of preserving this area from the “EXPANDED growth alternative” proposed by SFSU is mandatory in keeping the rental and prior affordable and rent-controlled units as a stock of housing for the city of San Francisco for the future.

It was the original intent of the board of supervisors when the original development of Parkmerced occurred with Met-Life, and should be seen as the underlying and compelling reason to refute this Draft EIR prepared by CSU’s SFSU Foundation as rubbish, nonsense, and non-responsive to the documented issues raised by surrounding neighborhood groups in their push to preserve and maintain the limited resource of rental housing in the city of San Francisco.......

REJECT SFSU’s Draft EIR and Final EIR, and Intercede to protect the Parkmerced area and limit the eventual impacts of the proposed development on the entire city, to prevent further deterioration of this and other neighboring districts, systems, housing, land-use, and property values both financial and aesthetic for the future generations of people to live in this city.

Sincerely

Aaron Goodman

2nd Vice President of the Parkmerced Resident’s Organization
P.R.O. Board Member
Parkmerced “TENANT”

Architect Concerned with the proposed development and disregard for Historic resources such as rental masterplanned districts such as Parkmerced, and their needed protection in the City and county of San Francisco, as well as in the interest of protecting rental housing for the State of California. [We have enough suburban sprawl as it is]

See: Submittal to the Landmarks Board sent this last November and letter from Docomomo Report and website on the Landscape and Historic Character of Parkmerced, www.outsidelands.org, which discussed Parkmerced in general and cites historic documents, as well as the sister developments in the state, La Brea Apartments, Park-Fairfax in Virginia (already labeled as a historic district in terms of planning and design, and Stuyvesant town in New York.)

cc: document will be sent to all possible organizations and agencies as a refutation and dismissal of the Draft EIR as non-complying with CEQA and issues raised by tenants and neighborhood organizations in general and specific issues
Response to Comment Letter 21

Response to Comment 21-1. Please see Master Response 3, Need for More On-Campus Housing, which indicates why locating more housing within the campus core is not considered viable.

The commenter notes that the University has been working in concert with Parkmerced’s property manager. The University has been working with the property manager in responding to residents’ concerns about student conduct off campus. To facilitate collaboration and communication with its neighbors on issues surrounding student conduct and quality of life in the communities neighboring the campus, the University has established the Neighborhood Taskforce over the course of the past year. The University initiated the Taskforce because it cherishes its standing as a valued part of the community and is committed to being recognized as a good neighbor. The Taskforce is a partnership between the University’s administration, faculty, and staff, its student leadership, our neighbors, and government officials and agencies. The Taskforce is an inclusive partnership, representing various points of view and constituencies. A broad range of perspectives is welcomed and membership is open to any interested student or community member. The Offices of Mayor Gavin Newsom, Supervisor Sean Elsbernd, and the San Francisco Police Department all actively participate on the Taskforce.

Over the course of this past year, the Taskforce has accomplished some early successes. University representatives meet regularly with neighbors and resident associations in Parkmerced and other neighboring communities, with Parkmerced management, City officials, and the police to coordinate responses to student conduct off campus. Additionally, due to a change in the State’s Education Code, the University and its Police now enforce the CSU Code of Conduct both on and off campus. The CSU police patrol Parkmerced and students creating disturbances or otherwise violating the law off campus (including disruptive parties, underage consumption of alcohol, drug use) are subject to discipline on campus. Parkmerced residents have been encouraged to contact the University Police at any time should concerns arise regarding students—both on and off campus. Additionally, the Taskforce has created an on-line course, “Welcome to the Neighborhood,” which will educate students about the neighborhood, provide tips for being a good neighbor, and alert students to ramifications they may face for engaging in disruptive conduct off campus.

Please see Response to Comment 25-6 regarding the purchase of UPS and UPN. Please also see Master Response 13, Parkmerced Historical Resource Impacts, for information about historical resource impacts related to redevelopment in UPS.

Response to Comment 21-2. CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines do not require assessment of social or economic impacts of a project, in and of themselves, including the potential for changed demographics of surrounding residential communities. The Draft EIR does however evaluate the potentially significant physical environmental impacts of the project, including those that may occur in the surrounding area. In particular, please see Draft EIR Section 4.10, Population and Housing and Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking. Please also see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts, and Master Response 14, Regional Housing Supply Impacts.
Additionally, please see Master Response 11, *Baseline of Environmental Analysis*, which indicates that the existing physical environmental conditions provide the baseline physical conditions against which project-related changes are compared.

**Response to Comment 21-3.** Please see Response to Comment 21-1.

**Response to Comment 21-4.** Please see Response to Comment 21-1.

**Response to Comment 21-5.** Please see Response to Comment 7-4. Please also see Master Response 4, *Village Main Streets*.

**Response to Comment 21-6.** This comment questions the desirability of strengthening connections between the campus and Lake Merced and between the campus and the neighboring residential community of Villas Parkmerced, and suggests that the boundaries of these two adjacent areas be maintained.

As the largest natural freshwater body in San Francisco, Lake Merced is a regional recreational resource, a significant natural resource and education area, and an emergency water resource for the City. The multi-lane roadways that surround the lake are artificial boundaries, the result of urbanization over time, which make pedestrian and bicycle access difficult and unsafe for neighbors and visitors from throughout the region who use the lake for fishing, boating, jogging, bicycling, golfing, picnicking, bird watching, and appreciation of the natural environment. The lake’s historic watershed was ten times its current size.

The campus and Lake Merced share a common ecological history. The Campus Master Plan reestablishes a physical and hydrological link between the campus and lake with the creation of a seasonal creek flowing into Lake Merced, which would also add fresh water to the lake and help improve the lake’s water levels. Moreover, the proposed stormwater management system in its entirety, with its network of bioswales and rain gardens, contributes to the health of the watershed by allowing water to infiltrate on site, recharging the groundwater. The proposed reintroduction of native plant communities along the creek corridor extends and improves habitat. In addition, the Campus Master Plan provides a safe pedestrian path connection via the proposed undercrossing below Lake Merced Boulevard that links the campus and lake as one continuous open space for the benefit of the entire district.

Programmatically, the University has a longstanding connection to the lake. Many departments within the University—notably Geography, Environmental Studies, Recreation and Leisure Studies, Biology, and Engineering—use the lake for teaching, research, and service. Professor of Geography Barbara Holzman’s website, “The Biogeography of Lake Merced,” [http://bss.sfsu.edu/holzman/LakeMerced/Default.htm](http://bss.sfsu.edu/holzman/LakeMerced/Default.htm) presents faculty and graduate student research on the physical and cultural geography of the lake and is a resource for all to use. The Community Sailing Program operated by the Department of Leisure Studies offers adult and youth summer and year-round sailing programs to the larger community in partnership with the San Francisco Recreation and Park Department and YMCA.
With the acquisition of the University Park South property—formerly the northernmost blocks of Parkmerced—Holloway Avenue has become an internal rather than edge street, serving both the University and Parkmerced. The Campus Master Plan envisions Holloway as an active, tree-lined street, inviting to pedestrians and bicyclists. Future campus buildings as well as proposed housing will open onto the street, providing retail and other ground-floor uses that animate and contribute to the safety of the street.

The north-south pedestrian and bicycle path and bridge connecting Buckingham Way to Cardenas Avenue is intended to provide the campus community and neighbors with a pleasant, park-like route through campus as an alternative to 19th Avenue.

Response to Comment 21-7. Please see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts, which indicates that the University is engaged in discussions with the City regarding any anticipated off-campus impacts of its growth, including transit. In terms of the University’s contributions made to date, the on-going maintenance of the SF State M-line platform is paid for by SF State. Additionally, the University’s shuttle service between the campus and the Daly City BART station addresses existing capacity issues on Muni’s 28-line and 28L-line.

Response to Comment 21-8. In response to the statement from PRO that “all students drive,” in fact only 25 percent of students drive alone to campus, which includes those who park off campus and walk (another 25 percent carpool or are dropped off), based on cordon surveys conducted as part of the Campus Master Plan Existing Conditions Analysis (WRT, 2006). Please also see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts, for a discussion of parking issues.

Response to Comment 21-9. The Campus Master Plan locates the new Creative Arts complex on the site of the existing softball field at Lake Merced and Font Boulevards and creates a new replacement softball field at 19th Avenue just east of Hensill and Thornton Halls. As a public institution, SF State makes this and other recreational facilities available to the community at large. Additionally, the creation of a gym-recreation/wellness center could include discounted community memberships for those living in close proximity to the campus. Such memberships could include access to the pool and other amenities not currently available in the area.

Response to Comment 21-10. The Draft EIR evaluates the impacts of the Campus Master Plan, including expanded recreational fields, on the water quality of Lake Merced (see Section 4.7, Hydrology). Please also see Chapter 3, Change to the Draft EIR, for revisions to this analysis. Please also see Response to Comment 21-26.

Under the Campus Master Plan, the only new field in the valley portion of the campus is a multi-purpose field that would be located on the western edge of campus. This field could be used for soccer or other similar sports. An existing softball field would also be relocated from its current site on the corner of Lake Merced and Font Boulevards, to the valley on the eastern edge of the campus. As this field
Currently exists it would not constitute a new use. Additionally, the existing tennis courts currently located on the western end of the valley would be relocated to the top of the existing parking garage.

It is not anticipated that sports played at the new multi-purpose field or other fields in the valley would be of the type that would draw large numbers of people from off-campus locations. Further, games that may be held at these locations are likely to occur during the day or evening or on the weekends at times when background traffic levels are lower than during the PM peak hour evaluated in the Draft EIR (4:30-5:30 pm). For these reasons, sporting event-related traffic would not be expected to result in traffic levels above and beyond those evaluated in the Draft EIR (see Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking).

**Response to Comment 21-11.** Please see Response to Comment 21-6.

**Response to Comment 21-12.** Please see Response to Comment 21-6.

**Response to Comment 21-13.** Please see Response to Comment 21-6.

**Response to Comment 21-14.** Please see Response to Comment 5-6.

**Response to Comment 21-15.** Alternative 2, *Expanded Housing Growth* (Draft EIR page 5-14) does not contemplate development in Parkmerced, but rather contemplates redevelopment on the University’s property located in UPS and UPN to provide for more housing. Further, SF State does not own, nor is it contemplating purchasing property in the future in Parkmerced. Therefore, University development in UPS and UPN, in and of itself, will not induce growth beyond these areas. As indicated in Impact POP-2 (Draft EIR page 4.10-13), the project would not induce substantial population growth, as the provision of expanded utilities would only be sized to serve increased enrollment and employment anticipated under the Campus Master Plan. Please also see Response to Comment 21-2.

**Response to Comment 21-16.** Comment noted. The commenter does not present substantial evidence to support the conclusion that development in Parkmerced would have a significant and unavoidable impact on the visual character of the area (Impact AES-3, page 4.1-12).

**Response to Comment 21-17.** Comment noted. The commenter does not present substantial evidence to support the conclusion that cumulative development would have a significant impact on the visual character of the area (see Impact AES-5, Draft EIR page 4.1-16). Further, traffic and transit impacts are evaluated in Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking, and are not part of the analysis of effects on visual character.

**Response to Comment 21-18.** Comment noted. The commenter does not present substantial evidence to support the conclusion that traffic-related air emissions would have a significant impact (see Impact AIR-3 and -4, Draft EIR pages 4.2-18 through 4.2-21). Further, the analysis of air impacts was done in accordance with the Bay Area Air Quality Management District’s CEQA Guidelines, Assessing the Air Quality Impacts of Projects and Plans (BAAQMD 1999), as described on Draft EIR pages 4.2-8 through 4.2-9.
Response to Comment 21-19. Please see Master Response 12, Biological Resource Impacts.

Response to Comment 21-20. Draft EIR Impact BIO-2 addresses impacts related to loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds. The creation of ad-hoc trails is identified in Mitigation BIO-2B as it relates to the potential for disturbance of sensitive bird habitat in the marsh vegetation around the edges of the lake. Ad-hoc trails and related concerns in the Parkmerced area are not the subject of this impact evaluation. Please see Master Response 1, Response to Neighborhood Issues, for additional information.

Response to Comment 21-21. Impact BIO-4 (see Draft EIR page 4.3-17) addresses those impacts on sensitive natural communities or special-status species that could result from the development of the proposed Campus Master Plan in conjunction with other cumulative projects (e.g., 77 Cambon Drive). This discussion indicates that potential impacts to sensitive natural communities and special-status species are described in Impacts BIO-1 through BIO-2 and that where these impacts are considered potentially significant, mitigation is proposed above to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level (see Mitigations BIO-1 and BIO-2). These impacts address the potential for removal of sensitive habitat and disturbance-related impacts associated with the increased presence of people and/or construction noise. The discussion further indicates that cumulative project sites (e.g., 77 Cambon) in the vicinity of the campus are already mostly developed and therefore, these projects would not result in impacts to wetlands or other sensitive natural communities and therefore would not accumulate with the proposed project.

Any or all of the reasonably foreseeable cumulative projects, however, could potentially impact nesting birds, if such nesting is taking place in on-site trees at the time of project construction. However, as standard pre-construction surveys for nesting birds, such as that identified in Mitigation BIO-2A, would also be required by the City and County of San Francisco, as appropriate, such surveys would ensure that nesting birds are not disturbed as a result of construction activities. Therefore, the Draft EIR concluded that neither development on campus, nor reasonably foreseeable future development within the southwestern portion of San Francisco, would result in a significant cumulative impact associated with adverse effects to sensitive natural communities and/or special-status species.

Increased vehicle traffic and population and related noise would not likely affect sensitive habitat and species in an urban area, if they are present, unless such activities were being introduced into a biologically sensitive area that was not already subjected to such disturbance. Further, as indicated in Section 4.9, Noise, traffic-related noise increases would be minimal (see Impact NOIS-2, page 4.9-15).

Response to Comments 21-22 through 21-25. Please see Master Response 13, Parkmerced Historical Resource Impacts.

Response to Comment 21-26. The system will be designed such that sediment and refuse that may be present will settle out or will otherwise be captured prior to discharge. As indicated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007), detailed design studies are planned for the creek corridor and for the Lake
Response to Comment 21-27. Please see Response to Comment 21-15, which indicates that SF State is not planning to purchase property in Parkmerced. Also, it should be noted that the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department was contacted for a list of reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the campus. This list includes projects that have been approved, but not yet constructed, or projects for which an application is pending. No projects in the Parkmerced complex were identified on that list. While the University is aware that Parkmerced is considering some redevelopment and has been conducting community outreach in that regard, the University is unable to assess the scope or nature of any plans, as to do so would be speculative at this time.

Response to Comment 21-28. Impact LU-1 assesses whether the project would physically divide an established community. The proposed redevelopment of housing in UPS will be constructed within a similar lot pattern as the existing development and will be located on the northern edge of the Villas Parkmerced residential complex. Therefore, this redeveloped housing will not physically divide the Villas Parkmerced residential complex. Moreover, roadway connections between Holloway Avenue, Font Boulevard, and 19th Avenue in the vicinity of the UPS property and the SOTA site will remain unchanged, allowing for continued access through or to these properties. Overall, the Draft EIR concluded that the proposed Campus Master Plan will not physically divide an established community (see Draft EIR page 4.8-6 for further information).

Response to Comment 21-29. Please see Response to Comment 7-4.

Response to Comment 21-30. Please see Response to Comment 21-15. Please also see Draft EIR page 4.8-10 for a discussion of the basis for the impact conclusion for Impact LU-3. This impact does not evaluate growth-inducing impacts of the project, but rather assesses whether cumulative growth in the vicinity would result in the development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with adjacent land use. As indicated in the Draft EIR, the majority of future development in the area is expected to consist of redevelopment of existing properties (e.g., 77 Cambon Drive), but a very limited amount of new development on undeveloped parcels may also occur in the vicinity of campus (e.g., 800 Brotherhood Way). Such development will be expected to be in general conformance with local land use plans and therefore will not likely result in substantial incompatibilities with surrounding land uses. As a result, the Draft EIR concluded that cumulative development in the vicinity of the SF State campus in the accordance with the local land use plans will not be expected to introduce land uses that will be substantially incompatible with the proposed campus development or other adjacent development.

Response to Comment 21-31. Impact NOIS-1 (page 4.9-13) evaluates the potential for substantial temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels associated with construction activities. As indicated in the discussion of standards of significance on page 4.9-10, noise impacts evaluated under the CEQA Guidelines include those that relate to substantial permanent or temporary increases in ambient noise levels. Substantial temporary increases are associated mainly with construction activities. Please
see Master Response 1, *Response to Neighborhood Issues*, for a discussion of student conduct off campus.

**Response to Comments 21-32 through 21-36.** Please see Master Response 14, *Regional Housing Supply Impacts*, for discussion of housing-supply related issues. Please see Master Response 6, *Proposed Enrollment Increase*, which discusses the basis for the proposed enrollment increase. Please see Response to Comments 7-11 and 21-2.

**Response to Comment 21-37.** Please see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts*.

**Response to Comment 21-38.** Comment noted. The commenter does not present substantial evidence to support the conclusion that utility impacts should be considered significant. Please see Chapter 4.12, *Utilities and Public Services*, for the basis for impact conclusions (Draft EIR page 4.12-10 through 4.12-18).

**Response to Comment 21-39.** Please see Response to Comment 5-6.

**Response to Comment 21-40.** The basis for the range of alternatives discussed in Section 5.2 (see page 5-3) is in accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Please see Response to Comment 21-6 regarding the boundaries of the campus. Please also see Master Response 8, *Local Control Over Campus Land Uses*.

**Response to Comment 21-41.** The determination of impact significance provided in this EIR is based on the standards of significance and other specifications requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Further, the methodologies and analytical approaches employed in the analyses are based on current standards of professional CEQA practice. No substantial evidence has been submitted during the public review of the Draft EIR that would indicate that: (1) impacts that were determined to be less than significant, should be considered significant; or (2) significant impacts that were determined to be mitigatable through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures, should be considered significant and unavoidable. Having said that, revisions have been made to the Draft EIR impact analysis and mitigation measures in response to public comments (see Chapter 3, *Changes to the Draft EIR*). Additionally, it should also be noted that any proposed future development would be subject to a project-specific analysis under CEQA, which would ensure that environmental impacts have been fully addressed and mitigated.

**Response to Comment 21-42.** Comment noted. Please also see Master Response 3, *Need for More On-Campus Housing* for a discussion about why building more housing in the campus core is not considered viable.

**Response to Comment 21-43.** The CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(c) indicates that among the factors that may be used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (1) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (2) infeasibility, or (3) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts. As indicated on Draft EIR page 5-5, SF State is primarily an undergraduate
institution where the critical mass of students and faculty and diversity of course options are what make for a rich education. Moving some of the educational programs and faculty to SF State regional centers would not support the educational mission of the SF State campus. Additionally, locating campus housing at a remote location elsewhere in the San Francisco also would not meet the project objective of providing more close-in housing that enables faculty, staff, and students to walk to school or work. Providing adequate on-campus housing is important as well because it reinforces the academic mission of the campus by providing for opportunities for student-faculty and student-student interactions, greater access to resources and assistance, etc.

Moreover, neither of these options (i.e., locating some programs to SF regional centers or locating new housing off-campus) would avoid the significant unavoidable traffic impact of the project. In fact, these options would likely increase traffic between these off-campus locations and the main SF State campus. For the above reasons, these options were not further evaluated in this EIR.

**Response to Comment 21-44.** Comment noted. Please also see Master Response 3, *Need for More On-Campus Housing* for a discussion about why building more housing in the core is not considered viable.

**Response to Comment 21-45.** Alternative 1, Reduced Housing Growth does not contemplate any redevelopment of existing housing in UPS and UPN. See Draft EIR page 5-9. Please also see Response to Comment 21-15, which indicates that SF State is not planning to purchase property in Parkmerced.

**Response to Comment 21-46.** In the long-term (i.e., beyond 2020) existing student housing in the campus core (e.g., Mary Park Hall) will be replaced with higher density housing. The Draft EIR indicates that the replacement of this housing with higher density housing is not feasible at this time, given that such housing is already paid for and is not beyond its useful life (see page 5-9). The campus does not consider it practical or economical to replace buildings that are not beyond their useful lives. It should also be noted that such housing that is already paid for, helps fund the construction of new housing through student housing fees.

**Response to Comment 21-47.** Impact AES-3 evaluates the impacts of the Campus Master Plan on surrounding areas, including the Villas Parkmerced neighborhood, in terms of whether it would result in a substantial degradation of the visual character. Issues related to the area as an historic resource are evaluated in Impact CULT-2. Please see Master Response 13, *Parkmerced Historical Resource Impacts* for further discussion of the programmatic evaluation of potentially significant historic structures on campus, including existing buildings in University Park South. Please also see Master Response 9, *Program vs. Project-Level EIR Analysis* regarding the programmatic nature of the environmental analysis provided in the Draft EIR. Additionally, it should also be noted that any proposed future development on the campus would be subject to a project-specific analysis under CEQA, which would ensure that environmental impacts have been fully addressed and mitigated.

**Response to Comment 21-48.** Please see Response to Comment 21-15. It should also be noted that Alternative 2, Expanded Housing Growth was developed and evaluated in the Draft EIR. The statement
provided on page 5-14 that no other land beyond these properties to the north and south was considered in this alternative (e.g., other locations within Villas Parkmerced), is an accurate statement. The campus is not considering expanding beyond UPN and UPS.

**Response to Comment 21-49.** Please see Response to Comment 7-4.

**Response to Comment 21-50.** Since the purchase of the Stonestown apartments (UPN) and the northern edge of the Villas Parkmerced development starting in 2000, the SF Foundation and SF State have not required, requested, or otherwise displaced existing residents in these areas. Further, as indicated in the Draft EIR, the formal conversion of existing units in these areas to SF State uses would take place only as existing tenants voluntarily vacate their units (see page 4.10-16). Please see Master Response 14, *Regional Housing Supply Impacts*, for additional discussion of the potential for displacement of existing residents from proposed development contemplated in the Campus Master Plan.

It should be noted that the University does not oversee or otherwise have control over the management of units elsewhere in the Parkmerced complex. The possible wrongful displacement of existing residents in this area is a property management issue and is not the responsibility of the University. Having said that, SF State is attempting to maximize the provision of new on-campus housing so that more students can live on campus than is currently the case, thereby reducing the demand for housing adjacent the campus. Please also see Master Response 14, *Regional Housing Supply Impacts*.

**Response to Comments 21-51 and 21-52.** Please see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts* for a discussion of traffic and parking issues raised during the public review period.

**Response to Comment 21-53.** The Draft EIR indicates that the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would reduce the project’s significant impacts with respect to traffic and air quality, and would place a reduced demand on off-campus housing supply (see page 5-20). As indicated in Response to Comment 21-43, the provision of academic programs or housing at SF State regional centers or other remote locations would likely increase these impacts. Please also see Master Response 3, *Need for More On-Campus Housing* for a discussion about why building more housing in the campus core is not considered viable. It should be noted that while the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) that will be recommended for approval to the CSU Board of Trustees does not reflect this level of housing construction by 2020, the horizon for plan. Please see Chapter 2, *Project Refinements*, which indicates that the final plan does provide for additional housing by reducing the size of the conference center and providing for some additional redevelopment in UPN.

The statement regarding areas that would be redeveloped (UPN and UPS) under this alternative being already “highly disturbed,” is in reference to the fact that these areas consist of built environments with minimal or no natural habitat remaining. Please see response to other comments above for additional information.
Hello and good day,

I would like to start by saying I am excited about the master plan and the potential growth of the University in so many ways. Thank you for all of your hard work in helping make all of this happen.

I would like to put in a request though for review within the plan itself. As buildings are being built, offices relocated and space changing ownership, it is my hope that you keep in the mind the need for student organization space. This space can be in the form of office space, meeting space and/or storage. We have over 200 identified student organizations on campus, many of which are affiliated in some way with an academic department. There is simply not enough space for groups on campus and think this is a great opportunity to better accommodate students/student organization needs.

I realize I have brought up student space before in prior planning meetings and do feel that it is being reviewed/incorporated in some way regarding event, meeting and programmatic space. However, the issue of storage and office needs do not appear to be part of the plan. I am not sure about the possibility of such spaces, but do hope that this issue will be kept in mind during your planning process.

If you have any questions or concerns, I am happy to address them in person, via email or phone (415-336-3865).

Thank you again for all your hard work and take care,

Joey

Joey D. Greenwell, Director
Office of Student Programs and Leadership Development
Student Services Building, Suite 105
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Ave
San Francisco, CA 94132

415-338-3885 (Direct)
415-338-3888 (Assistant)
415-338-2172 (Fax)
http://www.sfsu.edu/~ospld

Empowering students to succeed as academic scholars, community leaders and conscientious citizens at SFSU and beyond.
Response to Comment Letter 22

Response to Comment 22-1. The comment states that the University does not currently have enough space for its over 200 recognized student organizations. Particularly, the commenter seeks more storage and office space for these organizations. As part of the Campus Master Plan, the University envisions a gymnasium/recreation-wellness center. While the specific plans for the building will not be developed until a later date, it is conceptually viewed as a campus social center, taking a holistic approach to wellness and play. As one center of student life on campus, it may incorporate additional space for student organizations.
February 23rd, 2007

Richard Macias, Capital Planning, Design & Construction
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132-4021

Subject: Comments on San Francisco State University Master Plan

Dear Mr. Macias:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the SFSU Draft Master Plan (Plan). In general, I think the Plan is wonderful. It offers a well-defined vision that incorporates several ambitious features, such as restoring the valley as the central open space feature of the campus along with a portion of the creek that will once again flow into Lake Merced, that make it a very exciting project. I hope that you do not abandon some of those fantastic ideas as things progress.

My comments revolve primarily around the campus infrastructure issues covered in Chapter 10, and specifically, issues surrounding energy production and use.

Although Chapter 10 contains the qualifier that “the recommendations...are preliminary, and further studies...will be performed” and that the Plan “recommends a campus-wide integrated strategic energy resource plan,” several critical factors and issues are not mentioned in the Plan that should be.

CSU Executive Order 987 states that “the CSU shall develop a strategic plan for energy procurement and production to reduce energy capacity requirements from the electricity grid, and to promote energy independence using available economically feasible technology (solar, wind, biomass) and for on-site generation.” It goes on to list some specific renewable portfolio targets. Presumably, any campus undertaking the development of a Master Plan that will carry through 2020 would be well advised to take this declaration and these targets into account. I was able to find no mention whatsoever of biomass or wind power in the Plan, and the only mention of photovoltaics (PV) is almost parenthetical on page 96, when it is mentioned in passing as one of many opportunities for the implementation of sustainable principles. PV should be taken a lot more seriously, and should be a key component and central on-site energy generation component of the Plan. It can be considered both as a retrofit item for the rooftops of suitable existing buildings not slated for demolition, as well as integrated into the design of new construction. On-site conversion of biomass from grounds-keeping operations and food waste could offset a portion of energy use. And is the idea of wind turbines at the western edge of the campus along Lake Merced Boulevard completely out of the question?
Specific comments by page number:

Page 97. Central Utility Plant
The statement that the natural gas-fired central utility plant “is an ideal system to reduce dependence on purchased power sources” is inaccurate. Although it is true that SFSU lessens its dependence on the electrical grid for its power via the plant, the school must still purchase the fuel - natural gas or diesel - in order to run the generators. This does nothing to establish energy independence, or to achieve goals of energy security and sustainability. These two fuels are particularly vulnerable to price volatility and future shortages. In the final analysis, the current on-site plant is itself a purchased power source. The only avenue for true sustainability involves systems that provide true on-site power generation such as PV and wind.

Page 98. Central Plant – Energy Independence and Sustainability
Here the Plan states that energy independence and sustainability goals are “somewhat conflicting” without stating in what ways those two goals conflict. In fact, those two goals are entirely mutually compatible. One cannot achieve true energy independence unless one has achieved sustainability. The reverse is arguably true as well. It would be helpful to know in what ways the Plan authors perceive the goals of energy independence and sustainability in conflict with one another. This point is not elaborated and no examples are provided. Further related to this segment, it is stated that the central utility plant “includes” fuel sources. The utility plant does not include fuel sources. Again, these fuels must be purchased from an outside vendor.

This section goes on to say that “from an infrastructure standpoint, sustainability means the efficient use of energy and a degree of independence.” It is true that systems efficiency is of utmost importance in endeavoring to achieve sustainability, but true sustainability incorporates more than just a “degree” of independence. Independence must be a primary, conscious mid- and long-term goal.

Page 103. Central Plant – Existing Conditions
Here the Plan states that the ~2MW power plant is “insufficient to meet the average power needs of campus.” Earlier in the Plan, on page 99, it is stated that “the utility systems in general have sufficient capacity to accommodate campus growth.” So which is it? Judging from the electrical demand tables on the following pages, it appears that the current system does not meet existing draw, let alone produce enough to accommodate future growth. If this is correct, then any means of reducing the current load by implementing conservation, energy efficiency, retrofitting with renewable energy systems any buildings that are not slated to be replaced, and building future structures with a goal of zero net energy draw, will be advisable. As you may be aware, zero net energy use is possible. Visit www.zerenergybuilding.org for more information.

Page 105. Campus Infrastructure
Here the Plan “calls for the removal of a number of the existing campus facilities and replacing them with new buildings” and “this will impact... electrical... demands on the campus.” Yes, it will, and if you do it right, it will vastly reduce electrical demand on campus. As I’m sure you know, new construction affords several important advantages when considering sustainability
and energy efficiency. From building design, to the unique possibilities of incorporating the cost of renewable energy technologies, e.g. photovoltaics, into amortized capital costs or construction loans. No mention is made of this in the Plan.

Additionally on page 105 the tables use projected increases in square footage to come up with an estimate of the increase in electrical demand. That method only works if one accepts certain assumptions about how much a given building will draw and how the electricity is generated. If one designs a building to a LEED silver standard and much of the electricity is provided by rooftop PV, then that projection is out the window. In fact, if conservation, energy efficiency measures and renewable energy technologies are implemented adequately the new “satellite plant” mentioned in the section about meeting future demand to 2020 that will be developed at the north end of the campus, may be entirely unnecessary. Don’t forget to deduct the capital, maintenance and fuel cost of the avoided satellite plant from the cost of the PV!

Page 106. North Satellite Plant
Again, it is assumed that the energy efficiency and renewable energy implementation will not impact the load. You anticipate replacing Generator 2 before 2020 with a slightly larger capacity generator and propose an entirely new unit, the North Satellite Plant, of up to 2.5MW. The proposed in-depth electrical system analysis should strongly consider means of avoiding the construction of this new unit.

Page 108. Further Study
Regarding the section that mentions that further studies are needed to address electric substation capacity/expansion and cost-benefit analysis of power generation (not true on-site generation since the fuel is piped in from elsewhere) vs. power purchase. Included in this study should be an analysis of true on-site generation employing solar PV either via outright system purchase and ownership or via a power purchase agreement where ownership and maintenance remains in the hands of a third party and the SFSU pays only for the power at a guaranteed rate for a long term fixed period. Additionally, the studies should adequately account for significant implementation of energy efficiency measures and on-site generation renewable energy technologies.

Additional energy-related comments:

- Page 14. Purpose and Scope – This section states that, once adopted, the Plan will serve as a reference for all physical improvements, regardless of scale to ensure that every project undertaken contributes to the overall campus vision. Many physical improvements and/or policies that might improve energy management could be made in the near term with little or no cost. One example that stands out starkly is the bright lighting in the student center dining area that appears to be superfluous on sunny days. Simply turning off some or all of these lights would save considerable energy, and switching to energy efficient fixtures would help too. (Maybe I’m wrong, but they don’t look like energy efficient lights). My point is, the Plan does not explicitly address near term or immediate measures that might be undertaken to help fulfill the mandate in CSU Exec. Order 987. Can the Plan incorporate this or is there another arena where near term proposals of this nature can be addressed?
- No mention is made of implementing solar thermal systems to augment or replace domestic (showers/sinks) hot water use on campus. This is a highly economical and efficient way to produce hot water. (This is not meant as any criticism about the hot water from the co-gen plant – that’s great – I’m just saying solar hot water is great too).

- CSU Exec. Order 987 states that “each CSU campus will designate an energy/utilities manager with the responsibility and the authority for carrying out energy conservation and utilities management programs.” That person or position is not identified in the Draft Plan. It should be included in the final document.

- CSU Exec. Order 987 states that “Each CSU campus will develop and maintain a campus-wide integrated strategic energy resource plan.” The Draft Plan recommends that this be undertaken but does not state the current status of, or plans for that plan. The final document should.

- CSU Exec. Order 987 states that “a component of each campus’s emergency plan shall address action required to respond to short-term electrical outages, large-scale grid failures, natural gas curtailments, and other utility shortages or failures.” This provision is inadequately addressed in the Plan. The Plan mentions that there is redundancy in the systems, but fails to address what the course of action would be in the event that the feedstock for the redundant systems is not available. Detailed plans for “action required to respond to...natural gas curtailments” should be included in the final document.

- No mention is made of any potential for wind power generation. This should be addressed in the final document.

- It would be great if the school could include in the Plan a showcase energy project, such as a project that integrates on-site power generation via PV with the electrolyzing of water to produce hydrogen, to feed a stationary fuel cell stack and/or several clean hydrogen internal combustion or fuel cell campus fleet vehicles. The idea would be to help “put SFSU on the map” in terms of clean renewable energy development.

Additional non-energy-related comments:

- Page 52: Conference Center/Hotel – The hotel is mentioned without much fanfare. In my view this element could be a key if not the key element of the entire Plan. Why? The hotel, I believe, will by default serve as the main interface between the larger public and the university due at least to the fact that it will serve as the landing pad for most out-of-town visitors, and will be highly visible from 19th Ave. As such, it should exemplify the vision contained in the Plan. In other words, the hotel can serve as an interpretive center for all of the cutting edge aesthetic, cultural, architectural and sustainability measures implemented at the hotel itself and throughout the rest of the campus. The hotel, above all, should push the envelope of sustainable building design, and should be conceived as an interactive dynamic "museum" of sustainability.
• Page 74. Regarding the use of asphalt and concrete as the primary materials for general circulation paths and courtyards and interior walkways. This section appears to indicate that although pavers and other materials will be used as accent, the predominant materials for the predominant surface areas will be asphalt and concrete. In my view, asphalt is never aesthetically appealing, and concrete rarely is. I would suggest exploring alternatives including semi-pervious recycled-material surfaces, pavers, and/or some other perhaps "natural" looking surface.

• Local self-reliance: Not much mention is made of local self-reliance. This would include sourcing materials for capital improvements locally, as well as ongoing procurement shifting to products and services that do not require long distance shipment or travel, thus avoiding high fuel consumption. This could even include on-campus food production. Is there room for an on-campus mini-farm? How about putting it where you won't need that Satellite Power Plant?

• Re-using CDD – No mention is made of re-using reclaimed construction and demolition debris on-site for new construction and/or other purposes on campus. CSU Executive Order 987 addresses using environmentally superior materials for construction, but fails to identify on-site demolition materials or locally-sourced materials as being environmentally superior. They are, and this practice should be considered.

I offer these comments constructively and in a spirit of support. I hope that you find some of them helpful.

Sincerely,

W. Woodland (Woody) Hastings
SFSU Student, Environmental Studies Major
415-285-3824
woodland@sfsu.edu
Response to Comment Letter 23

Response to Comments 23-1 through 23-6. This response addresses comments related to the Campus Master Plan’s conformance with CSU sustainability policy and the use of renewable energy sources.

While the use of renewable energy sources, such as photovoltaics (PV) or wind turbines were discussed as a possibility, the detailed study to determine feasibility of such energy alternatives was beyond the scope of the Campus Master Plan. In an effort to develop a plan that is constructible, cost effective, and truly sustainable, the Campus Master Plan study focused on estimating the projected energy demand using conventional sources of energy such as natural gas and diesel. A campus-wide integrated strategic energy resource plan is recommended in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007) as a critical follow-on study, which would address these issues in detail.

Independence as used to describe the current central plant and planned future satellite plant was specifically related to generation of electricity in comparison to the purchase of power from the “grid.” The commenter’s point that the use of natural gas and diesel fuel make the system vulnerable to price and availability volatility is well taken. In a detailed study of the campus energy demands, co-generation options can also include investigation of alternative energy generation.

The conclusions of the Campus Master Plan study are that the current energy sources used in a co-generation plant to produce power and heating hot water offer the only model to provide the quantity of energy required for a campus the size of SF State. Alternative/renewable sources are currently not sufficiently available to the campus. Although, the University could not construct enough wind and PV systems economically to meet the average, let alone peak, electric demands, renewable energy sources should always be considered in future projects as an offset to traditional fossil-fuel based energy use.

The existing campus utility systems, in general, are capable of accommodating current and proposed campus demands; however, at the same time, the existing central plant cannot meet the current average electrical demand. Although it appears contradictory, the campus simultaneously has systems generally capable of providing for current and future demands while also having specific pieces of the system that need upgrade, replacement, etc.

In most cases, the Campus Master Plan replaces existing buildings with higher-density buildings. Certainly, energy-efficient design and construction will be implemented with the Campus Master Plan development. These measures can help to offset greater demand due to the increase in building density.

Energy efficiencies and alternative/renewable sources have a positive impact on energy consumption, but unfortunately not enough of an impact to eliminate the need for the proposed satellite plant. The detailed study will focus on refining the energy usage estimates and how that demand can best be met. The existing co-generation unit will be over 25 years old by 2020. The age of the unit combined with the increase in electrical demand will force its replacement at which time alternative technology options...
should be fully investigated. The detailed strategic energy study referred to in the final Campus Master Plan would investigate energy efficiency measures as well as alternative/renewable energy sources.

Building energy management systems, such as ambient light sensors and timers, would be part of the future development. SF State already has upgraded the energy management system in three buildings to use modern direct digital control, and will continue with further retrofits pending future Capital Renewal funding.

For example, the student center lighting is energy efficient, 50-watt metal halide H.I.D. Some time ago, the student center took advantage of PG&E's rebate program to upgrade its lighting to energy-saving T8 fluorescent lamps with electronic ballasts, metal halide, and compact fluorescent lamps. The student center also added timers and occupancy sensors and photo cells where appropriate, and installed a direct digital HVAC system with variable air volume and variable frequency drives. The student center is constantly striving to be environmentally responsible, whether through energy conservation, recycling, or composting.

Solar hot-water heaters are possible, but currently the campus produces significantly more hot-water than it can use. One of the main components in the Campus Master Plan central plant strategy is to rectify that imbalance. So, while the use of solar energy for water heating is possible, it is unlikely to be implemented with the current availability of hot-water.

The campus energy and utilities coordinator, based in Facilities and Services Enterprises, is responsible for the energy and utilities accounts, programs, and projects for the University, and serves as a liaison with on- and off-campus communities.

**Response to Comment 23-7.** The Campus Master Plan offers a number of sustainable strategies applicable to the design of the University Conference Center including the use of daylighting, natural ventilation, and stormwater management. Given the visibility and gateway function of the University Conference Center, the design of the building offers a particular opportunity to exemplify the sustainable foundations of the final Campus Master Plan.

**Response to Comment 23-8.** Asphalt and concrete are very practical and economical paving materials. Their predominant use around campus reflects these attributes. They can be relatively inexpensively installed; they are relatively easy to patch, repair, modify, and replace; and they are well suited to uniform ADA-friendly circulation surfaces. The technology of these materials has also advanced significantly over recent years. New variations can incorporate desirable earth-tone colors, permeable characteristics, light-weight materials, and recycled materials. All of these optional characteristics of the materials need to be explored in their selection and specification for new applications.

The Campus Master Plan proposes special paving materials such as unit pavers and exposed aggregate concretes for specific nodes, courtyards, and entrance areas. The selection of these materials also should
explore sustainable attributes such as permeability and use of recycled materials. The final Campus Master Plan has been revised to include the potential use of these materials. See Chapter 2, *Project Refinements* for details.

**Response to Comment 23-9.** On-campus food production was discussed during the campus planning process and should be pursued as a part of a more sustainable on-going operations strategy for the University. It could be a natural complement to the student-run restaurant, the Vista Room, operated by the University’s Hospitality Management Program. Because of limited space, on-campus vegetable gardens may be difficult to include; however, the potential can be explored in greater detail in the landscape master plan, recommended as a follow-on study to the Campus Master Plan.

Sourcing materials locally is a responsible sustainable practice and will be maximized in any new construction project. Even though the Campus Master Plan does not address procurement specifically, the final Campus Master Plan has been revised to include discussion of local materials sourcing. See Architectural and Urban Design Standards in Chapter 7 and to the Landscape and Site Design Guidelines in Chapter 8 of final Campus Master Plan.

**Response to Comment 23-10.** The use of recycled and reused construction and demolition materials should be maximized as part of a sustainable building program. Although this would automatically be explored as part of a LEED-based approach to building design as is recommended by the CSU Executive Order 987, it is desirable to reiterate this intent in the Campus Master Plan. The final Campus Master Plan has been revised to include discussion of local materials sourcing. See Architectural and Urban Design Standards in Chapter 7 and to the Landscape and Site Design Guidelines in Chapter 8 of final Campus Master Plan.
Clinical Sciences Building Project
To: maciasr@sfsu.edu
Subject: Clinical Sciences Building Project

March 6, 2007

Richard Macias
Capital Planning, Design and Construction
Re: Clinical Sciences Building Project

Dear Dr. Macias:

I am writing this letter in the hope that it will make known my concerns about the proposed Clinical Sciences (CS) building project.

It's my concern that, as currently proposed, construction of the new CS building will cause serious health problems for faculty, staff, students, and visitors in the Humanities building (HUM). The current plan to construct the CS building so near to the western face of HUM will block afternoon sunlight (which helps to dry up the moisture from the ocean and fog) from this wing of HUM which houses all of our faculty offices. The Humanities building recently underwent an extensive and expensive waterproofing/mold reduction project. It's the concern of many working in HUM that the mold problem will return if this project goes forth as now planned.

Another concern is that of losing valuable campus green space. The project will eliminate a beautiful patch of green area that serves as a place of rest, study, contemplation, and renewal for many of us in and around HUM. This small area's trees, shrubs, and flowers attract birds and butterflies to this corner of the campus. I would be a shame to lose one more green space unnecessarily. That is one of the many reasons students and employee, alike, are drawn to this campus. It is obvious that campus green space is a priority. I would like a new design/orientation to take this into account.

I am asking that construction be delayed so that the new building can either be redesigned or reoriented with the above concerns in mind. Moving ahead too quickly will very likely result in a situation similar to that of the Science and Technology student housing towers. Spending more money and time on this side of the project will ultimately be more cost-effective than having to fix problems that may very well arise after construction is complete.

Thank you for taking the time to read my comments about this most important matter.

Sincerely,

Ayan Jiggetts
Administrative Assistant
Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures
San Francisco State University
1600 Holloway Avenue, HUM 475
San Francisco, CA 94132

Tel: (415) 338-1421
Fax: (415) 406-0588

Office Hours: M-F, 8 a.m. to 5 p.m.
Response to Comment Letter 24

Response to Comments 24-1 through 24-3.  Please see Master Response 5, Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building, for a response to these comments.  It should also be noted that in order to serve the anticipated population under the Campus Master Plan additional academic space would be required.  The Campus Master Plan focuses on providing that space while generally maintaining the current pattern of land use.  The protection of major open space areas in the campus quad and in the valley portion of the campus is provided for under the Campus Master Plan.  The location of the proposed Clinical Sciences building on an already developed site adjacent to existing academic facilities is an appropriate site for such a facility.
February 23, 2007

Stephen Johns
83 Sylvan Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94132

Richard Macias, Campus Planner
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

By e-mail, regular mail and by fax to: 415-338-2960

Re: San Francisco State University's Draft Campus Master Plan

Dear Mr. Macias,

My main concern is that this master plan if implemented would significantly diminish the quality of life for all those living in, visiting and passing through the area. The quality of life would diminish if the daily population of the area were significantly increased and if the plans for new retail "main" streets were implemented. Also, certain aspects of the master plan may create very dangerous conditions which do not exist now. Any increase in congestion along 19th Ave., or Lake Merced Blvd. could hamper city evacuation efforts in an emergency. Any plan to deposit water into Lake Merced could damage the city of San Francisco's emergency water supply.

I object to the number of students at SFSU being increased from 20,000 FTE to 25,000 FTE. There is already too much congestion and traffic in our neighborhoods. The number of students at SFSU should be decreased in order to restore the higher quality of life we once enjoyed. I understand that because the population of the entire state of California is expected to increase in the coming years, the number of students seeking an education from the CSU system is also expected to increase. It is my understanding that CSU trustees have directed all 23 campuses to plan for significant growth. Of course it makes no sense for anyone to come to California, live in California, or be educated in California if the area is made uninhabitable by over-development by CSU. A much better idea would be to take the money CSU is planning to spend on expansion of each campus and spend it on creating one or two new campuses in communities that would welcome them.

I object to any new "main" streets being created. Streets of this sort will bring drug dealers, vagrants, crime, noise, garbage, pollution, congestion, traffic, pedestrian accidents, etc. These retail streets being proposed are very different from the ones we have now. For example, Lakeside Village is the retail strip on Ocean Ave. between 19th Ave. and Junipero Serra Blvd. This area closes
significantly at 5 p.m. and entirely at 10 p.m. and is surrounded by single-family homes. The retail streets suggested in the proposed master plan would have dense student housing. The pressure to allow late night or 24 hour retail would be enormous. Students stay up late. They want access to food, drug stores, copy facilities, etc. and retailers want to make money. This is exactly the atmosphere that attracts drug dealers, vagrants, crime, noise, garbage, pollution, etc. This proposal is hostile toward the current residents of the area, primarily middle class, seniors, and families with young children. We invested in a quiet neighborhood with a moderately sized shopping center and a University nearby. We did not invest decades of our lives here to live on the perimeter of a major urban University.

Residents of this area have existed in relative harmony with SFSU for decades largely because of its moderate size and self-contained footprint. Every expansion of SFSU over the years has resulted in inconvenience and diminished quality of life for residents, visitors and travelers; for example, the installation of traffic lights on Lake Merced Blvd, the daily traffic back-ups and parking problems. The footprint has been shattered by the recent acquisition of the Stonestown apartments and portion of Parkmerced. I suspect these acquisitions were not entirely legal because of the history of Parkmerced and Stonestown. Parkmerced and Stonestown were conceived, approved and supported as self-contained communities. The urban planners of the day likely created the communities this way to maintain harmony between such diverse uses as: single family homes in the Lakeshore, Merced Manor and Lakeside areas, the apartment/shopping center Stonestown, SFSU, and Parkmerced apartments. Obviously the limited size of SFSU over the decades has enabled this harmony. This SFSU Master Plan is an attempt to take over the entire area and make it into a college town, which the current residents don’t want, by using such deceptive language as, “Strong Connections to the Surrounding City,” (p.5 in the Executive Summary)

My understanding is that an increase of 5,000 FTE students translates to an average daily area population increase of about 15,000 people, taking into account additional faculty, staff and part time students. I have heard representatives of SFSU argue that because of increased on site housing and commuter strategies there will be no increase in congestion. This is obviously a blatant abuse and manipulation of statistics and studies. An increase of several thousand people into an area on a daily basis will increase congestion and associated problems. Any suggestion to the contrary is disrespectful extreme rationalization or outright lies.

University representatives argue that they are making available an education to more people who otherwise may not have the opportunity for education. The larger issue is that students learn much more by example. These administrators are teaching our children that it is okay to lie to and disrespect entire communities. If the students are successful, graduate, get a good job and invest
In a neighborhood they are taught to disrespect, and can expect to be disrespected by their neighbors. What value is teaching more students if you are teaching them disrespect?

Also from page 5 in the Executive Summary: "SFSU remains committed to modeling on campus...the world in which we would like to live." I doubt the world you would like to live in involves the hostile takeover and abuse of the surrounding communities.

Please revise this Master Plan to reduce the number of FTE students and eliminate any plans for new retail streets and dense housing.

Sincerely,

Stephen Johns.
Response to Comment 25-1. Please see Master Response 4, Village Main Streets, for a response to this comment. Please also see Master Response 1, Response to Neighborhood Issues.

Response to Comment 25-2. As indicated in the Draft EIR Section 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking, and Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts, to avoid increasing the number of daily and peak hour vehicle trips to the campus, the Campus Master Plan includes an expanded and enhanced Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that emphasizes alternate travel modes and a housing program that is designed to house more of the SF State affiliates on the campus. The timely and successful implementation of these programs included in the Campus Master Plan would help avoid increases in vehicle trips. The Draft EIR presents potential traffic impacts under two scenarios: (1) an analysis of likely traffic impacts assuming that the Campus Master Plan TDM and housing programs are successfully implemented, and (2) a conservative worst-case analysis that assumes that the proposed TDM and housing programs are not implemented successfully or in a timely manner, and therefore new vehicle trips would be added to study area roadways and intersections. Under the worst-case analysis (see item #2 above) where vehicle trips would increase with growth and development contemplated under the Campus Master Plan, the project would contribute 1 percent or less to total traffic on 19th Avenue and 7 percent or less to total traffic on Lake Merced Boulevard in 2020.

To ensure that automobile traffic levels remain at their current rates through 2020, the Draft EIR indicates that the campus will implement Mitigation TRA-1, which calls for: (1) baseline and ongoing cordon surveys to monitor PM peak hour vehicle trips every three years and no later than the addition of each 1,000 students, (2) annual cordon surveys if surveys above show that the PM peak period auto trips are greater than 5 percent above the baseline, (3) additional TDM programs if trips increase sufficiently, and (4) fair-share contribution towards intersection improvements at the two study intersections on Lake Merced Boulevard if the additional TDM programs fail to reduce traffic impacts (see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, for revisions to this measure). If intersection improvements were implemented, traffic conditions on Lake Merced Boulevard in the vicinity of the campus would improve over existing conditions. Please see Master Response 15, Transportation Impacts, for additional information.

It should also be noted that emergency evacuation from San Francisco is a complex regional issue that is beyond the scope of this EIR. However, it should be noted that no local, state, or federal agencies commented on the Draft EIR in regards to this issue. Additionally, no comments from such agencies were received during the Notice of Preparation review period, also known as the scoping period.

Response to Comment 25-3. Please see Master Response 6, Proposed Enrollment Increase, for a response to this comment.

Response to Comments 25-4 and 25-5. Please see Master Response 4, Village Main Streets, for a response to these comments.
Response to Comment 25-6. This comment questions the expansion of the University and the legality of the acquisition of the Stonestown apartments (UPN) and the northern blocks of Parkmerced (UPS). The University acquired these properties beginning in 2000 in order to expand its capacity to house faculty, staff, and students, and followed all pertinent CSU procedures in place at the time of the acquisitions. Stonestown, Parkmerced, and SF State were constructed at the same time, mostly during the 1950s. Typical of that era, each development was planned separately without consideration of its place in the larger urban context. This was the era of the automobile. The over-scaled roadways and lack of pedestrian amenity and safety that characterize this area of the city are the legacy of this super-block, auto-dominated planning. Consistent with current urban planning practice, the intent of the Campus Master Plan is to make the campus function as an integral part of the district, creating better pedestrian and open space connections that encourage walking and bicycling and ultimately help to reduce energy consumption and create a greater district-wide sense of community.


March 28, 2007

Stephen Johns
83 Sylvan Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94132

Richard Macias, Campus Planner
Office of Capital Planning, Design and Construction,
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

By: hand delivery

Re: Environmental Impact Report for proposed SFSU expansion

Dear Mr. Macias,

The law states that an EIR must be adequate, accurate and complete before it can be deemed final. Certainly if there were only a few minor errors, discussion in the comment portion would create a complete document but this EIR has so many very significant errors and omissions the law requires that it be redone and re-circulated for public comment. I have only had time to review a portion of it. Clearly, my comments together with the comments of others shows that a new EIR is necessary.

p.4.11-1 lists public comments received in response to the Notice of Preparation with respect to traffic but does not mention my comment from my Nov. 10th, 2006 letter:

The Traffic element should also include an analysis of the impact of the proposed project in the event of a major emergency evacuation of San Francisco. Mayor Gavin Newsome has indicated that in the event of a major earthquake both bridges might be unusable. The only way to evacuate the city would be by boat and by the major roads leading south. Highway 1 near SFSU is the major evacuation route for this area. Recent traffic studies done by Stonestown rated the intersection at 19th Ave. as Winston the lowest possible rating and other intersections in the area also very poorly.

The traffic study in this current DEIR on p.4.11-6 indicates the LOS at Winston and 19th Ave. at "E" not "F" nevertheless other intersections along 19th Ave. (Highway 1) are rated at "F" and the point is the same. Information from this traffic report contradicts information from the traffic report done by Stonestown only a few years earlier.

Again from my Nov. 10th, 2006 letter:
Any additional development at all in the area would have an unacceptable negative impact on normal daily traffic and possible catastrophic consequences in an emergency. Federal, State and local emergency authorities and Caltrans all need to thoroughly analyze and comment on any proposed development in this area and the comments presented to the public in the Draft EIR. An Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA may also be required.

(Enclosed is a copy of my Nov. 10th, 2006 letter in its entirety)

Possible impact on the emergency evacuation of the entire city of San Francisco is obviously a significant concern. 1) It should have been mentioned on p.4.11-1 along with the other public comments and addressed appropriately. 2) Federal, State and local emergency authorities and Caltrans all need to be notified and asked for comment and evaluation. 3) The comments of those government authorities need to be included and circulated in a Draft EIR so the public can review and comment on them as required by CEQA. Inclusion in the final EIR would not be adequate since the public would be denied the opportunity to comment on topics of significant concern.

Sect. 4.11.2.2 on p.4.11-14 states, “Potential impacts with respect to emergency access are addressed in section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials.” 1) Nowhere in section 4.6 is there any mention at all of emergency access and 2) my comment is in reference to emergency access to the campus, it is regarding potential emergency evacuation problems of the entire city that may result if the new Campus Master Plan is adopted and built. Emergency access to the campus should also be addressed and the public should have an opportunity to comment on it.

This DEIR makes no mention at all as to whether or not Federal, State and local emergency authorities and Caltrans were consulted. Given the climate of concern over emergency preparedness since the 9/11 attacks and hurricane Katrina, a full traffic study needs to be performed taking into account the scenario of the city of San Francisco using Highway 1 as an emergency evacuation route with and without the proposals in the proposed Master Plan and the results published for circulation in a DEIR before it can be considered complete.

p.4.11-1 states, “Commercial development along Holloway and Buckingham as proposed in the Campus Master Plan would be local serving and not of the type or scale of development that would generate vehicle trips. Because there would not be increased traffic due to this type of land use, the traffic analysis below does not include trips associated with this retail space.” This statement is completely absurd. There is no mention or suggestion to make these proposed new main retail streets for pedestrians only. Once retail is allowed there is no legal mechanism in place to allow certain types of retail and ban others.
Undoubtedly all involved will seek to maximize profit regardless of the impact on traffic. Additionally, as an example, people from all over Oakland and Berkeley travel to Telegraph Avenue for services, specialty shops, unique bookstores, late-night food, etc. Any new retail, especially the type associated with a University, will certainly generate vehicle trips. The traffic study needs to be re-done properly and the results circulated for public comment.

The colors on Figure 4.6.2 are poorly noted and confusing. Someone looking at this figure that is not familiar with the area would not understand the overwhelming predominance of single-family housing in the area. I made the point in my previous letters that a large University is incompatible with quiet residential neighborhoods consisting of large numbers of seniors and families.

The traffic study makes no mention of other proposed developments in the area. There are plans to build 200 condominiums at Arden Wood near 19th Ave. and Sloat Blvd. Certainly the traffic numbers would be different taking this into account. The public reviewing the EIR should be informed that other proposed developments were or were not taken into account as the results were presented.

I would like you to comment on my previous letters, which I have enclosed, in the response to the DEIR since there is no indication that the issues I raised were addressed or that the letters were even received at all.

I am looking forward to reviewing an EIR for this proposal that is accurate, adequate and complete.

Thank you,

Stephen Johns
November 10, 2006

Stephen Johns
83 Sylvan Dr.
San Francisco, CA 94132

Richard Macias, Campus Planner
1600 Holloway Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94132

By mail and by fax to: 415-336-2960

Re: Scope of Environmental Impact Report for proposed SFSU expansion

Dear Mr. Macias,

I am a longtime resident of this area. The Land-Use and Planning element in the Draft EIR for the proposed new Campus Master Plan, should include an accurate description of the communities and the lifestyles and desires of the residents. Please include a complete Public Services element as well as cumulative and detailed analyses of construction impact on: Air Quality, Biological Resources, Noise and Traffic. The Traffic element should also include an analysis of the impact in the case of a major emergency. The Alternatives Analysis should include a scenario based on a reduction of the number of current students and services, not an increase.

I was raised in the Lakeshore neighborhood in the 1960’s, went to Lowell High School and currently am a homeowner here. My mother has been a resident of the area since 1951. The suggested developments proposed at the Oct. scoping meeting would devastate the quality of life of tens of thousands of residents in the neighborhoods surrounding San Francisco State University and significantly inconvenience hundreds of thousands of commuters and travelers using Highway 1, Lake Merced Blvd. and others visiting the area. As we witnessed at the meeting, many other residents feel the same way. I think it is safe to assume that an overwhelming majority, probably more than 80% to 90% of the tens of thousands of residents would agree that the proposal would be a devastation to the area, not an improvement. From page 10 of the Notice of Preparation, under Land Use and Planning:

... the California State University System has a tradition of working cooperatively with the local communities, and it is the goal of the campus to seek consistency with local plans and policies, where possible. Therefore, a summary of relevant City and County of San Francisco land-use plans and policies will be presented in this EIR. Significant environmental impacts, if any, will be identified related to conformance with these plans and policies. The proposed development under the new
Campus Master Plan will also be examined to determine whether it would be compatible with existing land uses on and adjacent to the campus.

In the spirit of, "working cooperatively with the local communities," and being "compatible with existing land uses on and adjacent to the campus" the Land-Use and Planning element should include a genuine attempt to reflect the feelings of the human beings who live here, the quiet, slow pace and low density, not just the official, printed City and County of San Francisco land use plans and policies. The EIR should reflect the fact that thousands of people have invested money and decades of our lives here because it is relatively quiet, clean, safe and low density. The proposed SFSU Master Plan would have a severe negative impact on the lives of tens of thousands of residents.

The plan is proposing two new main streets with 24 hour retail, hundreds of new housing units, sports complex, hotel and conference center, a reduction of parking and much more all spread out to be built over a twenty year period. Obviously, public services like police, fire, ambulance, etc. would be significantly impacted by such an enormous development. Public Services needs to be included in the EIR. The statement on page 7 of the Notice of Preparation, "State Fire Marshal review for fire and life safety will be required during subsequent project -- specific approvals for individual building projects that could be implemented under the Master Plan" is clearly inadequate. A full Public Services element needs to be included in the EIR assuming full buildout of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan.

The cumulative impact on the area of twenty years of construction noise, dust, air pollution, construction traffic, biological hazards and risks clearly needs to be evaluated. Page 9 of the Notice Of Preparation under the section regarding the Air Quality Element of the EIR states: "Because the proposed project is a master plan not a construction project, construction emissions will not be estimated. This approach is also supported by BAAQMD's approach to examining construction impacts, which emphasizes the implementation of effective comprehensive control measures rather than detailed quantification of emissions." The cumulative impact of twenty years of air quality degradation due to construction work on the environment, the residents, the area biology, etc. needs to be analyzed. Page 11 of the Notice Of Preparation under the section regarding the Noise Element of the EIR states: "Noise from stationary sources and construction sites will be discussed qualitatively and will not be modeled." The cumulative impact of twenty years of construction noise, heavy trucks, etc. on the environment, the residents, the area biology, etc. needs to be analyzed. 20 years of construction noise could make life unbearable for the residents as well as the nearby wildlife. Things like mitigation measures for construction traffic for example, need to be identified. Studying construction impact, one project at a time, misses the potentially devastating impact of all the projects one after another over 20 years.
The Traffic element should also include an analysis of the impact of the proposed project in the event of a major emergency evacuation of San Francisco. Mayor Gavin Newsom has indicated that in the event of a major earthquake both bridges might be unusable. The only way to evacuate the city would be by boat and by the major roads leading south. Highway 1 near SFU is the major evacuation route for this area. Recent traffic studies done by Stonestown rated the intersection at 19th Ave. and Winston the lowest possible rating and other intersections in the area also very poorly. Any additional development at all in the area would have an unacceptable negative impact on normal daily traffic and possible catastrophic consequences in an emergency. Federal, State and local emergency authorities and Caltrans all need to thoroughly analyze and comment on any proposed development in this area and the comments presented to the public in the Draft EIR. An Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA may also be required.

The Alternatives Analysis should also include an alternative to the proposed project, which would be a reduction in the number of students from the current number and less buildings and services, not more. This alternative should consider that the current size of the University is already too large for the location given the relatively quiet residential areas in very close proximity which have been well established for many decades. An examination of the current census would show a large number of residents who are families and seniors who have lived in the area for decades. This alternative might consider improved walkways and bikeways, etc. to reduce the already over-congested situation.

I would like a response to this letter please. That is, I would like to know who is responsible for deciding which elements will be included in this EIR. If Public Services and construction effects are not included, I would like to receive a letter explaining why.

I would like to receive a copy of the Draft EIR directly when it is available please. Also, page 7 of the Notice of Preparation states: "Because of the long-term nature of the Campus Master Plan, the precise nature, size, and location of all the proposed programs and facilities cannot be accurately projected at this time. As warranted under CEQA, additional environmental review of Campus Master Plan projects will be undertaken as the plan is implemented." I would like to be directly informed in a timely manner of all of the environmental reviews of all of the Campus Master Plan projects. This should include Notices of Preparation, scoping meetings, Draft Environmental Impact Reports and Final Environmental Impact Reports as well as any other decisions and developments relating to such.

Thank You,

Stephen Johns.
Response to Comment Letter 26

Response to Comment 26-1. Please see Master Response 9, Program vs Project-Level EIR Analysis, and Master Response 11, Baseline for Environmental Analysis. These responses indicate that the subject EIR provides an appropriate program-level impact analysis of the development contemplated in the Campus Master Plan by 2020, based on an analysis of the proposed project as compared against existing conditions. Further, the CEQA criteria for recirculating the Draft EIR have not been met and therefore, the Draft EIR was not recirculated for public review. However, changes to the Draft EIR have been made in response to comments and as a result of project refinements contemplated in the final Campus Master Plan (July 2007). Please see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR.


Response to Comment 26-3. Level of service analysis at the study intersections was conducted based on the methodologies documented in the Highway Capacity Manual, 2000. The LOS was reported based on the thresholds documented in Tables 4.11-1 and 4.11-2 of the Draft EIR. The draft traffic impact study for Stonestown was completed in January 2003. Over the years traffic could have increased at the study intersections and in addition, the LOS reported in Stonestown draft traffic impact study is based on different thresholds than those used for the Draft EIR. The LOS thresholds used in the Draft EIR are based on the most current HCM 2000 and are used throughout the country. Please also see Response to Comment 25-2 regarding emergency evacuation.

Response to Comments 26-4 and 26-7. Please see Response to Comment 25-2 regarding emergency evacuation.


Response to Comments 26-9 and 26-10. Figure 4.8-2 is from the San Francisco Zoning Code and is provided to support the analysis of the project’s conformance with local plans and policies (Impact LU-2, page 4.8-6). While a number of different colors are used for different types of residential uses, the text clearly identifies the presence of residential and mixed residential uses to the south and east of the campus (see Draft EIR page 4.8-3). It should also be noted, that the SF State campus already exists in its current location adjacent to residential uses, which has been the case since the campus’ beginning.

Response to Comments 26-11 and 26-12. City and County of San Francisco Planning Department was contacted for the list of pending and approved projects within the vicinity of the proposed project during the preparation of the Draft EIR. These projects are listed on Draft EIR Table 4.0-1 and shown in Figure 4.0-1. Additionally, the Draft EIR projects 2020 traffic conditions without the project by applying a growth factor of 1 percent per year to the existing peak hour turning movement volumes at the study intersections per the Transportation Impact Analysis Guidelines for the City and County of San Francisco (see Draft EIR pages 4.11-15 and -16). In addition to the growth in general traffic, peak hour trips from
other approved and pending projects, were estimated and added to the projected Year 2020 peak hour turning movement volumes. The pending and approved projects summarized in Table 4.11-7 are based on the information provided by City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. The Arden Woods project mentioned in the comment was not specifically included in this analysis, as it was not included on the list of pending and approved projects provided by City and County of San Francisco. However, the application of a 1 percent per year growth rate to the existing peak hour turning movement volumes accounts for traffic from other cumulative growth and projects in the vicinity.

**Response to Comment 26-13.** The receipt of the November 2006 letter submitted by the commenter on the scope of the EIR is acknowledged for the record. To the extent that the issues raised involved potentially significant effects on the environment under CEQA criteria, they were addressed in the Draft EIR. It should be acknowledged that CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines are limited in that CEQA criteria focus on significant physical effects of a project on the environment. Social and economic effects are not covered by CEQA. Please see Master Response 1, *Response to Neighborhood Issues.*
March 16 2007

Dear Richard Martinez,

As a long term lecturer with a history of upper respiratory disease, who works in the Humanities building, I am most concerned about the plan to build the new Clinical Sciences building so close to the Humanities building. With the Humanities building's history of a mold problem, the plan risks a serious health hazard in violation of OSHA.

I was unable to attend the hearing because of my teaching commitments, but want my written comments on record before the CSU Board of Trustees meets to review and consider the Campus Master Plan.

Thank you in advance for forwarding my concerns,

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Anita Kittees
CGSU Lecturer in English Composition
Response to Comment Letter 27

Response to Comment 27-1. Please also see Master Response 5, Proposed Siting of Clinical Sciences Building, which addresses this comment.
Comment Letter 28

Jason Porth

From: SF State Public Affairs [pubcom@sfsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, April 03, 2007 3:30 PM
To: maciasr@sfsu.edu; jporth@sfsu.edu
Subject: Fwd: RE: 3FSU MASTERPLAN DRAFT EIR (Addendum)

X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Filtered: true
X-IronPort-Anti-Spam-Result: Ah4FAAE4EUbYG7+S/2dsb2JhbACCVDaDFg
X-Deliver-To: info@sfsu大师plan.org
DomainKey-Signature: a=rsa-sha1; q=dns; c=nofws;
s=s1024; d=yahoo.com;
h=X-YMail-OSG:Received:Date:From::Subject:To:MIME-Version:Content-Type:ContentTransfer-Encoding:Message-ID;
b=YccB2neNgp2EO5cRrz0HydHEDhP+mxzf9zVzEHzU44ViLnlscrtjVpwZ/rYGsnRmK2VQ2!
X-YMail-OSG:
50tIPvypVMIm66B5e360xj5LZGWGnB.y_mifMMIsKDimjPkuXx_wkC0EVlghr_DWdqS3W4I

Date: Mon, 2 Apr 2007 17:07:21 -0700 (PDT)
From: Julian Lagos <julianlagos@yahoo.com>
Subject: Fwd: RE: SFSU MASTERPLAN DRAFT EIR (Addendum)
To: info@sfsu大师plan.org
X-Assp-Delay: not delayed (auto whitelisted); 1 Apr 2007 16:54:42 -0700
X-Assp-Bayes-Confidence: 0.000000
X-Assp-Spam-Prob: 0.000000
X-Assp-Envelope-From: julianlagos@yahoo.com
X-SFSU-VirusScanner: Found to be clean

April 2, 2007

RE: Addendum to Earlier Comments on Draft EIR

To Whom It May Concern:

As an addendum to my earlier remarks regarding the Draft EIR, university planners also fail to address the impacts of the proposed construction of new planned urban development projects in and around the university, such as those planned for Brotherhood Way, Cambon Drive, and on Sloat Boulevard (near 19th Ave.).

Please address this important and final point also in the university's Final EIR.

Sincerely,
Julian Lagos

Note: forwarded message attached.
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April 2, 2007

RE: SFSU MASTERPLAN DRAFT EIR

To Whom It May Concern:

I have read the University’s Masterplan Draft EIR and wish to address the following points:

(1) The Draft EIR fails to adequately address the impacts from displacement of tenants
living both in Parkmerced and the former Stonestown Apartments Complex (now
University Park North);

(2) The Draft EIR fails to adequately address compensation to the residents of the
Parkmerced community and the former Stonestown Apartments Complex for losses
of facilities and services at (a) The playground, ball field, tennis courts, basketball
courts, handball courts on Block 42 (Font Blvd); (b) The vacant public school building
which formerly housed the School of the Arts (SOTA) on Font Blvd; (c) The loss
the Montessori school on Block 42; (d) Loss of off-street parking for residents targeted
for displacement on the affected blocks along Holloway Avenue.

(3) The Draft EIR fails to adequately address the impacts from increased traffic and air
and noise pollution for residents, visitors, workers, and others using surface streets,
State Highway 1 (19th Avenue), Interstate Highway 280, near the university and the
project areas.

(4) The Draft EIR fails to adequately address the impacts on the ecosystems in and
around the university and the affected project areas, including natural wildlife habitats;

(5) The Draft EIR fails to adequately address the impacts on sacred burial mounds
that are known to exist in and around the university and the affected project areas.

Please address the aforementioned five points I have raised in the university’s Final EIR.

Sincerely,

Julian P. Lagos  
128 Garces Drive  
San Francisco, CA. 94132  
(415) 584-1700

Expecting? Get great news right away with email Auto-Check.  
Try the Yahoo! Mail Beta.
Response to Comment Letter 28

Response to Comment 28-1. Please see Response to Comment 7-1. It should also be noted that where relevant, the analysis of cumulative impacts did include assessment of other pending and approved projects within the vicinity of the proposed project, based on a list provided by the City and County of San Francisco Planning Department. These projects are listed on Draft EIR Table 4.0-1 and shown in Figure 4.0-1.

Response to Comment 28-2. Please see Master Response 14, Regional Housing Supply Impacts for a response to this comment. See specifically the subsection in this response called “Displacement of People.”

Response to Comment 28-3. Please see Response to Comment 21-9 regarding the fields located on Block 41. As of this writing, SF State is still in negotiations related to the purchase of the existing vacant School of the Arts building on Font Boulevard. As indicated on Draft EIR page 4.12-17, the San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) has an excess of capacity that is expected to increase district-wide as enrollment is projected to decline over the next 10 years. Additionally, construction of new schools is not planned in the SFUSD. Therefore, the loss of this school site is not expected to result in school capacity problems in the SFUSD.

The Campus Master Plan does not propose any building replacements or other development of Block 42. Therefore, the existing Montessori School should not be affected by the Campus Master Plan. However, the long-term vision identified in the Campus Master Plan does call for development of this block beyond 2020. Therefore, it is possible that development of this area could be proposed in the future. The impact of this development will be evaluated if and when it is proposed.

The existing residential development in the blocks in UPN that would be subject to redevelopment under the Campus Master Plan would be replaced with higher density housing and associated off-street parking. Therefore, this redevelopment would not result in a loss of off-street parking. Please also see Master Response 14, Regional Housing Supply Impacts for information related to the potential displacement of existing residents in UPS blocks to be redeveloped.

Response to Comment 28-4. The Draft EIR provides an adequate analysis of traffic, air, and noise related to campus growth contemplated in the Campus Master Plan. Study intersections include those surrounding the campus, which were the subject of traffic, air, and noise analyses. Please see Draft EIR Sections 4.2, Air Quality, 4.9, Noise, and 4.11, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking, and Final EIR Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, for the analyses related to these topics. Is should be noted that Interstate 280 was not included in the analyses; however, Caltrans did not indicate during early consultations nor in its comments on the Draft EIR that Interstate 280 should have been analyzed (see Letter 1). The comment is not specific enough to provide any further response, nor does it provide substantial evidence to support the claim that the analyses related to traffic, noise, and air quality are inadequate.
Response to Comment 28-5. The Draft EIR provides an adequate analysis of biological resources on campus and in the adjacent Lake Merced area. Please see Draft EIR Section 4.3, Biological Resources. Please also see Master Response 12, Biological Resources, and Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR for revisions to the analysis and mitigation measures that resulted from responses to comments raised during the public review period. The comment is not specific enough to provide any further response, nor does it provide substantial evidence to support the claim that the analysis related to biological resources is inadequate.

Response to Comment 28-6. The Draft EIR provides an evaluation of archaeological resources in Draft EIR Section 4.4, Cultural Resources. Page 4.4-5 identifies the known archeological site on the campus (P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25), based on a search of the Northwest Information Center of the California Historical Resources Information System. This database tracks previously recorded archaeological sites identified in previous cultural resource surveys. The site is described as a possible sand midden with some shell and no charcoal.

Further, as reported on Draft EIR page 4.4-7, the California Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) was contacted to request a review of its Sacred Lands File and to receive a list of the individuals and groups that the NAHC believes should be contacted regarding information or concerns related to the project area. The NAHC responded with negative results for its search of the Sacred Lands File. Further, informational letters were sent to potentially interested parties identified by the NAHC. To date, one response to the informational letter has been received. The individual who responded had no specific concerns.

Mitigations CULT-1A and -1B (Draft EIR pages 4.4-12 and -13) provide for an appropriate mitigation program for future development in the vicinity of the known archaeological site, and elsewhere on the campus where it is possible that archaeological resources could be inadvertently discovered during construction. Please see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, for minor revisions to Mitigation CULT-1A.
February 23, 2007

Richard Macias  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction  
San Francisco State University  
1600 Holloway Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94132

Dear Mr. Macias,

This letter is a comment on the proposed San Francisco State University Master Plan.

Let me say first that I thank you for your open houses and for the letters giving the dates of these events. This is good outreach to your neighbors. I also am glad for the school’s Neighborhood Task Forces, in which I participate.

As a neighbor of the school I have three primary concerns. These will not be a surprise. They are parking, housing and student conduct.

I have spoken with several people at your open houses about the subject of parking. When I got to the person I was told was most knowledgeable, Jeffrey Tumlin of Nelson/Nygard, he said that the school’s plan to add no new on-campus parking spaces (net) was based on the plan of having the neighborhoods absorb the extra parking from your additional 5,000 students, minus those who bike or use public transit. This is absolutely untenable. As it is I have to park a quarter mile to a half mile from my home much of the time. Fortunately I have no difficulty with walking. However, many people do. These include not only some of the senior citizens who live near your campus but also include some of your students both young and old. Sometimes residents are forced to park outside the neighborhood, e.g., across 19th Avenue. Since these neighborhoods are also over-filled with parked cars this is not a solution. Your plan would make this part of the City of San Francisco unlivable.

Bringing your students to a place where parking is impossible will not serve them well. Further, it raises the chronic stress level of everyone who has to park on the street. This is bad for a person’s health and it is bad for on-campus morale. You must provide adequate parking for all additional students who drive. You need also to keep in mind that in some neighborhood apartments there may be two or more students and it is very likely that each one will have their own car. So your students who live nearby will be as stressed as your commuter students and the people who live in the neighborhoods.

I am not willing to see my neighborhood turned into a “housing annex” of SFSU. Therefore you must provide adequate on-campus housing for as many students as will be added to your population. To the extent that there might continue to be SFSU students living at Parkmerced or University Park South these should be the most mature of students, or faculty and staff.
Student off-campus behavior has been addressed in some new ways already and for this I am grateful. I myself have been involved in some of these meetings of residents and SFSU representatives. This effort must be continued and expanded because without it the neighborhood is marked by loud disturbances at night (and the resultant lost sleep), vandalism and criminal behavior. These things have reached levels never before seen at Parkmerced. This all started when students were allowed to move in to Parkmerced during the ownership of the JP Morgan Chase Strategic Investment Fund. The quality of life here has deteriorated quickly and consistently since this policy was changed. Even just this semester it is significantly downgraded by comparison with the fall semester.

In summary, these factors have a huge negative impact on the neighborhoods around the school already. Your Master Plan will only make things worse. Much worse. If you are to proceed with this project the plan must be changed so the great bulk of the impact of the higher number of people at SFSU will be absorbed directly by and on the campus and not the neighborhoods. I am not opposed to the school looking to its future, but the full plan you have in mind is probably unattainable given the real world context in which the school exists.

Thank you for reading my comments.

Ame Larsen
355 Serrano Drive, #6M
San Francisco, CA 94132
RevLarsen001@aol.com
Response to Comment Letter 29

Response to Comment 29-1. Please see Master Response 15, *Transportation Impacts*, for additional information about parking.

Response to Comment 29-2. Please see Master Response 3, *Need for More On-Campus Housing*, which indicates that the campus has increased the provision of on-campus housing under the final Campus Master Plan. Please also see Chapter 2, *Project Refinements*, for further discussion of additional housing. Please also see Master Response 1, *Response to Neighborhood Issues*, for a discussion of general issues raised by residents in the adjacent neighborhood.
Linh Le & Nhu Pham  
36 Serrano Drive  
San Francisco, CA 94132  
Phone 415/333-1572 - Email: linhie36@yahoo.com

February 12, 2007

Mr. Richard Macias, Campus Planner  
San Francisco State University  
1600 Holloway Avenue  
San Francisco, CA 94132

Re: Comments on SFSU Draft Master Plan

Dear Mr. Macias,

Below are our comments in response to your draft master plan as outlined on your website www.sfsu bumperplan.org:

Background:
1. My wife, Nhu Pham, and I have lived in Parkmerced since May 1975. Initially, we resided at No. 30 Tapia Drive for one year, and then moved to 36 Serrano Drive, our current home, on May 1976. Our daughter, Theresa U. Le, has studied at, and graduated from, San Francisco State a Phi Beta Kappa in June 1994.

2. In the early 1970's, Mr. William Burnett, who was my boss as Chief of the United States Army Procurement Branch in South Vietnam, was a professor at SFSU. It was Mr. Burnett who introduced our family to SFSU - as a result, all of my wife's three younger brothers attended SFSU and they all graduated in the late 1970's. One of them, Hoa Pham, is now a Senior Vice President at Bank of America.

3. Both my wife and I have worked for Chevron in San Francisco until we retired in 2000. In addition to my professional purchasing job at Chevron, I also spent several years working as Executive Director at three local nonprofits in San Francisco, all of them dedicated to train and help find jobs for the less fortunate and extremely low-income San Francisco Bay Area residents.

4. The above lengthy introduction is a way of conveying to you a sense of good relationship and appreciation that our family has toward the University. Having lived in the Parkmerced community for the past three decades, in spite of the occasional moments of exasperation caused by student-tenants, we have come to like the neighborhood and the diversity of our community. Years ago, we have decided to make Parkmerced our permanent home until we depart this world. In December 2001, when San Francisco State University Foundation, Inc. acquired from Olympic View Realty 153 residential units which include our apartment at No.36 Serrano Drive, we were elated to receive the news in the false hope, as it now turns out, that SFSU would be a better and more considerate landlord.
5. At an October 2006 public hearing, we were most surprised and saddened to learn that under SFSU's large-scale draft master plan, among other expansions, one entire residential block bordering Varela, Serrano, Cardenas and Holloway Avenues which includes our two-bedroom home at 36 Serrano Drive, will be demolished in “Year 6 to 10” and a museum will be constructed on that block! Our first and immediate thought was: At this late stage of our lives, what would we do and where would we move to if this happens?

6. In your most recent draft master plan, made public on January 24, 2007, under Chapter 11, Implementation, page 114, Phasing: Year 6-10, the drawing now shows the residential block bordering Varela, Serrano, Cardenas and Holloway Avenues having a green color, denoting “landscape improvement”. If this means that this entire residential block will eventually be demolished, people evicted and the area turned into a garden or a museum, then not only it doesn't make economic sense but utterly heartless. We find it hard to believe that SFSU, a public-funded educational institution, would initiate this plan with no compassion and due regard for the plight of long-term and elderly tenants such as ourselves. All we ask is if this master plan is approved, SFSU should treat us fairly and provide us with a suitable apartment within the Parkmerced complex so we can spend the rest of our lives here.

In the circumstances, we conditionally oppose all expansions south of Holloway Avenue as outlined in the SFSU draft master plan, particularly the proposed demolition of the residential block where our home for the past 31 years is now located.

Sincerely,

Linh Le

Nhu Pham

cc: Mr. Sean Elbernd, Supervisor, District 7, San Francisco
Ms. Fiona Ma, State Assembly Member, 12th District
State Senator Leland Yee, 12th District
Response to Comment Letter 30

Response to Comments 30-1 and 30-2. In the draft Campus Master Plan (January 2007) the block referred to in the comment was mistakenly colored green. Please see Chapter 3, Changes to the Draft EIR, for revised Draft EIR Figure 3-6. The Campus Master Plan does not contemplate development of the block referred to in the comment by 2020. However, beyond that point, it is possible that this block could be proposed for redevelopment as part of the long-term vision of the campus. Please see Master Response 14, Regional Housing Supply Impacts, for additional information about redevelopment in the areas known as University Park South and University Park North.