

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter 2 Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures.....2-1

2.1 Introduction.....2-1

2.2 Project Description2-1

2.3 Project Objectives2-2

2.4 Impact Summary2-4

2.5 Alternatives to the Proposed Project.....2-4

2.6 Known Areas of Controversy2-5

TABLES

Table 2-1 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR

Table 2-2 Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives

Summary of Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures

2.1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) evaluates the potential for significant environmental impacts from the growth of the San Francisco State University (SF State) under the proposed Campus Master Plan. This summary highlights the major areas of importance in the environmental analysis for the proposed Campus Master Plan, as required by §15123 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). It also provides a brief description of the proposed Campus Master Plan, project objectives, community/agency issues, alternatives to the proposed Campus Master Plan, and areas of controversy known to the CSU System. In addition, this chapter provides a table summarizing: (1) the potential environmental impacts that would occur as the result of campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan; (2) the level of impact significance before mitigation; (3) the recommended mitigation measures that would avoid or reduce significant environmental impacts; and (4) the level of impact significance after mitigation measures are implemented. A second table compares the anticipated impacts of the proposed project with those of each alternative.

2.2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Board of Trustees adopted the 1989 Campus Master Plan to serve as a guide for the physical development of the SF State campus and campus enrollment growth through 20,000 FTE students. As of Fall 2006, the Campus was nearing the enrollment ceiling established by the 1989 Master Plan. Therefore, SF State has prepared a new Campus Master Plan that addresses all aspects of future physical development and land use on the campus to accommodate the proposed increased enrollment ceiling of 25,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students through 2020¹. This represents 5,000 additional FTE students over the existing enrollment ceiling of 20,000 FTE, or a 25 percent increase in enrollment capacity. Concurrent with the enrollment increase, faculty and staff would also increase from about 3,428 employees to about 4,139, or an increase of 711 employees. As described in Chapter 1, *Introduction*, the proposed Campus Master Plan for SF State is intended to respond to the Board of Trustees' directive to plan for its share of increased enrollment and accommodate the evolving needs of the CSU System's academic, administrative, and student- and campus-support programs.

The proposed Campus Master Plan provides a comprehensive framework for the physical development of the SF State campus over the next 13 years through 2020. The proposed Campus Master Plan for SF State addresses the recent acquisition of adjacent properties, aging facilities, changing student demographics, and the need for additional academic building space and other support space to accommodate the anticipated growth in enrollment. To accommodate the projected growth in enrollment and academic

¹ The Campus Master Plan addresses only the SF State main campus and does not include enrollment or other growth that may occur at its satellite centers.

activities, the proposed Campus Master Plan accommodates a building program that envisions the development of an additional 1.2 million gross square feet (gsf²) of non-residential building space, including a Hotel and Conference Center on the campus, and the development or conversion of an additional 846 units of housing for employees and students on campus. (Conversion of housing refers to units of housing in University Park South and University Park North that are currently occupied by non-SF State affiliates that will ultimately be turned over for University use if and when existing tenants voluntarily vacate their units through 2020).

The proposed Campus Master Plan includes a master plan map that locates major buildings to guide the siting of future campus facilities. The master plan map proposes to maintain the current general configuration of land uses on the campus, which consists of a concentrated academic core surrounded by residential and other campus uses. Most of the growth in facilities would occur through replacement and densification projects within the already developed campus. The proposed Campus Master Plan is further described in Chapter 3, *Project Description*.

2.3 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the proposed Campus Master Plan project originate in the obligation SF State has to meet its educational mission as defined by the California Education Code. The University undertook a lengthy Campus Master Plan development process, led by a Steering Committee comprising the academic and administrative communities on the SF State campus. The project objectives that are drawn from the Campus Master Plan are based on the physical planning principles derived from the long-term vision for the SF State campus, consistent with the University’s strategic plan. The project objectives are provided below.

1. Provide facilities for expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the proposed enrollment ceiling increase of 25,000 FTEs, required by the CSU and California Education Code;
2. Provide student, faculty, and staff housing to aid in recruitment and retention;
3. Implement the planning principles provided in the proposed Campus Master Plan as follows:

A vibrant on-campus community

- Reinforce the academic core and extend it westward
- Integrate residential properties to create a unified campus
- Provide more close-in, affordable housing that enables faculty, staff, and students to walk to school and work.
- Redefine Holloway and Buckingham as “college main streets” offering neighborhood retail and services

² Gross square feet is the sum of all areas, finished and unfinished, on all floors of an enclosed structure. It includes the assignable square feet, circulation and mechanical areas, custodial services and public toilet areas, structural elements and one-half of covered unenclosed areas.

Strong connections to the surrounding city

- Strengthen the University's connections to Lake Merced and the surrounding neighborhoods
- Work with neighbors, the City of San Francisco, and other entities to improve public transportation and other services that benefit the entire district.

Emphasis on the pedestrian and alternative transportation

- Cluster development around high-frequency transit connections to encourage transit use
- Establish bicycle and pedestrian networks that provide safe, direct and attractive connections to work and school
- Develop the 19th Avenue edge as a transit-, bicycle-, and pedestrian-friendly parkway
- Implement Transportation Demand Management strategies to reduce parking demand
- Decentralize campus parking over time from the current central garage to a series of smaller perimeter parking facilities to disperse traffic and parking impacts, claim the campus core for pedestrians and bicycles, and allow for the eventual removal of the central parking garage from the valley

Recognition in the city and region

- Position semi-public uses at the corners of campus, creating icons that redefine the University's external identity and engage the larger community
- Create an identifiable and inviting campus perimeter

A continuous greenbelt between 19th Avenue and Lake Merced

- Establish the valley as the central open space of campus
- Provide expanded recreational fields
- Restore ecological landscapes in the valley

Universal design and access

- Ensure that all aspects of the campus physical environment—notably primary circulation routes and main building entrances—are comfortably usable by and inviting to the widest group of people possible
- Organize and design primary pathways and graphic signage to facilitate wayfinding, using a combination of visual, tactile, and auditory cues
- Establish strong north-south connections across the valley and Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue that link the University to its residential districts and to the surrounding neighborhoods
- Establish clear east-west functional and visual connections across campus and to the surrounding district

A campus that models sustainability

- Develop transportation and land use patterns that encourage greater use of transit, walking, and bicycle commuting and reduce dependence on automobiles
- Make efficient use of redevelopment sites
- Promote sustainability through green building and site design, native landscape, natural stormwater management, alternative transportation, higher-density housing, and walkable neighborhood retail.

These project objectives guided the proposed Campus Master Plan development process and the identification of physical improvements necessary and appropriate for the SF State campus to fulfill its educational mission as well as implement its strategic vision and core values.

2.4 IMPACT SUMMARY

Table 2-1, which is presented at the end of Chapter 2, provides a complete list of all impacts and mitigation measures. For each impact, Table 2-1 reports the significance of the impact before mitigation, applicable mitigation measures, and the level of significance of the impact after the implementation of the mitigation measures.

2.5 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The following alternatives were analyzed in detail in the EIR and compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. The objective of the alternatives analysis is to determine whether an alternative would feasibly attain some or most of the project objectives, while avoiding or substantially lessening some of the significant effects of the proposed project. The Campus Master Plan alternatives include:

- **Alternative 1: Reduced Housing Growth.** Under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative, future development of the campus would be planned to accommodate the proposed enrollment ceiling increase to 25,000 FTE students on campus by 2020, similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan. However, under this alternative the existing housing in UPS and UPN will be retained and will not be redeveloped to provide for higher density housing and to provide for the Hotel and Conference Center. Therefore, this alternative will not result in the construction of new housing in UPN and UPS, nor will it result in the construction of the Hotel and Conference Center. While the replacement of units in UPN and UPS will not result in significant environmental impacts under CEQA, some members of the surrounding community are concerned about this replacement and the resulting possible displacement of people that currently live in these units. This alternative considers the environmental implications of not providing the proposed housing.
- **Alternative 2: Expanded Housing Growth.** Under the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, future development of the campus would be planned to accommodate the proposed enrollment ceiling increase to 25,000 FTE students on campus by 2020, similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan. However, under this alternative all of the existing housing in UPS and UPN would be redeveloped to provide for higher density housing and to provide for the Hotel and Conference Center. No other land

beyond these properties to the north and south was considered in this alternative (e.g., other locations within Villas Parkmerced), because the campus is not considering expanding beyond UPN and UPS. This alternative was considered in order to maximize the provision of on-campus housing in order to minimize vehicle trips to the campus in the surrounding neighborhoods.

- **Alternative 3: No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended).** Under the No Project Alternative, the campus would remain subject to the 1989 Master Plan, as most recently amended in 2006. The Campus would continue to operate under the current enrollment ceiling of 20,000 FTE, and will maintain student enrollment at that level, which will allow for no increase in enrollment over existing conditions. While the existing 1989 Campus Master Plan map (as amended) does identify sites for new academic buildings (e.g., Behavioral and Social Sciences building), these buildings cannot be built under the existing plan because they will add FTE capacity to the campus. Therefore, the only new building on the existing Campus Master Plan map that can be built without adding FTE capacity to the campus is a proposed new greenhouse.

Detailed description and an analysis of potential impacts of each alternative are presented in Chapter 5, *Alternatives*. Table 2-2 (which follows Table 2-1) presents a comparison of the environmental impacts of these alternatives with those expected to result from the proposed project.

The No Project Alternative would avoid all of the significant impacts of the proposed Campus Master Plan. However, it would not meet any of the project objectives, as discussed in detail in Chapter 5 of this EIR. If the environmental analysis indicates that the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d)(2) requires that the EIR identify another alternative as environmentally superior.

Of the remaining alternatives, the environmentally superior alternative is the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative because it would reduce the project's significant impacts with respect to traffic and air quality, and would place a reduced demand on off-campus housing supply. Some of the footprint impacts of this alternative, such as impacts on cultural and biological resources, would be greater than that of the proposed project or the other alternatives evaluated in detail, but because the additional areas that would be redeveloped (UPN and UPS) under this alternative are already highly disturbed, the likelihood of significant impacts related to biological and cultural resources in these areas is very low. This alternative would also provide a greater environmental benefit compared to the proposed project and the other alternatives evaluated in detail because under this alternative more storm water runoff from the campus would be infiltrated and/or discharged into Lake Merced and this would help restore lake levels. This alternative would meet all of the objectives of the proposed project; in particular, the objectives related to the provision of on-campus housing to aid in recruitment and retention of faculty and staff and to allow the SF State population to walk to work or school would be more fully met under this alternative,

2.6 KNOWN AREAS OF CONTROVERSY

This EIR addresses environmental issues associated with the proposed project that are known to the lead agency or were raised by agencies or interested parties during the public and agency NOP review period. These issues include:

- The potential displacement of people associated with the replacement of existing housing units in UPS and UPN with denser housing within these areas.
- Traffic impacts in the vicinity of campus.
- The potential worsening of over-flow parking in the surrounding neighborhoods and associated neighborhood traffic.
- Nighttime noise and security issues associated with students living in the neighborhoods.
- Effects of growth on local public services.

More comprehensive and detailed listings of issues raised during scoping are provided in the beginning of each section in Chapter 4. Comment letters received and scoping meeting transcripts are available for review in the office of Capital Planning, Design & Construction on the SF State campus.

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
4.1 Aesthetics					
AES-1	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not substantially damage the small groves of Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine located in and around the Campus Core landscape zone that constitute scenic resources on the campus.	LS	AES-1A	The small groves of mature Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine trees located within the Campus Core landscape zone will be maintained and preserved with development under the proposed Campus Master Plan. Tree trimming and/or tree removal will take place in this portion of the campus only if required based on tree health conditions, public safety issues, and /or to allow for proposed development.	LS
			AES-1B	Any mature Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine trees that will be removed with proposed development under the proposed Campus Master Plan shall be replaced at a 1:1 ratio elsewhere within the Quad landscape zone. This planting shall be in addition to any replacement program implemented under the proposed Campus Master Plan to address the natural decline of trees.	
			AES-1C	Mature Monterey Cypress and Monterey Pine trees that will be retained within or immediately adjacent to a construction site shall be adequately protected prior to the commencement of construction activities. Fencing shall be installed no closer than the drip line of trees, to the extent possible. Fencing closer to the trunk than the dripline will be permitted only when necessary to allow construction of project elements. The campus shall periodically inspect construction sites to ensure that protective construction fencing remains in place during the entire construction phase of future projects.	
AES-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not substantially degrade the existing visual character of the existing SF State campus.	LS	AES-2	Mitigation not required	LS
AES-3	Development of the new housing in University Park South under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially degrade the existing visual character of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood, if not properly designed.	PS	AES-3	Expand the proposed Campus Master Plan to provide for appropriate architectural and urban design guidelines that apply specifically to the proposed redevelopment of a portion of the existing University South Park (UPS) buildings. These guidelines will require that any proposed new structures in UPS respect the existing	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				visual characteristics of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood. The guidelines should consider building color and design, exterior treatments and design details, and building heights such that the proposed new development is visually compatible with the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood.	
AES-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not create new sources of substantial light or glare on campus that could adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.	LS	AES-4A	New campus lighting will be consistent with LEED-NC guidelines for light pollution reduction. These guidelines require that directional and other lighting methods be used to minimize light trespass from buildings and outdoor areas. Available methods, include but are not limited to: directional and design methods to reduce spillage, automatically controlled turn off of interior spaces during non-business hours, lighting exterior areas only for safety and comfort, and using lower intensity lights.	LS
			AES-4B	Revise the proposed Campus Master Plan architectural and urban design guidelines to indicate that reflective metal, mirrored glass, or any other reflective building materials shall not be used as primary building materials for facades.	
AES-5	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other vicinity development, will not result in significant cumulative impacts due to substantial degradation of the existing visual character of the area.	LS	AES-5	Mitigation not required	LS
4.2 Air Quality					
AIR-1	Construction activities under the Campus Master Plan would result in emissions of PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} on a short-term basis.	PS	AIR-1	The Campus shall apply the following feasible control measures as required by BAAQMD: Basic Control Measures – For all construction sites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water all active construction areas at least twice daily, or as needed. • Cover all trucks hauling soil, sand, and other loose materials or require all trucks to maintain at least two feet of freeboard 	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pave, apply water three times daily, or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers on all unpaved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites. • Sweep daily (with water sweepers) all paved access roads, parking areas and staging areas at construction sites. • Sweep streets daily (with water sweepers) if visible soil material is carried onto adjacent public streets. <p>Enhanced Control Measures – For sites greater than 4 acres in area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All “Basic” control measures listed above. • Hydroseed or apply (non-toxic) soil stabilizers to inactive construction areas (previously graded areas inactive for ten days or more.) • Enclose, cover, water twice daily or apply (non-toxic) soil binders to exposed stockpiles (dirt, sand, etc.) • Limit traffic speeds on unpaved roads to 15 mph. • Install sandbags or other erosion control measures to prevent silt runoff to public roadways. • Replant vegetation in disturbed areas as quickly as possible. • Suspend excavation and grading activity when winds (instantaneous gusts) exceed 25 mph. • Limit the area subject to excavation, grading and other construction activity at any one time. 	
AIR-2	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan.	PS	AIR-2A	The SF State campus will work with the ABAG to ensure that campus growth associated with the proposed Campus Master Plan is accounted for in the regional population forecasts.	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			AIR-2B	The SF State campus will work with BAAQMD to ensure that campus growth-related emissions are accounted for in the regional emissions inventory and mitigated in future air quality planning efforts.	
			AIR-2C	The SF State campus will work with BAAQMD to ensure that environmental review of projects that will result in new TACs (i.e., expansion of the Central Plant, the new Northern Plant, and expansion of building space for science programs) are closely coordinated with the District's permitting process. The analysis of TACs from these new sources will be conducted in accordance with the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines and appropriate and feasible mitigations measures will be developed as necessary to ensure that impacts are reduced to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures that could be incorporated into future projects include but are not limited to: the establishment of buffer zones, the installation of control devices on equipment, and changes to operational practices.	
AIR-3	Traffic generated by development under the Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with traffic associated with other regional growth, would result in an increase in local CO concentrations at study area intersections.	LS	AIR-3	Mitigation not required	LS
AIR-4	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan in conjunction with other regional growth in the air basin could potentially result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan.	PS	AIR-4	Implement Mitigations AIR-2A through AIR-2C.	LS
4.3 Biological Resources					
BIO-1	Construction of the proposed bridge underpass, creek inlet, and path connection, and the discharge of storm water into Lake Merced could potentially affect wetlands and other sensitive habitats, as well as special-status plant and wildlife species in the adjacent Lake Merced.	PS	BIO-1A	The new path connection and the new seasonal creek inlet in the East Lake area shall be located in consultation with the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission. The new path connection shall be sited to minimize loss of wetland and other sensitive habitats (including bulrush marsh and willow scrub areas along the lake edge) to the extent feasible, and the path will also be sited to avoid bringing people into sensitive bird	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
BIO-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially result in the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds.	PS	BIO-2A	<p>If project construction is scheduled during the typical avian nesting season (March 1 to August 31), each work site (including access routes) and the areas within 150 feet of the work site shall be surveyed by a qualified biologist for the presence of migratory and/or special-status nesting birds. Surveys shall be conducted at each work site within two weeks prior to the commencement of ground disturbing activities. Work sites include tree-removal areas and/or any construction site on campus or within or immediately adjacent to the Lake Merced Natural Area (i.e., the bridge replacement site, the path connector site, and the creek inlet site).</p> <p>If nesting birds were found to be present, a 150-foot buffer zone shall be established around the perimeter of the nest substrate (tree, shrub, herb, etc.) and clearly marked with “environmentally sensitive area” fencing. Construction or any related activities shall not be conducted within those areas until all observed nesting activities are completed. A qualified biologist shall determine nesting status. Pre-construction surveys will not be required if project construction is scheduled outside the typical avian nesting season (September 1-February 28).</p>	LS
			BIO-2B	Appropriate signage and other design features (e.g., fencing) will be installed as deemed appropriate by the San Francisco Public Utilities Commission, to keep people on the connector path and to discourage the creation of ad-hoc trails. This signage will explain the potential for people to disturb birds nesting in the marsh vegetation around the edges of the lake, if they stray from the path.	
BIO-3	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan NCCP), or other applicable HCP.	LS	BIO-3	Mitigation not required	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
BIO-4	Campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other reasonably foreseeable development in the project vicinity, would not result in a substantial adverse cumulative impact on sensitive natural communities or special-status plant and wildlife species.	LS	BIO-4	Mitigation not required	LS
4.4 Cultural Resources					
CULT-1	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource through damage or destruction that could occur as a result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.	PS	CULT-1A	<p>During the planning and environmental review of specific development projects under the proposed Campus Master Plan, the campus shall follow the following protocol:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the project site is within 200 feet of archaeological site P-38-000025/CA-SFR-25, the campus shall conduct subsurface testing in order to determine whether buried archaeological materials are present and if so the extent of the deposit relative to the project's area of disturbance. In the event that an archaeological resource is encountered during subsurface testing, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B. No surveys or subsurface testing are necessary at project sites in the rest of the campus. The campus shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract, which requires that in the event that an archaeological resource is discovered during construction (whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease, and the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1B below. 	LS
			CULT-1B	<p>For an archaeological site that is encountered during subsurface testing or during construction, the campus shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain a qualified archaeologist to determine whether the resource qualifies as a historical 	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			<p>CULT-2C</p> <p>(ii) For a building or structure that qualifies as a historic resource, the architectural historian and the campus shall consider measures that would enable the project to avoid direct or indirect impacts to the building or structure. These measures could include preserving a building on the margin of the project site, using it “as is,” or other measures that would not alter the building. If the project cannot avoid modifications to a significant building or structure, the campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-2C.</p> <p>For a structure or building that has been determined by a qualified architectural historian to qualify as a historical resource, and where avoidance is not feasible, documentation and treatment shall be carried out as described below:</p> <p>(i) If the building or structure can be preserved on site, but remodeling, renovation or other alterations are required, this work shall be conducted in compliance with the “Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring, and Reconstructing Historic Buildings” (Weeks and Grimmer 1995).</p> <p>(ii) If a significant historic building or structure is proposed for major alteration or renovation, or to be moved and/or demolished, the campus shall ensure that a qualified architectural historian thoroughly documents the building and associated landscaping and setting. Documentation shall include still and video photography and a written documentary record of the building to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS) or Historic American Engineering Record (HAER), including accurate scaled mapping, architectural descriptions, and scaled architectural plans, if</p>	

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				<p>available. A copy of the record shall be deposited with the SF State Library. The record shall be accompanied by a report containing site-specific history and appropriate contextual information. This information shall be gathered through site specific and comparative archival research, and oral history collection as appropriate.</p> <p>(iii) If preservation and reuse at the site are not feasible, the historical building shall be documented as described in item (ii) and, when physically and financially feasible, be moved and preserved or reused.</p> <p>(iv) If, in the opinion of the qualified architectural historian, the nature and significance of the building is such that its demolition or destruction cannot be fully mitigated through documentation, the campus shall reconsider project plans in light of the high value of the resource, and implement more substantial modifications to the proposed project that would allow the structure to be preserved intact. These could include project redesign, relocation or abandonment.</p>	
CULT-3	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	PS	CULT-3A CULT-3B CULT-3C	<p>The campus shall implement Mitigation CULT-1 to minimize the potential for disturbance or destruction of human remains in an archaeological context and to preserve them in place, if feasible.</p> <p>The campus shall provide a representative of the local Native American community an opportunity to monitor any excavation (including archaeological excavation) within the boundaries of a known Native American archaeological site.</p> <p>In the event of a discovery on campus of human bone, suspected human bone, or a burial, all excavation in the vicinity will halt immediately and the area of the find will be protected until a qualified archaeologist</p>	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			CULT-3D	<p>determines whether the bone is human. If the qualified archaeologist determines the bone is human, or if a qualified archaeologist is not present, the campus will notify the County of San Francisco Medical Examiner of the find before additional disturbance occurs. Consistent with California Health and Safety Code § 7050.5(b), which prohibits disturbance of human remains uncovered by excavation until the Coroner has made a finding relative to PRC 5097 procedures, the campus will ensure that the remains and vicinity of the find are protected against further disturbance. If it is determined that the find is of Native American origin, the campus will comply with the provisions of PRC § 5097.98 regarding identification and involvement of the Native American Most Likely Descendant (MLD).</p> <p>If human remains cannot be left in place, the campus shall ensure that the qualified archaeologist and the MLD are provided an opportunity to confer on archaeological treatment of human remains, and that appropriate studies, as identified through this consultation, are carried out prior to reinternment. The campus shall provide results of all such studies to the local Native American community, and shall provide an opportunity of local Native American involvement in any interpretative reporting. As stipulated by the provisions of the California Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, the campus shall ensure that human remains and associated artifacts recovered from campus projects on state lands are repatriated to the appropriate local tribal group if requested.</p>	
CULT-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb and destroy significant paleontological resources, if they are located in undisturbed native sediments below the campus.	PS	CULT-4A	Prior to construction, a qualified paleontologist shall be consulted regarding the likelihood of encountering significant fossils on a given construction site. If the paleontologist determines fossils may be present, a paleontologic monitor shall be present at each excavation that penetrates potentially fossiliferous	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
			<p>CULT-4B</p> <p>CULT-4C</p>	<p>undisturbed native soil of the Colma Formation that has been identified by the paleontologist as moderately to highly sensitive.</p> <p>If a monitor is not required, contractors shall be notified that they are required to watch for potential paleontological resources and must notify the campus if paleontological resources are found.</p> <p>If paleontological resources are discovered, all soil disturbing work shall cease within 100 feet of the location. The resources shall be evaluated by a qualified paleontologist who will determine the resource’s potential scientific significance. If the find is determined to be significant, or potentially significant, a qualified paleontologist shall design and carry out data recovery consistent with the Standards of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontologists. Adequate recordation and recovery would include, at a minimum, the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of site-specific environment and contextual information regarding the particular resource. • Archival research and review of other studies in the area. • Accurate recordation and excavation of the noted resources. • In the event that a major significant find is uncovered, prior to excavating the significant resource, the campus shall ensure that an appropriate museum or scientific repository is selected for curation of the recovered materials. 	
CULT-5	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could contribute to cumulative damage to and/or loss of the resource base of unique archaeological resources and historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures), human remains, and paleontological resources in the City and County	PS	CULT-5	The campus shall implement Mitigations CULT-1 through CULT-4.	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
	of San Francisco.				
4.5 Geology, Soils and Seismicity					
GEO-1	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not expose people and structures on campus to substantial adverse effects associated with fault rupture, but could result in substantial adverse effects related to seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides, and/or settlement.	PS	GEO-1	Where existing geotechnical information is not adequate, detailed geotechnical investigations shall be performed for areas that will support buildings or foundations. Such investigations for building or foundation projects located in the valley portion of the SF State campus will comply with the California Geological Survey's <i>Guidelines for Evaluating and Mitigating Seismic Hazards in California</i> (Special Publication 117), which specifically address the mitigation of liquefaction and landslide hazards in designated Seismic Hazard Zones (CGS, 1997). All recommendations of the geotechnical investigations will be incorporated into project designs.	LS
GEO-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not result in substantial erosion of soils during construction.	LS	GEO-2	Mitigation not required	LS
GEO-3	Cumulative development, including the development on campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, could expose people or structures to potential adverse effects involving seismic ground shaking and related ground failure.	LS	GEO-3	Mitigation not required	LS
4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
HAZ-1	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan will increase routine use of hazardous materials, generation of hazardous wastes, and transport of such materials by SF State laboratories and departments and in maintenance and support operations, which will not create significant hazards to the public or the environment.	LS	HAZ-1	Mitigation not required	LS
HAZ-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not create significant hazards to the public or the environment, such that existing or proposed adjacent schools may be affected.	LS	HAZ-2	Mitigation not required	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
HAZ-3	Construction and demolition activities under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated soil or groundwater.	LS	HAZ-3	Mitigation not required	LS
HAZ-4	Demolition or renovation of buildings under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials.	PS	HAZ-4	<p>SF State will develop procedures regarding the demolition of laboratory space. These provisions will ensure the removal of hazardous materials; the decontamination of surfaces and equipment; proper characterization, storage and shipment of hazardous materials removed from laboratories; and proper worker training and safety procedures. These procedures should provide for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removal of all hazardous materials • User inspection for contamination • Performance of a site audit to determine likelihood of chemical spills • Performance of sampling for potential chemical contamination, if site audit finds that this is warranted • Use of survey meters or wipe samples to detect lingering radioactivity, if radioactive materials were present • Performance of sampling for potential chemical contamination, if site audit finds that this is warranted • Communication with workers to ensure any remaining risk and health and safety procedures are understood and followed during demolition • Following proper procedures for characterizing, storing, and shipping hazardous wastes, if necessary 	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
HAZ-5	Campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially interfere physically with the campus's Emergency Operations Plan (EOP).	LS	HAZ-5A	The campus shall continue to include the following requirements in its standards established by Capital Planning and implement them under the proposed Campus Master Plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction work shall be conducted so as to ensure the least possible obstruction to traffic. • Contractors shall notify the SF State's Representative at least two weeks before any road closure. • When paths, lanes, or roadways are blocked, detour signs must be installed to clearly designate an alternate route. • Fire hydrants shall be kept accessible to fire fighting equipment at all times. • To ensure adequate access for emergency vehicles when construction projects will result in temporary lane or roadway closures, campus police and dispatchers must be notified of the closures and alternative travel routes. 	LS
			HAZ-5B	New building and/or department-specific EOPs shall be developed for any new development project.	
HAZ-6	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other area development, will result in increased use, disposal, and transport of hazardous materials, but the increase will not result in a significant cumulative hazard or hazardous materials impact. It is unlikely that there will be a cumulative increase in risk of hazardous materials release, or risk to existing and proposed schools from handling of hazardous materials.	LS	HAZ-6	Mitigation not required	LS
4.7 Hydrology					
HYDRO-1	Storm water runoff from the campus could potentially increase nutrients in Lake Merced, and thereby adversely affect water quality.	PS	HYDRO-1	The campus shall conduct monitoring of storm water discharges to Lake Merced. If monitoring data indicate that the discharge of storm water from SF State to Lake	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				Merced increases the level of nutrients in the lake, then depending on the source of the nutrient, additional measures (e.g., reduce the use of fertilizer on campus) to reduce nutrient loads shall be implemented.	
HYDRO-2	Development of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect the Westside Groundwater Basin.	LS	HYDRO-2	Mitigation not required	LS
HYDRO-3	Development of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not result in any other hydrology and water quality impacts.	LS	HYDRO-3	Mitigation not required	LS
HYDRO-4	Campus development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other reasonably foreseeable development in the project vicinity, would not result in an adverse cumulative impact on Lake Merced water quality.	LS	HYDRO-4	Mitigation not required	LS
4.8 Land Use and Planning					
LU-1	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not physically divide an established community.	LS	LU-1	Mitigation not required	LS
LU-2	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not conflict with applicable land use plans, policies, or regulations of an agency with jurisdiction over the project adopted for the purposes of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	LS	LU-2	Mitigation not required	LS
LU-3	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, together with other growth in the vicinity, will not result in the development of land uses that are substantially incompatible with existing adjacent land uses or planned uses in the southwestern portion of San Francisco.	LS	LU-3	Mitigation not required	LS
4.9 Noise					
NOIS-1	Construction of campus facilities under the Campus Master Plan could expose nearby sensitive receptors to excessive airborne noise but not to excessive	PS	NOIS-1	The campus shall include the following noise control measures in all construction contracts for construction projects that are within 100 feet of a sensitive receptor:	SU

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
	groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Construction equipment used on campus is properly maintained and has been outfitted with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise. • Stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible. • Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses. • Whenever possible, academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise will be informed in writing at least a week before the start of each construction project. • Loud construction activity (i.e., construction activity such as jackhammering, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building shall not be scheduled during finals week. • Loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic use shall, to the extent feasible, be scheduled during weekends, holidays, Thanksgiving break, Christmas break, Spring break, or Summer break. • Loud construction activity within 500 feet of a residential building shall be restricted to the hours between 7:30 AM and 7:30 PM, Monday through Saturday. 	
NOIS-2	The increase in vehicular traffic on the city road network due to campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would not result in a noticeable increase in ambient noise levels.	LS	NOIS-2	Mitigation not required	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
4.10 Population and Housing					
POP-1	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would directly cause population growth in the study area by accommodating increased enrollment and employment, but this growth would not be substantial.	LS	POP-1	Mitigation not required	LS
POP-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not indirectly induce substantial population growth in the study area through extension of roads or other infrastructure.	LS	POP-2	Mitigation not required	LS
POP-3	Growth of the SF State campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, would not create a demand for housing that would exceed the supply or displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region.	LS	POP-3	Mitigation not required	LS
POP-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region.	LS	POP-4	Mitigation not required	LS
POP-5	Growth of the SF State campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other regional growth, would create a demand for housing that would exceed the supply, but the project's contribution will not be cumulatively considerable.	LS	POP-5	Mitigation not required	LS
4.11 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking					
TRA-1	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan could potentially contribute substantial traffic at two intersections in southwest San Francisco.	S	TRA-1	<p>The campus shall implement the following monitoring and mitigation program:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a first step, the campus shall conduct a new baseline cordon survey no less than 18 months following the certification of this EIR. Alternately, the campus may use the 2006 cordon survey as a baseline. Next, at intervals of no more than every three years, and no later than the addition of each 1,000 	SU

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				<p>students in enrollment, SF State will hire an outside transportation planning or data analysis firm to conduct a statistically significant cordon survey of campus commuters during the PM peak hours. The cordon survey will cover all major entrances to the campus and will examine the travel behavior of SF State affiliates. The survey will be conducted during typical days while classes are in session, excluding final examination, national holiday or orientation weeks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If cordon surveys show that the PM peak period auto trips to and from campus are greater than 5 percent above the baseline, the campus shall conduct the cordon surveys annually. • If the cordon surveys show an increase in PM peak period auto trips sufficient to result in impacts at the two affected intersections, the campus will increase the level of TDM programs until the impacts associated with traffic increases are mitigated to a less-than-significant level. • If the campus fails to reduce its traffic impacts to a less-than-significant level for more than two years in a row, it will contribute its “fair share” (as defined in this EIR) of the cost of identified intersection improvements to the City and County of San Francisco, as appropriate. 	
TRA-2	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would result in a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity.	PS	TRA-2A	In the event that transit capacity enhancements listed in the Campus Master Plan are not implemented in a timely manner by Muni and/or SFCTA and if Muni reports that M line average pm peak period, peak direction passenger loading between SF State and West Portal Station exceeds 85 percent of combined seating and standing load capacity for two or more years in a row, SF State will extend the campus shuttle service to West Portal Station, and this service will achieve the 85 percent combined seated/standing passenger capacity	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation ¹	Campus Master Plan Mitigation Measures		Level of Significance Following Mitigation ¹
				target.	
			TRA-2B	The campus shall monitor peak hour utilization of campus shuttle buses on an annual basis and if average PM peak period, peak direction passenger loading exceeds 85 percent of combined seated and standing load capacity for service between the campus and the Daly City BART station, the campus shall increase shuttle frequency or add higher capacity vehicles until this standard is met.	
TRA-3	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect conditions for pedestrians or otherwise interfere with pedestrian accessibility.	LS	TRA-3	Mitigation not required	LS
TRA-4	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not adversely affect conditions for bicyclists.	LS	TRA-4	Mitigation not required	LS
TRA-5	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not result in a parking demand that exceeds the projected supply.	LS	TRA-5	Mitigation not required	LS
TRA-6	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not conflict with any adopted plans, policies or programs supporting alternative transportation.	LS	TRA-6	Mitigation not required	LS
4.12 Utilities and Public Services					
UTL-1	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction or expansion of water supply or distribution facilities, nor will new water supply entitlements be required to serve the project.	LS	UTL-1	Mitigation not required	LS
UTL-2	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction or expansion of wastewater and/or storm water distribution or treatment facilities.	LS	UTL-2	Mitigation not required	LS
UTL-3	The proposed Campus Master Plan will result in the construction of new electrical, natural gas, and heating water facilities, which will not cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	UTL-3	Mitigation not required	LS

**Table 2-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures in the Campus Master Plan EIR**

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

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)	Reduced Housing Growth Alternative	Expanded Housing Growth Alternative	No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)
4.1 Aesthetics					
AES-3	Development of new housing in University Park South under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially degrade the existing visual character of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood, if not property designed.	PS	LS	PS+	NI
4.2 Air Quality					
AIR-1	Construction activities under the Campus Master Plan would result in emissions of PM ₁₀ and PM _{2.5} on a short-term basis.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
AIR-2	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan.	PS	PS	PS-	NI
AIR-4	Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan in conjunction with other regional growth in the air basin could potentially result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan.	PS	PS	PS-	NI
4.3 Biological Resources					
BIO-1	Construction of the proposed bridge underpass, creek inlet, and path connection, and the discharge of storm water into Lake Merced could potentially affect wetlands and other sensitive habitats, as well as special-status plant and wildlife species in the adjacent Lake Merced.	PS	PS	PS	NI
BIO-2	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially result in the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
4.4 Cultural Resources					
CULT-1	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource through	PS	PS-	PS+	NI

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

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)	Reduced Housing Growth Alternative	Expanded Housing Growth Alternative	No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)
	damage or destruction that could occur as a result of grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.				
CULT-2	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical building or structure, as a result of alteration, removal or demolition of the building, or alteration of the site associated with project development.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
CULT-3	Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
CULT-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb and destroy significant paleontological resources, if they are located in undisturbed native sediments below the campus.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
CULT-5	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could contribute to cumulative damage to and/or loss of the resource base of unique archaeological resources and historical resources (including archaeological sites and historic buildings and structures), human remains, and paleontological resources in the City and County of San Francisco.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
4.5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity					
GEO-1	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not expose people and structures on campus to substantial adverse effects associated with fault rupture, but could result in substantial adverse effects related to seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction, lateral spreading, landslides, and/or settlement.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials					
HAZ-4	Demolition or renovation of buildings under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially expose	PS	PS	PS	NI

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

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)	Reduced Housing Growth Alternative	Expanded Housing Growth Alternative	No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)
	construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials.				
4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality					
HYDRO-1	Storm water runoff from the campus could potentially increase nutrients in Lake Merced, and thereby adversely affect water quality.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
4.9 Noise					
NOIS-1	Construction of campus facilities under the Campus Master Plan could expose nearby sensitive receptors to excessive airborne noise but not to excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise.	PS	PS-	PS+	NI
4.10 Population and Housing					
POP-3	Growth of the SF State campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, would not create a demand for housing that would exceed the supply or displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region.	LS	LS+	LS-	NI
POP-4	Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region.	LS	LS-	LS+	NI
POP-5	Growth of the SF State campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan, in conjunction with other regional growth, would create a demand for housing that would exceed the supply, but the project's contribution will not be cumulatively considerable.	LS	SU	LS-	NI
4.11 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking					
TRA-1	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan could potentially contribute substantial traffic at two intersections in southwest San Francisco.	S	S	S-	NI
TRA-2	Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would	S	S+	S-	NI

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

**Table 2-2
Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives**

Campus Master Plan Impact		Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)	Reduced Housing Growth Alternative	Expanded Housing Growth Alternative	No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)
	result in a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity.				
4.12 Utilities and Public Services					
UTL-1	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction or expansion of water supply or distribution facilities, nor will new water supply entitlements be required to serve the project.	LS	LS	LS	NI
UTL-2	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction or expansion of wastewater and/or storm water distribution or treatment facilities.	LS	LS	LS	NI
UTL-3	The proposed Campus Master Plan will result in the construction of new electrical, natural gas, and heating water facilities, which will not cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	LS	LS	NI
UTL-4	Growth and development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will not require the construction of new or physically altered police or fire protection facilities that will cause significant environmental impacts.	LS	LS-	LS+	NI

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