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CEQA requires an EIR to describe and evaluate a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, or alternatives to the location of the proposed project. The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to explore ways that the objectives of the proposed project could be attained while avoiding or reducing significant environmental impacts of the project as proposed. The alternatives discussion must evaluate the comparative merits of each alternative relative to the proposed project and the discussion of each alternative should be sufficient to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis, and comparison with the proposed project. Therefore, the significant effects of each alternative are discussed in less detail than those for the project, but in sufficient detail to permit decision makers to make a reasoned choice when considering approval of a project. This process is intended to foster informed decision-making and public participation in the environmental process.

Comments received on the Notice of Preparation regarding alternatives to the proposed Campus Master Plan are summarized below:

- A commenter asked that the alternatives analysis include a scenario based on a reduction of the number of current students and services, not an increase.
- A commenter asked that all potential sites that SF State is considering building housing on be identified in relationship to a larger building program alternative, including lands not currently owned by the campus.
- Commenters suggested building housing on the central part of the campus instead of building new housing in UPS and UPN.
- Commenters suggested that proposed growth take place at other SF State regional centers, (e.g., the Downtown Center).
- Commenters suggested that proposed growth take place at some other location.

All of these comments are addressed in the analysis that follows.

5.1 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternatives considered in the EIR should be feasible, and should attain most of the basic 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

   **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
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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.

5.2 OVERVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF PROPOSED CAMPUS MASTER PLAN

The range of alternatives studied in the EIR must be broad enough to permit a reasoned choice by decision-makers when considering the merits of the project. The analysis should focus on alternatives that are feasible (i.e., that may be accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, and that take economic, environmental, social and technological factors into account). Under CEQA, alternatives that are remote or speculative should not be discussed in the alternatives analysis. Furthermore, alternatives should focus on reducing or avoiding significant environmental impacts.
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associated with the project as proposed. Campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan would result in the following significant or potentially significant environmental impacts:

- Impacts on aesthetics related to the potential degradation to the existing visual character of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood due to development in a portion of UPS (Impact AES-3).
- Impacts on air quality including from construction dust emissions (Impact AIR-1) and operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan of the BAAQMD (Impacts AIR-2 and AIR-4).
- Impacts on biological resources, including: wetlands and special-status plants and wildlife in the adjacent Lake Merced related to the construction of the proposed creek inlet and path connection, and the discharge of storm water into Lake Merced (Impact BIO-1); and loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds on campus and in the adjacent Lake Merced (Impact BIO-2).
- Impacts on cultural resources, including archeological sites, historic features and buildings, human remains, and paleontological resources (Impacts CULT-1 through -5).
- Impacts related to seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure (Impact GEO-1).
- Impacts associated with hazardous materials related to the demolition of buildings and exposure to contaminated building materials (Impact HAZ-4).
- Impacts on hydrology and water quality related to directing storm water flows to Lake Merced, which could potentially increase nutrients in the lake (Impact HYDRO-1).
- Impacts associated with the exposure of sensitive receptors to excessive construction noise levels (Impact NOIS-1).
- Impacts related to the contribution of substantial traffic at two intersections in southwest San Francisco (Impact TRA-1) and a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity (Impact TRA-2).

Most of the potentially significant impacts can be reduced to less-than-significant levels through incorporation of mitigation measures. However, the project would have significant and unavoidable impacts with respect to historic resources in exceptional cases (Impact CULT-2), construction noise in exceptional cases (Impact NOIS-1), and off-campus traffic under the worst-case scenario (Impact TRA-1).

The analysis below presents the alternatives that were considered for this project. As required by CEQA Guidelines, a No Project Alternative is also analyzed. Each alternative is examined for its ability to reduce environmental impacts relative to the proposed project, feasibility of implementation, and ability to meet project objectives.
5.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED AS INFEASIBLE

This section discusses alternatives that were considered for the project but were rejected because they did not meet project objectives or were found to be infeasible for technical, environmental, or social reasons.

5.3.1 Alternative Site Plans

In the course of the development of the Campus Master Plan, the Campus considered a number of urban design concept alternatives to accommodate the same growth in population and building space that is envisioned under the proposed Campus Master Plan. These alternatives explored different configurations for the new academic facilities, housing, and key semi-public uses. However, all of these alternatives were striving to achieve the same vision and planning principles, identified for the master planning process such as: reinforcing the academic core and extending it westward, decentralizing parking, and establishing the valley as the central open space of campus (see Project Objectives in Section 5.1 above for further information). Therefore, these alternatives are not dramatically different from one another. The primary difference is that each of the scenarios present different locations for the Gym/Recreation-Wellness Center, which was the most challenging facility to site due to its size, as well as other semi-public uses.

Options A, B, C, and D were presented to the Steering Committee in meetings in the spring and fall of 2006. As a result of the evaluation of these options, and comments and other input received in public meetings, a variation of the urban design concepts was selected and carried forward as the preferred concept plan for the proposed Campus Master Plan. The various urban design concept alternatives are not evaluated in detail in this EIR as project alternatives, as they would not reduce or otherwise substantially change the conclusions of the environmental analysis for the proposed project, given that the same level of growth would occur with all of these alternatives.

5.3.2 Off-Campus Alternatives

A number of public comments received during the NOP process indicated that the proposed growth should be accommodated at SF State regional centers, such as the Downtown Center, Tiburon, etc., or at some other off-campus site. Alternative sites were not considered during the master planning process for a number of reasons. 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. Moreover, the SF State regional centers do not have adequate capacity to accommodate the proposed enrollment ceiling increase and physical development anticipated by the Campus Master Plan. Additionally, as the SF State campus does not own any other land that would be suitable for a new satellite campus, such an alternative is also not considered feasible. It should also be noted that it is much more sustainable and environmentally sound to expand an existing urban campus where the infrastructure is already in place versus developing a new campus on undeveloped land remote...
from these resources. For the above reasons, off-campus alternatives are not evaluated in detail in this EIR.

### 5.3.3 Rehabilitation of Existing Structures

Much of the proposed Campus Master Plan involves the replacement of existing buildings that are beyond their useful life. The SF State campus considered whether it would be feasible to rehabilitate and reuse the existing structures as opposed to replacing them. It was determined that this approach would not be feasible due to the high costs of rehabilitation and also due to substantial issues involving lack of ADA access in older campus buildings. Additionally, building rehabilitation does not allow for as much flexibility to add building capacity as building replacement does, which is needed to serve the population growth anticipated by the proposed enrollment ceiling increase. Therefore, this alternative was considered but rejected by the SF State campus, as it would not meet the primary project objective of providing for the physical development needed to serve the additional 5,000 FTE students that would result from the proposed enrollment ceiling increase.

### 5.3.4 Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative

A reduced enrollment growth alternative was considered and rejected by the SF State campus because:

1. It does not meet the primary objective of the project, which is to enable SF State to accommodate an increased enrollment cap of 25,000 FTEs by 2020;
2. Larger CSU campuses typically grow in 5,000 FTE student increments, and
3. Providing for a reduced enrollment growth alternative would not provide for a long enough period of growth for the campus before needing to seek another enrollment increase.

Regarding the third point, given the campus’s historic growth rate of about 2.5 percent per year, a reduced enrollment growth alternative that was substantially less than that currently being proposed (e.g., 2,500 FTE students) would not provide for a long enough period of campus growth. In all likelihood under such a reduced enrollment alternative, the campus would be required to seek another Campus Master Plan and enrollment ceiling increase in 5 years or less. The time and cost involved in developing the proposed Campus Master Plan and EIR and in getting an approval for a 5,000 FTE student enrollment increase makes sense when it allows the campus to proceed with 10 plus years of growth. However, such a process is not practical for a smaller increment of growth. For the above reasons, a reduced enrollment growth alternative was considered but rejected from further analysis. Given that a reduced enrollment growth alternative was considered but rejected as infeasible, a building program that would increase academic building space on the campus by less than 1.2 million square feet was also rejected from further consideration.

Additionally, the suggestion received during the NOP comment period that SF State consider reducing existing enrollment rather than increasing it is not feasible given CSU’s mandate to the campuses in its system. This alternative was therefore considered but rejected, as it also does not meet the primary objective of the project cited above.
5.4 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN DETAIL

This section presents an evaluation of three alternatives to the proposed Campus Master Plan:

- Reduced Housing Growth Alternative
- Expanded Housing Growth Alternative
- No Project Alternative

Several of the significant impacts of the Campus Master Plan stem from the size of the new population and the amount of on-campus housing that will result with the implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan and enrollment ceiling increase. The increase in the size of the on-campus residential population by 2020 would determine the magnitude of traffic impacts. The size of this new population would also determine the magnitude of the impacts on regional housing resources. Therefore, the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative was developed as a means to reduce traffic impacts and impacts on regional housing resources. This alternative looks at replacing all of the existing housing in UPN and UPS with higher density housing in order to provide for more on-campus housing. However, members of the surrounding neighborhood are concerned about reconstruction and replacement of existing units in UPN and UPS and the potential displacement of existing residents that may occur as a result of this proposed reconstruction. Therefore, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative was developed as a means to avoid this reconstruction. The No Project Alternative, which is required by CEQA, would result in the continued implementation of the 1989 Campus Master Plan for the campus, which would not allow for any enrollment or academic capacity increases on the campus.

Key attributes of the three alternatives are listed in Tables 5-1 and 5-2. Figure 5-1, Master Plan Diagram, shows the areas that would be developed under the proposed Campus Master Plan. This figure is provided to assist the reader in comparing the area of effect (footprints) of the alternatives to that of the proposed Campus Master Plan. Figures 5-2 and 5-3 illustrate the areas that would be developed under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative and the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, respectively.

For each alternative, a brief description is first presented, followed by a summary impact analysis relative to the proposed project, and an assessment of the degree to which the alternative would meet project objectives.
## Table 5-1
Summary of Project Characteristics for Campus Master Plan Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>New Students (FTE)</th>
<th>Net Increase in Non-Residential Building Space (million gsf)</th>
<th>New Housing Construction in UPN/UPS (Units)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

## Table 5-2
SF State Affiliates Accommodated in New and Remaining On-Campus Housing Under Each Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Net Increase in Remaining UPS/UPN Units Occupied by SF State by 2020¹</th>
<th>New Housing Units Constructed in UPS/UPN by 2020²</th>
<th>Housing Units demolished in Core by 2020³</th>
<th>Net Increase in New and Remaining On-Campus Housing Occupied by SF State by 2020⁴</th>
<th>Net Increase in SF State Affiliates Housed in New and Remaining On-Campus Units by 2020⁵</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Project</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>1,693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1,357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</td>
<td>-288</td>
<td>1,844</td>
<td>-49</td>
<td>1,507</td>
<td>3,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Project</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1,056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. The number of remaining units is based on the total of existing units (960 units), minus the number of units that would be demolished under the alternative, if any, and minus the number of units currently occupied by SF State affiliates (288). Existing SF State affiliates housed is based on an estimate that about 30 percent of the existing 960 units in UPN and UPS are occupied by SF State affiliates, most of them students. The total SF State affiliates housed in remaining units by 2020 is based on the assumption that about 85 percent of the remaining units in UPN and UPS under the alternative would be occupied by SF State affiliates.
2. Data taken from Table 5-1.
3. The amount of core housing would be reduced under most alternatives by 49 units to allow for the development of new faculty offices.
4. The net increase is equal to the sum of columns 1 through 3.
5. The total net increase in SF State affiliates housed in new units by 2020 is based on the total number of new and remaining in column 4. It is assumed that about 50 percent of these units would be occupied by students at 3 students per unit and about 50 percent would be occupied by SF State employees at 1 employee per unit.
5.4.1 Alternative 1. Reduced Housing Growth

5.4.1.1 Description

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 demolition and the resulting possible displacement of people that currently live in these units. Therefore this alternative considers the environmental implications of not providing this housing.

Members of the community also suggested providing the additional housing on the main part of the campus, as opposed to in UPN and UPS. Given that on-campus housing reduces traffic and parking impacts, moving the proposed new housing elsewhere on campus was considered as part of the development of this alternative. However, in general additional housing cannot be provided elsewhere on campus for the following reasons: (1) existing remaining open space on campus in the valley needs to be retained to provide for existing and new recreational facilities, the need for which will continue to grow as the campus grows; (2) the open space area of the valley will also be utilized to accomplish the proposed storm water management system, which is beneficial in that it will contribute to raising lake levels in Lake Merced and will also reduce the amount of runoff directed to San Francisco’s combined sewer system; and (3) the replacement of existing student housing on campus with higher density housing is not feasible at this time, given that such housing (e.g., Mary Park Hall) is already paid for and is not beyond its useful life. The only remaining location where housing could be developed is the Sutro Library site, which is also proposed for housing development under the proposed Campus Master Plan. This alternative therefore also includes the development of about 200 housing units on the Sutro site, similar to the proposed project.

Overall, this alternative will result in about 1,357 SF State affiliates being housed on campus in comparison to about 1,693 under the proposed Campus Master Plan, or about a 20 percent reduction. This alternative will also result in a reduction in the total square footage of non-residential building space as a result of not building the Hotel and Conference Center. The net increase in academic, support, and semi-public space that would result under this alternative would be about 0.8 million gsf of space, or a reduction of about 30 percent as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. The main change in the footprint of development compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan is that there would be no new development of housing or the Hotel and Conference Center in UPN and UPS, as noted above. Figure 5-2, Reduced Housing Growth Alternative, shows the footprint of development on the campus under this alternative.
5.4.1.2 Impact Analysis

The impact analysis below focuses on those impacts that were determined to be potentially significant under the proposed Campus Master Plan, as summarized in Section 5.2 above. Less-than-significant project impacts are discussed only if implementation of the alternative will substantially increase the impact. Table 5-3 provides a comparison of the environmental effects of the proposed project and the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative.

Aesthetics

The development of the SF State campus under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will not result in less development in the academic core of campus. The same amount and type of academic and support facilities in the central portion of campus will also be constructed under this alternative. However, development under this alternative will avoid the aesthetic impact related to the potential degradation of the visual character of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood (Impact AES-3), as existing housing in UPS will not be redeveloped under this alternative. Therefore, no mitigation will be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

Air Quality

Development of the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will somewhat reduce construction PM\textsubscript{10} and PM\textsubscript{2.5} emissions (Impact AIR-1) as less building space will be constructed, as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. However, the impact will remain potentially significant under this alternative and Mitigation AIR-1 will need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

At a regional level, the operational impacts from this alternative will be similar than those from the proposed Campus Master Plan (Impact AIR-2). As discussed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines distinguish between projects and plans and recommend that the evaluation of air quality impacts from land use plans not focus on the quantification of emissions but rather on an analysis of the plan’s consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP). As this alternative will have the same level of population growth as the proposed Campus Master Plan, it will also result in a potentially significant impact. This alternative would also require implementation of the same mitigation measures (Mitigations AIR-2A and -2B). Because the Bay Area does not attain the state ozone standard, growth that is not consistent with the CAP could potentially hinder attainment efforts. This air quality impact of this alternative will likely be very similar to that of the proposed project because although daily vehicle trips will likely be greater under this alternative (as a result of reduced on-campus housing), the increase will be offset by the avoidance of vehicle trips associated with the Hotel and Conference Center. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative will be consistent with the CAP in relationship to the CAP Transportation Control Measures and in relationship to the CAP criteria regarding odors and toxics assuming Mitigation AIR-2C is implemented. Overall, implementation of Mitigations AIR-2A through AIR-2C would reduce this impact to a less-than-significant level, as for the proposed project.

This alternative will result in a similar potentially significant cumulative contribution of ozone precursors to the regional air basin, as the proposed Campus Master Plan (Impact AIR-4). According to the
BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines for any project that does not individually have significant operational air quality impacts, the determination of significant cumulative impacts should be based on an evaluation of the consistency of the project with the local general plan and of the local general plan with the CAP. If the project is proposed in a city or county with a general plan that is consistent with the CAP and the project is consistent with that general plan (i.e., it does not require a general plan amendment), then the project will not have a significant cumulative impact. As indicated in Section 4.2, Air Quality, the San Francisco General Plan is consistent with the CAP. Additionally, as for the proposed Campus Master Plan, this alternative would not require any local approvals or a general plan amendment. It would be consistent with the CAP in relationship to the CAP’s TCMs, and with the implementation of Mitigations AIR-2A through -2C, with the CAPs criteria related to population growth and TACs. Therefore, this alternative also would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact related to regional emissions from project operation, nor would it contribute considerably to such a cumulative impact.

**Biological Resources**

The majority of impacts to biological resources under the proposed Campus Master Plan relate to proposed development in and adjacent to the Lake Merced area (i.e., new pedestrian underpass, path connection, and creek inlet). As these improvements will also be constructed under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative, impacts related to wetlands, sensitive habitat, and special-status species in Lake Merced (Impacts BIO-1 and BIO-2) will remain unchanged under this alternative. Proposed mitigations for these impacts will also be required under this alternative to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The impact related to the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status species (Impact BIO-2) will be somewhat reduced on campus, as no development will occur in UPS or UPN. Therefore, less potential disturbance to nesting birds will occur. However, the impact will continue to be potentially significant under this alternative and Mitigation BIO-2A will need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Cultural Resources**

Under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative all cultural resource impacts (Impacts CULT-1 through CULT-5) will be somewhat reduced, given that less development will occur under this alternative. Therefore the potential to disturb and/or destroy archaeological sites, historic features and buildings, human remains, and/or paleontological resources through building construction and/or demolition will be somewhat reduced under this alternative. However, the impacts will continue to be potentially significant or significant in these impacts categories under this alternative and proposed mitigations for these impacts will be required to reduce the significance of these impacts. However, similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, this alternative could result in significant and unavoidable impacts on historic resources in rare and exceptional cases, even with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

**Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

The impacts related to seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure (Impact GEO-1) will be somewhat reduced under the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative, given that less development will
occur under this alternative. As less development will occur, the potential to expose more people and
structures on campus to effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure
will be somewhat reduced. However, the impact will continue to be potentially significant under this
alternative and Mitigation GEO-1 will be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will result in an
impact associated with exposure to contaminated building materials during demolition of the existing
Science building on campus, as this building will also be demolished under this alternative. Mitigation
HAZ-4 will also need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under this alternative, the proposed pedestrian underpass at Lake Merced Boulevard and creek inlet into
Lake Merced will also be constructed. However, the impact related to the potential increase in nutrients
in Lake Merced (Impact HYDRO-1) will be somewhat reduced under this alternative, as with no
redevelopment in UPN, the amount of stormwater directed to Lake Merced could be somewhat reduced.
However, the impact will remain potentially significant under this alternative and Mitigation HYDRO-1
will need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. This measure, which
requires monitoring of water quality, will ensure that the proposed new system will operate as planned
and will adequately reduce urban pollutants via infiltration and filtration. However, the overall benefits
of the proposed storm water management system will also be reduced under this alternative. For
example, the amount of infiltration and runoff that would benefit Lake Merced lake levels will be reduced
under this alternative.

**Land Use and Planning**

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will not result in
any significant land use impacts.

**Noise**

With the reduction of construction on the SF State campus under this alternative, exposure of nearby
sensitive receptors to excessive construction noise would be somewhat reduced (Impact NOIS-1).
However, the impact will remain significant and unavoidable even with the implementation of Mitigation
NOIS-1, as this alternative will also result in some construction activities that are within 100 feet or less
of sensitive receptors.

**Population and Housing**

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will not result in
any significant population and housing impacts. As discussed in Section 4.10, *Population and Housing,*
some members of the surrounding community have expressed concerns about the possible displacement
of people that live in UPN and UPS. Although Impact POP-4, which discusses the displacement of
housing units (and residents) in UPN and UPS, is not a significant impact of the proposed Campus Master
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Plan, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will avoid the possible displacement of existing residents in UPN and UPS as no redevelopment in these areas will occur under this alternative.

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

Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

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

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

Utilities and Public Services

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will not result in any significant utility and public service impacts. Reduced campus housing development and no development of the hotel and conference center will reduce the overall demand for water supply, generation of wastewater, and demand for gas and electricity on campus (Impacts UTL-1 through UTL-3). However, as more people will be residing off campus under this alternative, much of this demand will simply shift to off-campus locations.

This alternative could somewhat reduce that need for on-campus sworn police officers (Impact UTL-4) given that the campus residential population will be reduced under this alternative. However, a larger on-campus police station will still be required under this alternative, the impacts of which are evaluated in Section 4.12, Utilities and Public Services, and elsewhere in this EIR.
5.4.1.3 Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

Like the proposed project, the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative would support the primary project objectives of increasing the enrollment cap to 25,000 FTEs and providing for the necessary expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the enrollment increase. The alternative, however, would not fully meet the objective of providing for faculty and staff housing to aid in recruitment and retention, as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. This alternative also would not meet the project objectives related to: (1) providing more close-in housing that enables the SF State population to walk to school and work; (2) redefining Holloway and Buckingham as “college main streets” that offer neighborhood retail and services, because with no redevelopment of UPN and UPN for higher density housing and for the Hotel and Conference Center, such retail could not be provided; (3) making efficient use of redevelopment sites; (4) integrating new residential properties to create a unified campus; and (5) positioning semi-public uses at key campus corners. Additionally, it would be more difficult to establish a strong north-south connection across the valley and Buckingham Way and Holloway Avenue without redeveloping UPN and UPS. The other planning principles of the proposed Campus Master Plan could be implemented under this alternative.

5.4.2 Alternative 2. Expanded Housing Growth

5.4.2.1 Description

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.

The purpose of this alternative is to maximize to the extent possible the amount of housing that could be provided on campus, in order to minimize the number of people that would be traveling to the campus on a daily basis. Secondarily, this alternative would also minimize the number of new SF State affiliates and their families that would seek new housing off-campus in San Francisco and elsewhere in other Bay Area communities.

Given that some members of the community are concerned about the demolition of units and the resulting possible displacement of people that currently live in UPN and UPS, an attempt was made to put some or all of the expanded housing proposed under this alternative elsewhere on campus. However, similar to Alternative 1 above, this was not possible, with the exception of the Sutro site, which this alternative also considers for housing development.

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

### 5.4.2.2 Impact Analysis

The impact analysis below focuses on those impacts that were determined to be potentially significant under the proposed Campus Master Plan, as summarized in Section 5.2 above. Less-than-significant project impacts are discussed only if implementation of the alternative will substantially increase the impact. Table 5-3 provides a comparison of the environmental effects of the proposed project and the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative.

#### Aesthetics

The development of the SF State campus under the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative will not result in greater development in the academic core of the campus. The same amount and type of academic and support facilities in the central portion of campus will be constructed under this alternative. However, the aesthetic impact related to the potential degradation of the visual character of the adjacent Villas Parkmerced neighborhood (Impact AES-3) will somewhat increase, as all of the existing housing in UPS will be redeveloped under this alternative. Mitigation AES-3 will be required and will reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

#### Air Quality

Development of the Reduced Housing Growth Alternative will somewhat increase construction PM$_{10}$ and PM$_{2.5}$ emissions (Impact AIR-1) as more building space will be constructed, as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. However, the impact will remain potentially significant under this alternative and the implementation of Mitigation AIR-1 will be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

At a regional level, the operational impacts from this alternative will be similar or somewhat lower than those from the proposed Campus Master Plan (Impact AIR-2). As discussed in Section 4.2, Air Quality, the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines distinguish between projects and plans and recommend that the evaluation of air quality impacts from land use plans not focus on the quantification of emissions but rather on an analysis of the plan’s consistency with the Clean Air Plan (CAP). As this alternative will have the same level of population growth as the proposed Campus Master Plan, it will also result in a potentially significant impact, and Mitigations AIR-2A and -2B will be required to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level. Because the Bay Area does not attain the state ozone standard, growth that is not consistent with the CAP could potentially hinder attainment efforts. This impact will likely be somewhat reduced under this alternative because regional emissions of criteria pollutants associated with...
mobile sources (i.e., vehicles) will likely be reduced under this alternative, as fewer people will need to travel to the campus in vehicles given the increase in on-campus housing. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative will be consistent with the CAP in relationship to the CAP Transportation Control Measures and in relationship to the CAP criteria regarding odors and toxics assuming Mitigation AIR-2C is implemented.

This alternative will result in a somewhat reduced cumulative contribution of ozone precursors to the regional air basin, as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan (Impact AIR-4). According to the BAAQMD CEQA Guidelines for any project that does not individually have significant operational air quality impacts, the determination of significant cumulative impacts should be based on an evaluation of the consistency of the project with the local general plan and of the local general plan with the CAP. If the project is proposed in a city or county with a general plan that is consistent with the CAP and the project is consistent with that general plan (i.e., it does not require a general plan amendment), then the project will not have a significant cumulative impact. As indicated in Section 4.2, Air Quality, the San Francisco General Plan is consistent with the CAP. Additionally, as for the proposed Campus Master Plan, this alternative would not require any local approvals or a general plan amendment. It would be consistent with the CAP in relationship to the CAP’s TCMs, and with the implementation of Mitigations AIR-2A through -2C, with the CAPs criteria related to population growth and TACs. Therefore, this alternative also would not result in a significant cumulative air quality impact related to regional emissions from project operation, nor would it contribute considerably to such a cumulative impact. However, this impact will likely be somewhat reduced under this alternative because regional emissions of criteria pollutants associated with mobile sources (i.e., vehicles) will likely decrease under this alternative, as described above.

**Biological Resources**

The majority of impacts to biological resources under the proposed Campus Master Plan relate to proposed development in and adjacent to the Lake Merced area (i.e., new pedestrian underpass, path connection, and creek inlet). As these improvements will also be constructed under the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, impacts related to wetlands, sensitive habitat, and special-status species in Lake Merced (Impacts BIO-1 and BIO-2) will also occur under this alternative. Proposed mitigations for these impacts will continue to be required under this alternative to reduce these impacts to less-than-significant levels.

The impact related to the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status species (Impact BIO-2) will be somewhat greater on campus, as all of the units in UPS or UPN will be redeveloped. Therefore, more potential disturbance to nesting birds will occur, if they are nesting in adjacent trees. Implementation of Mitigation BIO-2A will be required which would reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Cultural Resources**

Under the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, all cultural resource impacts (Impacts CULT-1 through CULT-5) will be somewhat increased, given that more development will occur under this alternative.
Therefore the potential to disturb and/or destroy archaeological sites, historic features and buildings, human remains, and/or paleontological resources through building construction and/or demolition will be somewhat increased under this alternative, and implementation of the proposed mitigations for these impacts will be required. Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, this alternative could result in significant and unavoidable impacts on historic resources in rare and exceptional cases, even with the implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

**Geology, Soils, and Seismicity**

The impacts related to seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure (Impact GEO-1) will be somewhat increased under the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative, given that more development will occur under this alternative. As more development will occur, the potential to expose more people and structures on campus to effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure will be somewhat increased, and implementation of Mitigation GEO-1 will be required.

**Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative will result in an impact associated with exposure to contaminated building materials during demolition of the existing Science building on campus, as this building will also be demolished under this alternative. Mitigation HAZ-4 will also need to be implemented to reduce the impact to a less-than-significant level.

**Hydrology and Water Quality**

Under this alternative, the proposed pedestrian underpass at Lake Merced Boulevard and creek inlet into Lake Merced will also be constructed. However, the impact related to the potential increase in nutrients in Lake Merced (Impact HYDRO-1) will be somewhat increased under this alternative, as with redevelopment of all housing units in UPN, the amount of storm water directed to Lake Merced will increase. Mitigation HYDRO-1 will be required, which will ensure that the impact is reduced to a less-than-significant level, as for the proposed project. This measure, which requires monitoring of water quality, will ensure that the proposed new system will operate as planned and will adequately reduce urban pollutants via infiltration and filtration. The overall benefits of the proposed storm water management system will be greater under this alternative because the amount of infiltration and runoff that would benefit Lake Merced lake levels will be increased under this alternative.

**Land Use and Planning**

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative will not result in any significant land use impacts.

**Noise**

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

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative will not result in any significant population and housing impacts. However, the alternative will result in a greater amount of potential displacement of existing residents in UPN and UPS (Impact POP-4) as all existing housing units will be redeveloped under this alternative. While this is not a significant impact of the Campus Master Plan, some members of the surrounding community have expressed concerns about the possible displacement of people that live in these units (see Section 4.10 Population and Housing, for additional information).

As this alternative will increase the amount of on-campus housing, a greater proportion of the new population in the study area associated with the SF State campus will be accommodated in on-campus housing and fewer people will be seeking housing off-campus. Therefore, the project’s impact on housing supply (Impact POP-3) and the project’s contribution to the cumulative housing supply deficit in the study area by 2020 (Impact POP-5) will be less under this alternative. Similar to the proposed project, the alternative’s contribution to the cumulative housing supply impact will not be considerable.

**Traffic, Circulation, and Parking**

As the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative will increase the number of SF State affiliates that can be accommodated in on-campus housing by about 73 percent, total number of daily and peak hour vehicle trips generated under this alternative are expected to be lower, as a smaller number of people would travel to the campus in automobiles. Therefore, the contribution of traffic at study area intersections is expected to be lower under this alternative. However, the reduction in peak hour vehicle trips will not be large enough to reduce the worst-case significant traffic impacts at two study intersections to a less-than-significant level, and Mitigation TRA-1 will still be required, as is the case for the proposed project. Also similar to the proposed project, under the worst-case traffic scenario, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable.

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

**Public Services and Utilities**

Similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan, the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative will not result in any significant utility and public service impacts. Expanded campus housing development will increase the overall demand for water supply, generation of wastewater, and demand for gas and electricity on campus (Impacts UTL-1 through UTL-3). However, as less people will reside off campus under this alternative, most of this demand that would have occurred in off-campus locations will simply shift to the campus.
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This alternative could somewhat increase the need for on-campus sworn police officers (Impact UTL-4) given that the campus residential population will be increased under this alternative. A larger on-campus police station will also be required under this alternative, the impacts of which are evaluated in Section 4.12, Utilities and Public Services, and elsewhere in this EIR.

5.4.2.3 Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

Like the proposed project, the Expanded Housing Growth Alternative would support the primary project objectives of increasing the enrollment cap to 25,000 FTEs and providing for the necessary expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the enrollment increase. The alternative would meet all other project objectives. 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, given that it provides for more on-campus housing.

5.4.3 Alternative 3. No Project

5.4.3.1 Description

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, the EIR’s alternatives analysis must include consideration of the No Project Alternative. The “No Project” analysis discusses the existing conditions as well as what would reasonably be expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project was not approved (CEQA Guidelines § 15126.6 (e) (2) and (3) (A)). Under the No Project Alternative, a new Campus Master Plan and an enrollment ceiling increase to 25,000 FTE students would not be adopted and the campus would continue to operate under the previously adopted 1989 Campus Master Plan, as amended most recently in early 2006.

Under the No Project Alternative, the campus would not be able to increase enrollment above existing levels as the campus is currently almost at its enrollment ceiling of 20,000 FTE students. Therefore, student enrollment would be maintained at existing levels. Given that student enrollment would not increase, faculty and staff numbers would also remain unchanged. 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 would add FTE capacity to the campus. This additional capacity cannot be added until an enrollment ceiling increase is approved by the CSU Board of Trustees. The only new building shown on the existing Campus Master Plan map that could be built without adding FTE capacity to the campus is a proposed new greenhouse.

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

The impact analysis below focuses on those impacts that were determined to be potentially significant under the proposed Campus Master Plan, as summarized in Section 5.2 above. Additionally, Table 5-3 provides a comparison of the environmental effects of the proposed project and the No Project Alternative for all impacts identified.

The implementation of the No Project Alternative will avoid or reduce environmental impacts in all categories to less-than-significant levels, as only a new greenhouse will be developed under this alternative. Therefore, the significant unavoidable impacts of the proposed Campus Master Plan will be avoided under this alternative.

5.4.3.2 Ability to Accomplish Project Objectives

The No Project Alternative would not meet the primary project objectives of increasing the enrollment cap to 25,000 FTEs and providing for the necessary expansion of academic programs and administrative functions to support the enrollment increase. Therefore, this alternative will not allow the SF State campus to be responsive to the CSU Board of Trustees’ directive to plan for its share of the increased enrollment anticipated to occur in the CSU system. Additionally, this alternative would not meet any other of the project objectives.

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

Table 5-3, at the end of this section, provides a summary comparison of the alternatives with the proposed Campus Master Plan with the purpose of highlighting whether the alternative would result in a similar, greater or lesser environmental impact than the proposed Campus Master Plan.

The No Project Alternative would avoid most of the significant environmental impacts of development under the proposed Campus Master Plan, because most of these impacts are population driven, and there would be no increase in campus population under the No Project Alternative. The alternative would avoid significant traffic and air quality impacts, and potentially significant impacts on cultural and biological resources, geology, hazardous materials, and hydrology and water quality. Therefore, this alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet key project objectives of the proposed project with respect to program development.

If 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 students, faculty and staff and to allow the SF State population to walk to work or school would be more fully met under this alternative.
## Table 5-2
### Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Master Plan Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)</th>
<th>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.1 Aesthetics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AES-3</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>PS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.2 Air Quality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR-1</td>
<td>Construction activities under the Campus Master Plan would result in emissions of PM$<em>{10}$ and PM$</em>{2.5}$ on a short-term basis.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR-2</td>
<td>Campus growth under the Campus Master Plan would result in operational emissions that could hinder the attainment of the Clean Air Plan.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIR-4</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.3 Biological Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIO-2</td>
<td>Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially result in the loss or abandonment of active nests of special-status birds.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.4 Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-1</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Master Plan Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)</th>
<th>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>grading, excavation, ground disturbance or other project development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-2</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-3</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could disturb human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-4</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CULT-5</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Geology, Soils, and Seismicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEO-1</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative
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### Table 5-2
Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Master Plan Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)</th>
<th>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Hazards and Hazardous Materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAZ-4</td>
<td>Demolition or renovation of buildings under the proposed Campus Master Plan could potentially expose construction workers and campus occupants to contaminated building materials.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Hydrology and Water Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYDRO-1</td>
<td>Storm water runoff from the campus could potentially increase nutrients in Lake Merced, and thereby adversely affect water quality.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Noise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOIS-1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>PS</td>
<td>PS-</td>
<td>PS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Population and Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP-3</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS+</td>
<td>LS-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP-4</td>
<td>Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan would not displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere in the region.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POP-5</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>SU</td>
<td>LS-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1NA: Not Applicable; NI: No impact; LS: Less than significant; PS: Potentially significant; S: Significant; SU: Significant and unavoidable; SP: Speculative
### Table 5-2
Summary Comparison of Campus Master Plan Alternatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Master Plan Impact</th>
<th>Proposed Campus Master Plan (Before Mitigation)</th>
<th>Reduced Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>Expanded Housing Growth Alternative</th>
<th>No Project (1989 Campus Master Plan, as Amended)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.11 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA-1</td>
<td>Implementation of the Campus Master Plan could potentially contribute substantial traffic at two intersections in southwest San Francisco.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRA-2</td>
<td>Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would result in a substantial increase in transit demand that could not be accommodated by adjacent transit capacity.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>S+</td>
<td>S-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.12 Utilities and Public Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTL-1</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTL-2</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTL-3</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTL-4</td>
<td>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.</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>LS-</td>
<td>LS+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NI</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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