

Chapter 6 Other CEQA Considerations6-1

6.1 Significant and Unavoidable Environmental Impacts6-1

6.2 Significant Irreversible Environmental Effects6-2

6.3 Growth-Inducing Impacts6-3

6.3.1 Overview of Growth Inducing Impacts6-4

6.3.2 Direct Population and Employment Growth.....6-4

6.3.3 Indirect Employment Growth6-6

6.4 References.....6-7

OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

Section 15126 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines requires that all aspects of a project be considered when evaluating its impact on the environment, including planning, acquisition, development and operation. As part of this analysis, the EIR must identify the following three types of impacts:

- *Significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented;*
- *Significant irreversible environmental effects that would be involved in the proposed project should it be implemented; and*
- *Growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project.*

The following sections identify each of these types of impacts based on analyses contained in Chapter 4, *Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation*.

6.1 SIGNIFICANT AND UNAVOIDABLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

This section identifies significant impacts that could not be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level by mitigation measures imposed by the University. The final determination of significance of impacts and of the feasibility of mitigation measures will be made by the California State University Board of Trustees as part of its certification action for the EIR.

A summary of the Environmental Impacts and Mitigation Measures is contained in Chapter 2 of this EIR. Sections 4.1 through 4.13 provide a comprehensive identification of the proposed project's environmental effects, including the level of significance both before and after mitigation.

The following significant and unavoidable impacts would result from development proposed under the Campus Master Plan:

Cultural Resources

Impact CULT-2 Implementation of the proposed 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.

Noise

Impact 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.

Traffic and Circulation

Impact TRA-1 Implementation of the Campus Master Plan could potentially contribute substantial traffic at two intersections in southwest San Francisco.

6.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS

Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by the proposed project. Specifically, Section 15126.2(c) states:

Uses of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of the project may be irreversible, since a large commitment of such resources makes removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary impacts and, particularly, secondary impacts (such as highway improvement which provides access to a previously inaccessible area) generally commit future generations to similar uses. Also, irreversible damage can result from environmental accidents associated with the project. Irrecoverable commitments of resources should be evaluated to assure that such current consumption is justified.

Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if:

- *The primary and secondary impacts would generally commit future generations to similar uses.*
- *The proposed consumption of resources is not justified (e.g., the project involves the wasteful use of energy).*
- *The project would involve a large commitment of nonrenewable resources.*
- *The project involves uses in which irreversible damage could result from any potential environmental accidents associated with the project.*

Development under the proposed Campus Master Plan will result in the continued commitment of the SF State campus to institutional uses, thereby precluding any other uses for the lifespan of the campus. The California State University System's ownership of the campus represents a long-term commitment of the campus lands to an institutional use. Restoration of the campus to pre-developed conditions is not feasible given the degree of disturbance, the urbanization of the area, and the level of capital investment.

Resources that will be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include water, electricity, natural gas, and fossil fuels; however, the consumption of these resources would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. The growth in student enrollment, and the associated growth in the campus population, is in response to growth that has already occurred in the state as the children of the "baby boom" generation mature to college age. Therefore, natural resources are currently being consumed by this demographic group and would continue to be consumed by this group throughout California. Nonetheless, construction activities related to the proposed Campus Master Plan

would result in the irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable energy resources, primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles and construction equipment.

The SF State campus has instituted several water conservation measures. These include a water conservation program to reduce the use of irrigation water. The Campus has also been installing low-flow fixtures in new buildings to minimize water consumption. A program to retrofit fixtures in existing buildings has also been implemented. Additionally, the storm water management plan included in the proposed Campus Master Plan provides for storm water infiltration/storage facilities in the valley portion of the campus, which will provide an opportunity for harvesting and reuse of rain water and irrigation water runoff. Such harvesting could also offset the increase in demand for water.

The campus has also instituted lighting and other energy conservation measures and has been replacing in-building lighting systems with up-to-date energy-saving equipment. In addition, the Campus will continue to construct new facilities under the proposed Campus Master Plan in accordance with specifications contained in Title 24 of the CCR, and with the CSU Green Building Standards.

With respect to operational activities on campus, compliance with all applicable building codes, as well as, Campus Master Plan objectives, and standard campus conservation features, would ensure that all natural resources, including water, are conserved to the maximum extent feasible. It is also possible that new technologies or systems will emerge, or will become more cost-effective or user-friendly, to further reduce the campus's reliance upon nonrenewable energy resources. Overall, the consumption of natural resources would increase at a lesser rate than the projected population increase due to the variety of energy and water conservation measures that the Campus has implemented and will continue to implement.

The CEQA Guidelines also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by an accident associated with the project. While the campus uses, transports, stores, and disposes of hazardous wastes, as described in Section 4.6, *Hazards and Hazardous Materials*, the campus complies with all applicable state and federal laws and existing campus programs, practices, and procedures related to hazardous materials, which reduces the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible environmental damage. In fact, over the campus history, there has never been an accident that resulted in irreversible environmental damage, indicating that current practices with respect to hazardous materials handling are adequate, and thus the potential for the proposed Campus Master Plan to cause irreversible environmental damage from an accident or upset of hazardous materials, is very low.

6.3 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR must discuss ways in which a potential project could induce growth. A project may be growth inducing if it directly or indirectly fosters economic or population growth or the construction of new housing, removes obstacles to population growth, or requires or encourages the construction of new facilities. According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.2(d), "it must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment."

The effect of new population directly added by campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan is evaluated in Section 4.10, *Population and Housing*. The discussion of the removal of obstacles to growth relates directly to the removal of infrastructure limitations or regulatory constraints that could result in growth unforeseen at the time of project approval. The potential for Campus Master Plan-related infrastructure improvements to induce growth is also discussed in Section 4.10 (see Impact POP-2). The analysis presented in this section discusses the potential for the proposed Campus Master Plan to indirectly induce growth in the study area through the workings of the multiplier process.

6.3.1 Overview of Growth Inducing Impacts

Potential growth inducing impacts of the proposed Campus Master Plan are evaluated with respect to a study area that includes all of the City and County of San Francisco and the Bay Area region as a whole. This is the area that is within relatively easy commuting distance of the campus. Based on journey-to-work flow data, about 56 percent of existing and new SF State population is expected to reside in San Francisco and the remainder (44 percent) is expected to reside in other Bay Area Communities (see Section 4.10, *Population and Housing* for additional information). The new SF State-related population that will live outside of San Francisco would likely be distributed among a large number of communities, and therefore would not be expected to substantially affect those out-of-county communities.

The proposed Campus Master Plan would be considered growth inducing for a number of reasons:

- It would directly increase the study area population by providing facilities so that campus student population would increase from approximately 26,596 in 2006 to approximately 32,113 in 2020. It would also cause employment on the campus to increase from approximately 3,428 to about 4,139 in 2020. It is assumed that 50 percent of the new students and all of the new faculty and staff would result in new population added to the study area, with the remainder already living in the region. As some of the new students and most of the employees would be accompanied by dependents, the proposed Campus Master could cause the regional population to increase by an estimated 5,130 persons over 2006 levels. Assumptions used to estimate this growth are discussed in the following section and in Section 4.10, *Population and Housing*.
- The proposed Campus Master Plan would also indirectly increase employment and population in the region through the expenditures made by the campus and by students, faculty and staff which could create or support up to 1,640 additional jobs. Assumptions used to estimate this growth are discussed in the following section.

Each of these aspects of growth inducement is discussed below.

6.3.2 Direct Population and Employment Growth

The information provided in this section is based on the analysis of direct population and employment growth provided in Section 4.10, *Population and Housing*. Please see this section for further information.

With the implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan, the total SF State population (not including dependents of new students, faculty, and staff) would grow from a total of 30,024 in 2006 to an

estimated 36,252 by 2020. This increase of about 6,228 persons would consist of about 5,517 new students and 711 new faculty and staff.

Historically, the majority of new SF State students already lived in the Bay Area region at the time of their enrollment at SF State; however, this trend is shifting with increasingly more students relocating to the Bay Area from other areas to attend SF State. Therefore, this EIR assumes that about 50 percent of all the additional students (or about 2,760 students) would relocate in order to study at SF State and would therefore be “new” to the study area. This EIR also assumes that all of the faculty will be new to the study area, as faculty is likely to be recruited from outside the area. Although staff positions are typically filled by persons already living in the Bay Area, conservatively this EIR assumes that the additional staff will also be new to the study area. Based on these assumptions approximately 3,470 SF State affiliates will be new to the study area and therefore will be seeking housing.

Of the total 2,760 new students in the study area projected under the proposed Campus Master Plan, about 1,270 would be housed on campus and the rest (about 1,490 students) would seek housing elsewhere in the study area. Of the 711 new employees, 423 would be housed on campus and the rest (about 288 employees) would seek housing elsewhere in the study area. Assuming a worst case of one SF State employee per housing unit and two students per housing unit, there would be about 1,033 new households seeking housing units off-campus in the study area.

As discussed under Impact POP-3, the housing demand in San Francisco associated with new SF State affiliates in the study area would represent about 0.7 percent of projected additional housing units by 2020. The housing demand in San Francisco associated with new SF State affiliates will be well within the projected supply and would not trigger shifts of demand to other parts of the Bay Area region, nor would it stimulate the need to build additional new housing above and beyond that already projected. Likewise, housing demand elsewhere in the Bay Area region associated with new SF State affiliates also would be well within the projected supply. Therefore, there would be no substantial shift in demand to more distant communities outside the Bay Area region, nor would the project stimulate the need to build additional new housing above and beyond that already projected.

Additionally, as discussed under Impact POP-5, the growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan in conjunction with other regional household growth would create a demand for housing that would theoretically exceed the projected supply of housing in 2020 in San Francisco and other Bay Area communities. It is unclear whether or not such a housing deficit will actually occur. However, even if there were a deficit, the SF State-related contribution to the deficit will be relatively small at about 2.5 percent in San Francisco and 3.6 percent in other Bay Area communities.

To minimize the environmental effects of new housing construction and other urban development, the General Plans of the affected jurisdictions contain policies to control urban encroachment, especially on agricultural lands and sensitive habitats. Furthermore, the environmental review process of each affected jurisdiction is designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects of specific development projects as they are proposed. However some significant and unavoidable impacts, especially related to traffic and habitat conversion, would be expected. By virtue of being a contributor to the regional demand for new housing and urban amenities, the SF State campus also would contribute to these environmental

impacts, as they are created by overall growth in regional housing and other urban amenities. However, the campus's contribution would not be considerable.

In addition to impacts from the development of new housing, the new SFSU-related population that would reside off campus in regional communities would place a demand on utilities and services such as water, sewer, schools, and parks in these affected communities. Because SFSU-related population would make a very small fraction of the total population of the Bay Area communities, its contribution to any cumulative impacts on utilities and services in those communities would not be considerable.

6.3.3 Indirect Employment Growth

In addition to the direct population changes described above, additional changes in regional population would result as campus-serving businesses or other businesses move into the area or expand in response to the increased demand for goods and services. Therefore, apart from the direct jobs on the campus, the operation of the campus under the proposed Campus Master Plan would result in the creation of new indirect and induced jobs. Indirect jobs are those that are created or supported when the campus purchases goods and services from businesses in the region, and induced jobs are created or supported when wage incomes of those employed in direct and indirect jobs or students are spent on the purchase of goods and services in the region.

Based on a number of studies prepared for other campuses in the CSU system, campus growth under the proposed Campus Master Plan could result in about 1.3 to 1.8 indirect and induced jobs in the study region for every one job at the SF State campus (CSUS 2003; CSUF 2006; CSULB 2007). Given the urban environment of San Francisco and the greater Bay Area region, most of the spending by the campus and SF State affiliates would be captured within the study area and therefore the higher multiplier (1.8 indirect and induced jobs for every direct job) would be appropriate for SF State.

Based on a multiplier of 1.8 indirect/induced jobs for every new direct job on the campus, it is estimated that about 1,640 indirect and induced jobs would be created or supported in San Francisco and the Bay Area. It would be expected that most of these indirect and induced jobs would be created in the food, entertainment, and service sectors within San Francisco and other Bay Area communities.

It would also be expected that the campus-related indirect and induced employment growth would result in some commercial development on lands that are underutilized, especially in those parts of San Francisco that are near the campus. However, it is anticipated that there would not be any major shifts in land use planning in San Francisco and that future growth beyond 2007 will continue to emphasize redevelopment because most of San Francisco is built out. If and when specific commercial development projects are proposed, they will be subject to environmental review.

6.3.3.1 Indirect Population Growth

The indirect and induced employment that would result from the implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan could theoretically result in additional population growth if individuals move into the study area to fill these jobs. However, a large influx of non-local population into San Francisco and the Bay Area region is not expected to result from these 1,640 indirect and induced jobs for a number of reasons.

San Francisco and the Bay Area region have a large number of employed residents who presently commute for work. It is anticipated that some of these persons would stop commuting and would take up the new indirect and induced locally available jobs related to campus growth. In addition, there should be a pool of local labor available to fill these jobs, given current unemployment rates. Furthermore, the vast majority of the anticipated indirect and induced jobs would be in the retail and services sectors and would not require special skills, and therefore could be filled by students or by dependents/spouses of persons who move to the area to fill jobs on the campus. Therefore the indirect and induced jobs are not expected to result in substantial population growth in San Francisco or other Bay Area communities.

6.4 REFERENCES

- California State University, Fresno. 2006. *The Economic Impact of California State University, Fresno on the San Joaquin Valley's Economy*. Prepared by Dr. Antonio Avalos, Department of Economics, California State University, Fresno. January.
- California State University, Sacramento. 2003. *Impacts of California State University, Sacramento on the Sacramento Region*. Prepared by Sacramento Regional Research Institute. August.
- California State University, Long Beach. 2007. CSULB Website, Economic Impact of the College (http://csulb.edu/colleges/cba/alumni_development/economic_impact.htm). Accessed January 2007.