Findings of Fact

and

Statement of Overriding Considerations

Master Plan
California State University, Dominguez Hills
(SCH #2007031129)

Findings by

The California State University
California State University, Dominguez Hills
1000 East Victoria Street
Carson, CA 90747
Phone: 310-243-3750

September 2009

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION

This Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations document is divided into five major sections. Section 1 (Introduction) provides background information as to the purpose of the document. Section 2 (Project Description) provides a brief discussion of the proposed project. Section 3 (Findings Regarding Environmental Effects) presents the significant effects associated with the project. Section 4 (Alternatives to the Proposed Project) provides a brief discussion of other alternatives that were evaluated in the environmental impact report (EIR). Finally, Section 5 (Statement of Overriding Considerations) is provided for those adverse effects that cannot be feasibly mitigated or avoided, even with the adopted mitigation measures.

Mitigation measures are referenced in the mitigation monitoring and reporting program adopted concurrently with these findings and will be effectuated through the process of constructing and implementing the project.

Except as otherwise noted, the findings reported in the following pages incorporate the facts and discussions of environmental impacts that are found in the final environmental impact report (final EIR) for the California State University, Dominguez Hills (CSUDH) Master Plan, July 2009, as fully set forth therein. These findings constitute the decision-makers' best efforts to set forth the rationales and support for their decision under the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

For each of the significant project or cumulative impacts associated with the project, the following information is provided:

- **Significance Criteria** – Standards to which the proposed project is subject for determining whether a significant impact would occur;
- **Description of Significant Effect** – A specific description of each significant environmental impact identified in the final EIR;
- **Proposed Mitigation** – Mitigation measures or actions that are proposed for implementation as part of the project;
- **Finding** – The findings made are those allowed by Section 21081 of the California Public Resources Code. The findings are made in two parts. In the first part, a judgment is made regarding the significance of the impact or effect. In the second part, which pertains only to impacts found to be significant, one of three specific findings is made, in accordance with the statement of acceptable findings provided in Section 15091 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*;
- **Rationale** – A summary of the reasons for the decision; and
- **Reference** – A notation on the specific section in the Draft or final EIR that includes the evidence and discussion of the identified impact.

Pursuant to Section 21081.6 of the California Public Resources Code and Section 15097 of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, a mitigation monitoring and reporting program must be adopted to ensure the efficacy of proposed mitigation measures. The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the CSUDH Master Plan is a separate document, presented for adoption together with these Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The Record of Proceedings for the Board of Trustees of the California State University's decision on the proposed project consists of the following documents, at a minimum:

- The Notice of Preparation (NOP) and all other public notices issued by the Board of Trustees in conjunction with the project;
- The draft EIR for the CSUDH Master Plan and all technical appendices (November 2007);
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the 45-day comment period on the draft EIR;
- All comments and correspondence submitted to the Board of Trustees with respect to the project, in addition to timely comments on the draft EIR;
- The final EIR for the CSUDH Master Plan, including comments received on the draft EIR, responses to those comments, errata, and technical appendices;
- The mitigation monitoring and reporting program for the project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the Board of Trustees in connection with the CSUDH Master Plan and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared by the Board of Trustees of the California State University, consultants to the Board of Trustees, or responsible or trustee agencies with respect to the Board of Trustees' compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the Board of Trustees' action on the CSUDH Master Plan;
- All documents submitted to the Board of Trustees by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the CSUDH Master Plan, up through the completion of the final EIR;
- Minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held by the Board of Trustees in connection with the CSUDH Master Plan;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted to the Board of Trustees at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- Matters of common knowledge to the Board of Trustees, including, but not limited to, federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings, in addition to those cited above; and
- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6, subdivision (e).

2 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

2-1 Master Plan Concepts

When CSUDH entered into a land lease agreement with the Anschutz Development Company for development of the U.S. Soccer National Training Center, now referred to as the Home Depot Center, questions were raised concerning the university's ability to meet its projected enrollment cap of 20,000 full-time-equivalent (FTE) students within the remaining 261-acre campus. AC Martin Partners was engaged in 2003 to conduct a capacity and central precinct study and develop land use strategies to accommodate the university's enrollment cap, which was established in the original 1964 master plan.

The primary principles guiding the 2009 master plan are to 1) create a campus that is designed to reinforce the educational mission, 2) use open space as a campus organizing tool, 3) define and harmonize campus character by landscape, 4) reinforce the pedestrian character of the campus core, and 5) overcome grade changes and strengthen the campus fabric.

In the master plan design process, campus planning, landscape, and building design guidelines were identified and followed to address issues related to the physical development of the campus. Master plan development focuses on expanding the campus development footprint by intensifying use of the campus core, then expanding outward to development pads to the south, north, and east within the existing campus boundaries. The master plan notes that existing open spaces are underused and therefore should be developed to help meet the expansion needs of the academic and administrative services.

The land use component of the master plan focuses on 1) separating on-campus vehicle circulation from pedestrian circulation, 2) distributing parking facilities to the periphery of the campus core for convenient access from surrounding arterials and roadways, and 3) maintaining the campus academic core as a pedestrian zone by reducing general use of campus through roads while maintaining access to accessible parking and for service and emergency vehicles.

The 2009 master plan provides design guidelines for future growth and development on the campus. Some of the focal design strategies identified in the 2009 master plan, which take into account the existing character of the campus, were to retain

- a clearly identifiable modern architectural style for the main buildings,
- a sloping campus with changes in grade and topography,
- a compact and exclusively pedestrian campus core, and
- a thematic double-tree canopy composed of tall trees and shorter floral trees.

Sustainable design would be promoted in the master plan by following the U.S. Green Building Council's Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED™) Green Building Rating System and the University's Sustainable Building Principles, Standards, and Processes.

2-2 Goals of the Master Plan

The intent of the 2009 master plan is to map out a trajectory for growth and change that will enhance the physical campus, reinforce the university's strengths, ameliorate its weaknesses, and support the university's mandate to provide high-quality education to a large student body. Specifically, the master plan facilitates the university's ability to

- support the faculty and staff with appropriate teaching, research, and administrative facilities;
- reinforce the sense of campus community by providing in-class and out-of-class opportunities for faculty, student, and staff collaboration;
- make available the appropriate facilities for informal recreation and intercollegiate athletics;
- serve as an accessible, attractive, safe, and welcoming campus for students, staff, faculty, and the community;
- serve as a regional center for intellectual, athletic, cultural, and life-long learning;
- adequately manage and maintain all campus facilities;
- preserve a balance between open space and built structures;
- maintain its stewardship of campus landscape and natural resources; and
- continue its good relations with the City of Carson and the surrounding community.

To achieve these goals, the 2009 master plan provides CSUDH with a framework for development that updates the 1964 master plan. The 2009 master plan is a strategic approach to the development of the physical campus that provides support for both immediate and long-term decision making by

- documenting and evaluating existing campus conditions,
- assembling and recording documentation of future campus needs and requirements,
- identifying appropriate sites for development of new facilities to support the needs of current and future growth,
- specifying safe and functional pedestrian and vehicle circulation patterns,
- quantifying parking requirements and identifying sites for adequate parking facilities,
- incorporating facilities currently under construction into the campus fabric, and
- specifying design guidelines to govern height limits, setbacks, building area, and connections with campus open space, pedestrian pathways, and vehicle access roads with new structures.

2-3 Project Location

The CSUDH campus is located in southern Los Angeles County, in the City of Carson, southwest of the intersection of Central Avenue and East Victoria Street. The CSUDH campus is situated near the top of the Dominguez Hills. The CSUDH campus is bordered by East Victoria Street to the north, Central Avenue to the east, University Drive to the south, and Avalon Boulevard to the west. A variety of uses surround the campus: to the north, across Victoria Street, is a residential community; west of campus and immediately adjacent to its boundary is the Home Depot Center; to the south, along University Drive, is another residential community; and to the east, along Central Avenue, are industrial uses. The campus is accessible to the greater Los Angeles region from three major freeways, Interstates 405 and 110 and State Route 91.

2-4 Project Description

The 2009 master plan has been prepared to address issues related to a future enrollment level of 20,000 FTE students. Enrollment for the academic year 2005–2006 was 8,718 FTE students (or 13,671 total students). In 2009, 14,338 students (or 9,554 full-time-equivalent [FTE] students) were enrolled at the campus. Current growth rates indicate that a benchmark of 11,000 FTE students will occur around 2017 and an enrollment level of 20,000 FTE students will occur around 2089.

Although buildout with 20,000 FTE students is envisioned in the master plan, the document acknowledges that a sequential phasing plan will need to be developed because some projects cannot be justified until an actual, demonstrated need occurs. Also, some projects cannot be constructed until other projects upon which they depend are constructed. In addition, some projects may require long lead times to obtain sufficient funding.

The master plan identifies near- and long-term projects. The near-term projects are likely to be built within the next 8 years if funding is available and enrollment levels justify construction of new facilities.

2-4.1 Approach of the Master Plan

Near-term projects are projects that would be needed to accommodate an enrollment level of 11,000 FTE students (or 17,368 students). According to current estimates in the 2009 master plan, an enrollment level of 10,518 FTE would be achieved in 2017. For the purposes of the EIR, a conservative higher estimate of 11,000 FTE is assumed for 2017. Near-term projects would be constructed in a phased manner over the next 8 years. If enrollment levels do not reach 11,000 FTE students by 2017, or if funding is unavailable, some of the near-term projects may not be built. The environmental impacts for the near-term projects are analyzed in detail in this EIR. The near-term projects are in various phases of design and planning. Since more information is available for these projects, greater analysis can be provided.

Long-term projects are those projects that would be required to meet the demands of 20,000 FTE students (or 31,344 students). Such projects have been defined in concept only, and no formal design efforts have begun. In the draft EIR, released for public review in November 2007, it was assumed that an enrollment level of 20,000 FTE would be achieved by 2040. The 2009 master plan revised the FTE estimates based on current enrollment information and growth trends. It is expected that enrollment will increase at a slower rate than previously anticipated. The 2040 projection regarding FTE students has been revised downward to 13,565 FTE. For the purposes of the EIR, a conservative higher estimate of 14,000 FTE is assumed for 2040. It is expected that a buildout enrollment of 20,000 FTE will occur much later, perhaps in 2089, based on current enrollment trends. Since long-term projects would be constructed far in the future, beyond the planning horizon of local and regional plans, the impacts of these future projects can only be qualitatively assessed. For example, the horizon year for the Regional Transportation Plan is 2030; for the South Coast Air Quality Management Plan and the City of Carson General Plan, the horizon year is 2020. Buildout enrollment of 20,000 FTE would occur in 2089. Any analysis beyond 2040 is too speculative and is not discussed in the text of this document.

As enrollment levels rise beyond 11,000 FTE students, appropriate environmental documentation will be prepared to address new construction (not previously addressed in this project EIR) to accommodate enrollment growth.

2-4.2 Long-Term (2040) Projects

The long-term development of the campus as envisioned in the master plan includes various academic/administrative facilities, campus life and student support facilities, vehicle access, circulation and parking projects, campus infrastructure, and athletic fields and playfields. As shown in Figure 2-3 in the EIR, Functional Organization of the Campus, student support functions form a "T" at the heart of the campus, which is surrounded by academic villages. On the periphery of this academic core are student residential villages, parking areas, and recreational/playfield uses. Surrounding these functional areas are campus-wide support areas, which are designated areas for future faculty/staff housing facilities. This organizational structure allows CSUDH substantial flexibility as the campus grows and, at the same time, permits alterations to reflect the needs of a changing pedagogy and university priorities over the long term.

New academic and administrative facilities would be arranged along quadrangles; these quadrangles would be formed through construction of new academic, classroom, laboratory, and faculty office and other administrative office buildings. The prototype for the buildings assumes four stories and an average floor area of 40,000 square feet (60,000 to 90,000 square feet for academic and administrative buildings). According to this prototype, 21 buildings with 1,318,000 additional square feet or 2,029,000 gross square feet (gsf) of floor area, as proposed in the master plan, would be sufficient to accommodate an additional 9,200 FTE students.

Campus life and support facilities include new dining, student services and recreation, and performance facilities. A 1,500-seat performing arts center to be used by the campus and community is also proposed.

At buildout (20,000 FTE), the 2009 master plan would increase the amount of parking provided on campus, principally through the development of three parking structures, which would be located on existing surface parking lots at strategic locations and directly accessible from the campus periphery. Two other surface lots, which are also located at the campus periphery, would be retained under the plan. A new surface lot with approximately 750 to 1,000 parking spaces is planned for the area just south of the existing student housing facility as a near-term project. This lot would give the campus flexibility with respect to the timing of construction for the first parking structure. By 2040, the master plan anticipates a total of 7,285 parking spaces for a total of 13,565 FTE. Entry points would be visually reinforced with monument signs and landscape improvements that would include directional signs. An internal campus circulation loop would be created by partial closure of Toro Center Drive.

The campus Physical Plant occupies 3.4 acres; an additional 4.2 acres to the south and west of the plant is reserved for future expansion of campus maintenance facilities.

2-4.3 Near-Term (2017) Projects

a. New Building Construction Projects

New Science and Health Professions Laboratory Building

A four-story**,** 150,000-square-foot science and health professions laboratory building would be constructed on the campus. Two locations have been proposed for the building: 1) south of the existing natural sciences and mathematics building or 2) within the Small College Complex.

Extended Education Complex Addition

A two-story**,** 22,000-square-foot addition is planned for the extended education complex, which houses the College of Extended and International Education. The addition would be located to the east of the existing extended education complex. Many of the programs offered at the extended education complex are open to the community.

Recreation Center

A 110,400 gsf recreation center near the existing gymnasium and playfields is proposed.

Faculty and Staff Housing

Faculty and staff housing would be provided on a 23-acre area in the southeast corner of the campus. The housing would be for campus faculty and staff only. The faculty and staff housing would be accessed directly via University Drive.

La Corte Hall Addition and Renovation

A four-story addition to La Corte Hall (building #40) with 47,000 additional square feet/72,000 gsf is proposed. The proposed improvements would include some limited remodeling to transition from the existing fine arts building to the new addition. The project would provide studio space for sculpting and painting, lecture areas, as well as appropriate support space.

Although no design plans have been developed, the master plan lays out a concept for development of this housing. The housing types that could be built range from two-story attached townhome-type units to apartment/condo-type units that could be up to four stories. Depending on the mix and size of units, the 23-acre site could accommodate up to an estimated 230 to 350 units (assuming an overall density of 10 to 15 units per acre), or 998,757 square feet of total floor area. Access to the faculty and staff housing would be provided via a new driveway on University Drive.

Student Housing

Two areas east and southeast of the existing Pueblo Dominguez student housing area, totaling approximately 18.3 acres, have been designated for future student housing. Currently, student housing is proposed along Central Avenue, which would provide a total of 798,280 gsf of floor space. The student housing would be no more than four stories in height.

Student housing would be constructed in two phases. Phase I would construct a building with 300 beds. Similar to the existing layout, the layout for future student housing, which would provide 600 beds, would be composed of 1-, 2-, and 3-bed units.

Southeast Campus Site Development/Infrastructure

It is proposed that a single-story, 3,500-square-foot cogeneration facility be located within the existing Central Plant area. The facility would be accessed via Pacific View Drive at Central Avenue.

Campus Site Accessibility Development

The existing sidewalks within the campus would be improved to meet Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. Additional ramps or internal sidewalks may be constructed as necessary. The intent of these improvements is to provide ADA-accessible sidewalks from the points of arrival on campus to the campus grounds and public outdoor facilities; this would include external building-to-building access and accessible parking spaces throughout the campus.

b. Access and Parking Projects

New Campus Entrance from Central Avenue

A new entrance and access road is tentatively proposed from Central Avenue at Beachey Place. The road would connect to the existing east–west circulation system on campus and provide access to the future surface parking lot 8. The access road would have two lanes.

Parking Lot 8

A 750- to 1,000-space surface parking lot, Lot 8, is proposed in proximity to Lot 7. For the long term, the parcel is designated for student housing; therefore, the parking lot would be incorporated into the proposed student housing complex in the future.

c. Renovation and Modernization Projects

Cain Library Educational Resource Seismic Safety and Fifth-Floor Remodeling

A seismic safety retrofit of the existing building is also planned. The existing building has a total area of 129,200 square feet and is five stories in height. Also, the existing building's 30,625-square-foot fifth floor would be remodeled.

Natural Sciences and Mathematics Building Remodeling (classrooms and offices)

Remodeling of the natural sciences and mathematics building, encompassing 85,500 square feet, is proposed. The natural sciences and mathematics building is located in the center of the campus.

Social and Behavioral Sciences Building Remodeling

Remodeling of the social and behavioral sciences building, encompassing 27,800 square feet, is proposed. The social and behavioral sciences building is located in the center of the campus.

3 FINDINGS/SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS AND MITIGATION MEASURES

The final EIR identified several significant environmental effects (or "impacts") that the proposed project could create. Impacts in the following resource areas can be reduced to less-than-significant or insignificant levels through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

- Aesthetics
- Biology
- Archaeology
- Paleontology
- Geology
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Hydrology and water quality
- Transportation/circulation

Following area would have unavoidable significant impacts.

- Air quality
- Noise

Significant and unavoidable cumulative impacts would occur in the following resource areas.

- Biological resources (burrowing owl)
- Public services (police and fire services)
- Utilities (water, wastewater, solid waste, and energy)

These impacts are outweighed by overriding considerations, as set forth in Section 5, below. Section 5 details the findings pertaining to significant environmental impacts and the mitigation measures of the proposed project.

3-1 Potentially Significant Project Impacts

3-1.1 Aesthetics

a. Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this EIR, in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant impact on visual resources if it would

- substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings,
- substantially damage significant visual resources such as trees and historic buildings,
- have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista/view or obstruct the scenic views of sensitive viewers,
- create substantial shade/shadow impacts that would affect shadow-sensitive viewers,

- result in substantial glare that would adversely affect sensitive viewers in the area or create potential hazards for motorists, or
- create a substantial amount of artificial light and adversely affect nighttime views in the area.

b. Description of Significant Effects

Operational Impacts

As a result of proposed near-term projects, the amount of existing open space available on campus would be reduced. The La Corte Hall addition and renovation work would result in the loss of some of the landscaped area and a few mature trees near the existing La Corte Hall, located in the academic core. This would substantially change the visual quality and character at this location. In addition, the loss of landscaping at the Small College Complex would be a potentially significant impact should the new science and health professions laboratory building be constructed at that location.

c. Proposed Mitigation

AES-1 New buildings and renovations to existing buildings shall adhere to the standards, criteria, and guidelines in the master plan under Campus Design Guidelines to ensure compatibility and cohesion in terms of architectural design, scale, massing, and siting.

AES-2 New development proposed at the Small College Complex and La Corte Hall shall preserve the strong axes/cross-axial sight lines and pedestrian circulation to the academic core buildings. New landscaping shall be consistent with existing landscaping at the Small College Complex.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce impacts on visual character that may be present to a less-than-significant level.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of visual impacts, see Section 3A of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Cumulative Impacts

It is assumed that all related projects would be developed in accordance with approved community design plans and public input in an effort to minimize potential visual impacts. The proposed master plan would not change the basic design attributes of the campus in any significant way. In addition, operational procedures and policies governing implementation of the proposed project are premised upon avoidance of environmental impacts, good community relations, and enhancing aesthetic quality. As a result, visual impacts are expected to be less than significant. Overall, no significant scenic resources, vistas, or views have been identified in local plans that would be cumulatively affected by related projects. Consequently, the related projects and proposed master plan are not expected to result in significant cumulative visual impacts when considered together.

3-1.2 Air Quality

a. Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this EIR, in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant impact on air quality if it would

- conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality management plan,
- violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation,
- result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including the release of emissions that exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors),
- expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, or
- create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people.

b. Description of Significant Effects

Construction-Period Impacts

Construction of the proposed project has the potential to create air quality impacts from the use of heavy-duty construction equipment on the project site, vehicle trips made by construction workers traveling to and from the project site, or the delivery of building materials to the project site. Combustion emissions, primarily oxides of nitrogen (NOx), would result from the use of on-site construction equipment, such as graders, wheeled loaders, and cranes. During the finishing phase of construction, the application of architectural coatings (i.e., paints) and the use of certain building materials could cause a

release of reactive organic compound (ROC) emissions. Short-term emissions during construction are expected to exceed South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) regional significance thresholds for NOx and ROC.

c. Proposed Mitigation

AQ-1 Use U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Tier 2 emissions-compliant equipment or newer.

AQ-2 Use architectural coatings containing a low level of volatile organic compounds.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-1 would reduce NOx emissions by 55 percent, ROC emissions by 77 percent, and combustion-source particulate emissions (particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter [PM10] and particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter [PM2.5]) by 51 percent. Implementation of mitigation measure AQ-2 would result in a net ROC reduction of approximately 10 percent. Implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce impacts due to NOx below the respective SCAQMD threshold. However, ROC emissions would remain above the threshold level.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of air quality impacts, see Section 3B of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Description of Significant Effects

Operational Impacts

Regional air pollutant emissions associated with project operations would result from energy demands and the operation of on-road vehicles. The project's net regional emissions would exceed regional SCAQMD thresholds for carbon monoxide (CO), NOx, ROC, and PM10. Therefore, regional emissions from operations would result in a significant long-term regional air quality impact.

h. Proposed Mitigation

AQ-3 Synchronize traffic lights on streets affected by development.

AQ-4 Contribute or dedicate land for off-site bicycle trails to link the facility to designated bicycle commuting routes.

AQ-5 Provide preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools, and provide a minimum of 7 feet, 2 inches of vertical clearance in parking facilities for vanpool access.

AQ-6 Provide on-site child care and after-school facilities or contribute to off-site development within walking distance.

AQ-7 Construct on-site or off-site bus turnouts, passenger benches, or shelters.

AQ-8 Use solar or low-emission water heaters.

AQ-9 Use central water heating systems, where appropriate.

AQ-10 Use energy-efficient appliances.

AQ-11 Provide shade trees to reduce building heating/cooling needs, where appropriate.

AQ-12 Use energy-efficient and automated controls for air conditioners.

AQ-13 Use double-pane glass windows.

AQ-14 Use energy-efficient low-sodium parking lot lights.

AQ-15 Use lighting controls and energy-efficient lighting.

AQ-16 Orient buildings to the north for natural cooling and include passive solar design (e.g., day lighting).

AQ-17 Use light-colored roof materials to reflect heat.

AQ-18 Increase wall and attic insulation beyond Title 24 requirements.

i. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

j. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures presented above would reduce mobile-source ROC emissions by 6 percent and NOx, CO, PM10, and PM2.5 emissions by almost 7 percent. With mitigation incorporated, ROC, NOx, CO, and PM10 emissions remain above their respective daily significance thresholds. No other feasible mitigation measures or alternatives have been identified that would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. Therefore, impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

k. Reference

For a full discussion of air quality impacts, see Section 3B of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

l. Cumulative Impacts

With respect to the proposed project's construction- and operations-period air quality emissions and cumulative basin-wide conditions, SCAQMD has developed strategies to reduce the criteria pollutant emissions outlined in the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) pursuant to federal Clean Air Act (CAA) mandates. As such, the proposed project would comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 requirements, among other SCAQMD requirements, and implement all feasible mitigation measures. In addition, the proposed project would comply with adopted AQMP emissions control measures. Per SCAQMD rules and mandates, as well as the CEQA requirement to mitigate significant impacts to the extent feasible, these same requirements (i.e., Rule 403 compliance, the implementation of all feasible mitigation measures, and compliance with adopted AQMP emissions control measures) would also be imposed on construction projects basin-wide, which would include each of the related projects mentioned previously.

As stated earlier, construction-period ROC regional mass emissions and operations-period ROC, NOx, CO, and PM10 mass emissions associated with the proposed project are already projected to result in a significant impact on air quality. As such, when combined with foreseeable future development projects, cumulative impacts on air quality during proposed project construction would be significant and unavoidable.

3-1.3 Biological Resources

a. Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this EIR, in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant impact on biological resources if it would

- Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
- Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive vegetation community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the CDFG or USFWS.
- Substantially and adversely affect federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrologic interruption, or other means.
- Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.
- Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

b. Description of Significant Effects

Construction Impacts

The campus development proposed for the vacant lot adjacent to the extended education complex may result in the removal of a seasonally wet depression that provides habitat for fairy shrimp. Such action could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a species identified as being a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFG or USFWS. Therefore, the potential impact would be considered significant. In addition, if San Diego fairy shrimp and/or vernal pool fairy shrimp are present, the potential impact would trigger "take" considerations under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) because these species are on the federal endangered and threatened lists, respectively.

c. Proposed Mitigation

3C-1a Avoidance. If feasible, the footprint of the proposed extended education complex addition should be altered to avoid any direct impacts on the seasonally wet depression or its watershed. This includes avoidance of grading activities, construction, and/or material laydown. If avoidance is infeasible, mitigation measure 3C-1b shall be incorporated.

3C-1b Consultation under the Federal ESA. If San Diego fairy shrimp and/or vernal pool fairy shrimp are present within the proposed project footprint, consultation with USFWS under the federal ESA shall be initiated. Prior to approval of grading or improvement plans, permits or approvals (i.e., take authorization) shall be obtained from USFWS for potential impacts on species on the federal lists. Consultation under the federal ESA will identify conservation measures to be implemented to ensure significant adverse impacts do not occur.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce impacts on species listed on federal or state lists to a less-than-significant level.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of biological impacts, see Section 3C of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Description of Significant Effects

Construction Impacts

Near-term projects may result in the removal of mature trees on campus that provide potentially suitable nesting habitat for several species of raptors observed or considered to have the potential to occur within the study area. Raptor and migratory bird nests are considered sensitive biological resources and, if established on site, could be affected by proposed project activities (e.g., noise, the presence of people, lighting, etc.). Nests are less sensitive outside of the breeding season when they are not in active use; however, raptors often use the same nest sites for many years.

Therefore, the loss of inactive nests is considered an adverse effect. Grading in the vicinity of active nests during the breeding season could impede the use of raptor and migratory bird breeding sites. Such an impact could interfere substantially with the movement of native resident wildlife species or use of established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, these impacts would be considered significant.

h. Proposed Mitigation

3C-2 Raptor Nesting Preconstruction Survey. Thirty days prior to the commencement of construction (if between January 15 and August 31), a qualified biologist shall perform a raptor nesting survey. This shall consist of a single visit to ascertain whether there are active raptor nests within 300 feet of the limits of disturbance. This survey shall also identify the species of nesting raptor and, to the degree feasible, the nesting stage (e.g., incubation of eggs, feeding of young, near fledging). Nests shall be mapped but not by a global positioning system (GPS) because encroachment may cause nest abandonment. If active nests are found, construction shall not occur within 300 feet of the nest until the nesting attempt has been completed or abandonment, due to non-project-related reasons, occurs.

i. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

j. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce impacts on raptor and migratory bird nests to a less-than-significant level.

k. Reference

For a full discussion of biological impacts, see Section 3C of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

l. Description of Significant Effects

Construction Impacts

The potential exists for the species to use resources on the proposed project site (i.e., burrows and foraging habitat). If it is determined that burrowing owls do occur within the study area, the proposed project could result in impacts on burrowing owls through removal of habitat. Such impacts could have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on a species identified as being a candidate, sensitive, or special-status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations or by CDFG or USFWS. In addition, grading in the vicinity of active nests during the breeding season could impede the use of breeding sites. Such an impact could interfere substantially with the movement of native resident wildlife species or use of established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. Therefore, these impacts would be considered significant.

m. Proposed Mitigation

3C-3a Burrowing Owl Focused Survey. A focused survey for burrowing owls shall be performed following California Burrowing Owl Consortium (CBOC) guidelines (CBOC 1997). A survey for burrows and owls shall be conducted by walking through suitable habitat and areas within approximately 500 feet of the project impact zone where legally accessible. Burrows shall be mapped, and any observations of burrowing owls shall be recorded. If access to the 500-foot buffer is restricted, a visual survey of the area for burrows and burrowing owls will be required.

Burrowing owls shall be surveyed by visiting the site on four separate occasions. If burrowing owls are observed during the surveys, mitigation measure 3C-3c shall be implemented. If no burrowing owls are observed, mitigation measure 3C-3b shall be implemented.

3C-3b Preconstruction Burrowing Owl Survey. Thirty days prior to the commencement of construction, a pre-construction burrowing owl survey shall be performed. This shall consist of a single survey with the focused intent of determining whether burrowing owls are still absent from the study area. If no burrowing owls are observed/detected, additional mitigation is not required. If burrowing owls are observed, mitigation measure 3C-3c shall be implemented.

3C-3c Passive Relocation. Thirty days prior to the commencement of construction, a preconstruction burrowing owl survey shall be performed. This shall consist of a single survey with the focused intent of determining whether burrowing owls still occur within the study area. If the species is present outside the breeding season (September 1 through February 28), passive relocation shall be performed by a qualified biologist. No permits are necessary for this work. Prior to passive relocation of the birds from occupied burrows, potentially suitable burrows within the study area shall be collapsed so that the birds being passively relocated do not occupy a nearby burrow. At least 48 hours will pass between the start of passive relocation and the collapse of the occupied burrows. This will ensure that the birds are gone.

If the species is found to be present and it is within the breeding season (March 1 through August 31), construction shall not occur within 300 feet of the active burrows until it has been confirmed by a qualified biologist that the nesting effort has been completed. At that time, passive relocation can be employed as described above.

n. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

o. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce impacts on burrowing owls and established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors to a less-than-significant level.

p. Reference

For a full discussion of biological impacts, see Section 3C of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

q. Description of Significant Effects

Construction Impacts

Water features identified within the study area (see Figure 3C-1) may be regulated by one or more of the following resource agencies: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), CDFG, or the regional water quality control board (RWQCB). These potential jurisdictional resources are located within an area where development of faculty and staff housing is planned. Impacts on wetlands or other waters regulated by USACE, CDFG, and/or the RWQCB could be significant under CEQA.

r. Proposed Mitigation

3C-4a Resource Agency Coordination. Prior to initiating detailed site plans for the faculty and staff housing complex, the applicant shall coordinate with USACE, CDFG, and the RWQCB to determine whether any or all of these agencies would regulate the water features on site. If none of these agencies takes jurisdiction over these features, additional mitigation will not be required. However, if one or more of these agencies take jurisdiction over these features, mitigation measure 3C-4b shall be incorporated.

3C-4b.1 Avoidance. If USACE, CDFG, and/or the RWQCB takes jurisdiction over the water features on site, the proposed faculty and staff housing complex shall be designed to avoid any direct impacts on regulated waters, if feasible. This includes avoidance of grading activities, construction, and/or material laydown within these areas. If avoidance is infeasible, mitigation measure 3C-4b.2 shall be incorporated.

3C-4b.2 Replacement of Wetland/Water Functions and Values. If avoidance of regulated waters is not feasible, the applicant shall develop a compensatory mitigation plan to ensure no net loss of wetland/water functions and values. The plan shall be developed through coordination with the appropriate agencies (USACE, CDFG, and/or the RWQCB) during the permitting processes with these agencies. The plan shall include criteria for evaluating the success of the mitigation plan as well as contingency plans in the event that the plan does not meet all success criteria.

s. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

t. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures will reduce impacts on jurisdictional water resources of USACE, CDFG, or the RWQCB to a less-than-significant level.

u. Reference

For a full discussion of biological impacts, see Section 3C of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

v. Cumulative Impacts

If burrowing owls are located within the proposed impact area, the project has the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact on burrowing owls, which are thought to be extirpated from the Los Angeles area. After mitigation, the project-level impacts on burrowing owls would be reduced to less than significant.

While the proposed project has the potential to result in impacts on fairy shrimp, a species that is on the federal list, cumulative impacts are not anticipated because impacts on species on the federal list would require consultation with USFWS under the federal ESA, which would

identify conservation measures to ensure that cumulative impacts do not occur. However, this assumes that there would be no net loss of habitat for fairy shrimp.

While the proposed project has the potential to result in impacts on jurisdictional wetlands and other waters, cumulative impacts are not anticipated because permits/approval would be required from the regulating agency or agencies (e.g., USACE, CDFG, RWQCB), which would include mitigation requirements to ensure that cumulative impacts do not occur.

Because the majority of the proposed project area and surrounding areas is currently developed or disturbed, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in additional cumulative impacts on biological resources.

3-1.4 Archaeological Resources

a. Significance Criteria

For the purposes of the EIR, in accordance with Section 21084.1 of CEQA, the proposed project would have a significant adverse environmental impact under CEQA if it

- causes a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource.

Cultural resources management work conducted as part of the proposed project shall comply with the CEQA Statutes and the *State CEQA Guidelines*, which direct lead agencies to first determine whether an archaeological site is a "historically significant" cultural resource. Generally, a cultural resource shall be considered by the lead state agency to be "historically significant" if the resource meets any of the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources, including the following:

(A) is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;

(B) is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;

(C) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction or represents the work of an important creative individual or possesses high artistic values; or

(D) as yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.

The cited statutes and guidelines specify how cultural resources are to be managed in the context of projects such as the proposed CSUDH Master Plan. Briefly, archival and field surveys must be conducted, and identified cultural resources must be inventoried and evaluated in prescribed ways. Prehistoric and historical resources deemed "historically significant" must be considered in project planning and development.

Therefore, if potentially important archaeological resources are discovered during implementation of the proposed project, those resources must be inventoried and evaluated to ascertain whether they meet the criteria for listing on the California Register of Historical Resources.

b. Description of Significant Effect

Construction-Period Impacts

The archaeological survey of the project site failed to identify prehistoric or historical archeological resources. However, buried cultural resources or human remains could be inadvertently unearthed during ground-disturbing activities, which could result in demolition of or substantial damage to cultural resources.

c. Proposed Mitigation

The following measures shall be implemented to avoid or mitigate project-related significant impacts on archaeological resources that may be encountered during construction of the proposed build alternatives:

AR-1 Archaeological monitoring by a qualified archaeologist is recommended for the Grand View Geranium Gardens site, which is where the proposed student and faculty/staff housing projects would be located. If buried cultural resources, such as flaked or ground stone, historic debris, building foundations, or non-human bone, are inadvertently discovered during ground-disturbing activities, work will stop in that area and within 100 feet of the find until a qualified archaeologist can assess the significance of the find and, if necessary, develop appropriate treatment measures. Treatment measures typically include development of avoidance strategies, capping with fill material, or mitigation of impacts through data recovery programs such as excavation or detailed documentation. If, during cultural resources monitoring, the qualified archaeologist determines that the sediments being excavated are previously disturbed or unlikely to contain significant cultural materials, the qualified archaeologist can specify that monitoring be reduced or eliminated;

AR-2 If cultural resources are discovered during construction activities, the construction contractor will verify that work is halted until appropriate site-specific treatment measures, such as those listed above, are implemented; and

AR-3 If human remains of Native American origin are discovered during ground-disturbing activities, the construction contractor will comply with state laws, which fall within the jurisdiction of the California Native American Heritage Commission (Public Resources Code Section 5097) relating to the disposition of Native Americans. According to California Health and Safety Code, six or more human burials at one location constitute a cemetery (Section 8100), and disturbance of Native American cemeteries is a felony (Section 7052). Section 7050.5 requires that excavation be stopped in the vicinity of discovered human remains until the coroner can determine whether the remains are those of a Native American. If the remains are determined to be Native American, the coroner must contact the California Native American Heritage Commission to determine the most likely living descendant(s). The most likely living descendant shall determine the most appropriate means of treating the human remains and any associated grave artifacts and shall oversee disposition of the human remains and associated artifacts by the project archaeologists.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

There are no known significant archaeological resources located in the area that would be disturbed during construction. The mitigation measures above would ensure that any impacts on previously undiscovered or unknown archaeological resources that may be encountered during construction would be reduced to a level that would be less than significant.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of archaeological resources impacts, see Section 3E of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Cumulative Impacts

The geographic scope of the area affected by potential cumulative archaeological impacts is defined by the cultural setting and ethnographic territory of the prehistoric and historic peoples who occupied this area of Southern California. As discussed above, this region of Los Angeles County was part of the territory of the Gabrielino people. Related projects in the proposed project area and other development in the county could result in the progressive loss of, as yet, unrecorded archaeological resources. This loss, without proper mitigation, would be an adverse cumulative impact.

Construction activities associated with related projects could contribute to the progressive loss of archaeological resources and result in significant cumulative impacts under CEQA. The proposed project could also disturb or destroy archaeological resources that may exist in the proposed project area, a potentially significant impact. Thus, the combined effects of the proposed and related projects could result in significant cumulative impacts on archaeological resources. The proposed project includes mitigation that would reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level. Similar measures may be implemented for related projects that also have the potential to affect archaeological resources. Consequently, the incremental effects of the proposed project and related projects, after mitigation, would not contribute to an adverse or cumulatively considerable impact on archaeological resources under CEQA.

3-1.5 Paleontological Resources

a. Significance Criteria

Paleontologically sensitive sedimentary units are those units with a high potential for containing significant paleontological resources (i.e., rock units within which vertebrate fossils or significant invertebrate fossils have been determined by previous studies to be present or likely to be present). These units include, but are not limited to, sedimentary formations that contain significant paleontological resources anywhere within their geographical extent as well as sedimentary rock units temporally or lithologically suitable for the preservation of fossils. Determinations of paleontologic sensitivity must therefore consider not only the potential for yielding abundant vertebrate fossils but also the potential for production of a few significant fossils, large or small, vertebrate or invertebrate, which may provide new and significant data on fossils types, species changes over time, or geologic strata. Areas that may contain datable organic remains older than the recent era and areas that may contain unique new vertebrate deposits, traces, and/or trackways must also be considered paleontologically sensitive.

Fossils can be considered to be of significant scientific interest if one or more of the following criteria apply.

- The fossils provide data on the evolutionary relationships and developmental trends among organisms, both living and extinct.
- The fossils provide data useful in determining the age(s) of the rock unit or sedimentary stratum, including data important in determining the depositional history of the region and the timing of geologic events therein.
- The fossils provide data regarding the development of biological communities or interaction between paleobotanical and paleozoological biotas.
- The fossils demonstrate unusual or spectacular circumstances in the history of life.
- The fossils are in short supply and/or in danger of being depleted or destroyed by the elements, vandalism, or commercial exploitation and are not found in other geographic locations.

According to CEQA, a project that may cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical (or paleontological) resource is a project that may have a significant effect on the environment (CEQA, rev. 1998, Section 15064.5(b)). CEQA further states that a substantial adverse change in the significance of a resource means the physical demolition, destruction, relocation, or alteration of the resource or its immediate surroundings such that the significance would be materially impaired. For purposes of this EIR, in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a potentially significant effect on the environment if it directly or indirectly destroys a unique paleontological resource or site.

b. Description of Significant Effect

Construction-Period Impacts

Within the existing boundaries of CSUDH, the majority of the proposed project area is situated on older Quaternary alluvium. Excavations in undisturbed older Quaternary deposits exposed throughout the proposed project area have a good chance of uncovering significant vertebrate fossils, even at depths as shallow as 5 feet below the surface. The destruction of any unique fossil resources on the proposed project site would result in a significant impact under CEQA.

c. Proposed Mitigation

The following measures shall be implemented to ensure that potential impacts on any unique paleontologic resources that may be present would be reduced to a level of insignificance under CEQA.

PR-1 A qualified paleontologic monitor shall monitor all excavation in areas identified as likely to contain paleontological resources. These areas are defined as all areas within the proposed CSUDH project area where planned excavation will exceed depths of 5 feet. The qualified paleontologic monitor shall retain the option to reduce monitoring if, in his or her professional opinion, sediments being monitored are previously disturbed. Monitoring may also be reduced if the potentially fossiliferous units, previously described, are not found to be present or, if present, are determined by qualified paleontologic personnel to have a low potential to contain fossil resources.

PR-2 The monitor shall be equipped to salvage fossils and samples of sediments as they are unearthed to avoid construction delays and shall be empowered to temporarily halt or divert equipment to allow removal of abundant or large specimens.

PR-3 Recovered specimens shall be prepared to a point of identification and permanent preservation, including washing of sediments, to recover small invertebrates and vertebrates.

PR-4 Specimens shall be curated into a professional, accredited museum repository with permanent retrievable storage.

PR-5 A report of findings, with an appended itemized inventory of specimens, shall be prepared. The report and inventory, when submitted to the county, will signify completion of the program to mitigate impacts on paleontological resources.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

There is a high probability that unique paleontological resources are present on the project site. If resources are encountered and destroyed during project-related ground-disturbing construction-period activities, the impact would be significant under CEQA. The measures listed above would ensure that potential impacts on any unique paleontologic resources that may be present would be reduced to a level of insignificance under CEQA.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of paleontological resources impacts, see Section 3F of CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Cumulative Impacts

Construction activities associated with the proposed project could contribute to the progressive loss of paleontological resources and result in adverse cumulative impacts. The proposed project could also disturb or destroy paleontological resources that may exist on the site, an adverse impact. Thus, the project could result in adverse cumulative impacts on paleontological resources. However, mitigation measures have been identified that would avoid or reduce potential project-related impacts. These measures include monitoring, recovery, treatment, and deposit of fossil remains in a recognized repository. Similar measures may also be implemented for other related projects that have the potential to affect paleontological resources. Consequently, the incremental effects of the proposed project, after mitigation, would not contribute to an adverse cumulative impact on paleontological resources.

3-1.6 Geology and Soils

a. Significance Criteria

For the purposes of this EIR, in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would result in a significant effect under CEQA if it exposes people or structures to substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death, involving the following:

- rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the state geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault;

- strong seismic ground shaking;
- seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction;
- landslides;
- substantial soil erosion or loss of topsoil;
- location on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable or that would become unstable as a result of the project and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse;
- Location on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code, or corrosive soils, creating substantial risks to life or property.

b. Description of Significant Effect

Construction-Period Impacts

As a result of grading and excavation activities during construction, soils on the project site would be exposed to wind and water erosion.

c. Proposed Mitigation

Compliance with industry-standard stormwater pollution-control best management practices (BMPs) would reduce soil erosion impacts to a less-than-significant level. No mitigation is necessary.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the BMPs would significantly reduce the potential for potential wind and water erosion. Consequently, unavoidable significant adverse wind and water erosion impacts on soils during construction are not anticipated.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of geology and soils impacts, see Section 3G of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Description of Significant Effect

Construction-Period Impacts

The potential for hazards from slope instability during construction and earthwork exists for construction workers.

h. Proposed Mitigation

GEO-1 A geotechnical investigation shall be performed by qualified, licensed professionals before final design of any structures, and recommendations provided in the report shall be implemented, as appropriate.

GEO-2 Design and construction of structures for the proposed project shall conform to all applicable provisions and guidelines set forth in the 2007 California Building Code (CBC), Title 24, Part 2, Volume 2. The CBC is based on the 2006 UBC and sets forth regulations concerning proper earthquake design and engineering.

i. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

j. Rationale for Finding

All feasible mitigation measures have been identified to reduce construction hazards from slope instability during construction and earthworks. In general, the geologic and seismic hazards could be mitigated by employing sound engineering practices in the design and construction of the near-term projects of the CSUDH Master Plan and associated improvements. These measures and engineering practices would reduce construction hazards due to slope instability to less-than-significant levels.

k. Reference

For a full discussion of geology and soils impacts, see Section 3G of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

l. Description of Significant Effect

Operation-Period Impacts

The potential for ground rupture and ground shaking exists due to distant earthquakes.

m. Proposed Mitigation

GEO-1 A geotechnical investigation shall be performed by qualified, licensed professionals before final design of any structures, and recommendations provided in the report shall be implemented, as appropriate.

GEO-2 Design and construction of structures for the proposed project shall conform to all applicable provisions and guidelines set forth in the 2007 California Building Code (CBC), Title 24, Part 2, Volume 2. The CBC is based on the 1997 UBC and sets forth regulations concerning proper earthquake design and engineering.

n. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

o. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the mitigation measures would significantly reduce the potential for structural damage, including structural collapse, or risks to lives from seismic ground shaking and ground rupture, although damage could still occur. Preventing structure collapse should greatly reduce the risk for loss of life, although property loss can still be expected in the event of strong seismic activity on a nearby fault. Nonetheless, proper building design should reduce risks to acceptable levels. Consequently, unavoidable significant adverse ground shaking impacts are not anticipated.

p. Reference

For a full discussion of geology and soils impacts, see Section 3G of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

q. Description of Significant Effect

Operation-Period Impacts

Soil characteristics and the potential for corrosion, compaction, and expansion all have a bearing on the design of buildings and infrastructure. Soils on campus are known to be expansive. Thus, significant impacts could result from unstable soil conditions.

r. Proposed Mitigation

GEO-3 The geotechnical investigation for the proposed facilities shall fully document the presence and extent of corrosive, expansive, or loose compactable soil. Appropriate mitigation shall be designed using the collected data. Mitigation options could include the following: removal of unsuitable subgrade soils and replacement with engineered fill, installation of cathodic protection systems to protect buried metal utilities, use of coated or nonmetallic pipes (i.e., concrete or PVC) that are not susceptible to corrosion, construction of foundations using sulfate-resistant concrete, support of structures on deep-pile foundation systems, densification of compactable subgrade soils with in situ techniques, and placement of moisture barriers above and around expansive subgrade soils to help prevent variations in soil moisture content.

s. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

t. Rationale for Finding

The impact from unstable soil conditions would pose a less-than-significant impact provided that appropriate mitigation measures are implemented.

u. Reference

For a full discussion of geology and soils impacts, see Section 3G of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

v. Cumulative Impacts

The proposed project would mitigate geology-, soil-, and seismically related impacts to a less-than-significant level. Proposed structures would be built in accordance with the building codes of California and the City of Carson. Geologic hazards would be mitigated on an individual basis through sound engineering and adherence to geotechnical construction and operational standards. It is assumed that related projects would similarly comply with the applicable building codes, thereby reducing the potential for risks to life and property due to geologic hazards. The proposed project would not contribute to adverse cumulative impacts on unique geologic features, and it would not contribute to a cumulative increase in the risks posed by seismic hazards.

3-1.7 Hazards and Hazardous Materials

a. Significance Criteria

For the purposes of the analyses in this EIR, in accordance with Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*, the proposed project would have a significant hazardous waste impact under CEQA if it

- creates a significant hazard for the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- creates a significant hazard for the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment;
- emits hazardous emissions or involves handling hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within 0.25 mile of an existing or proposed school; and
- is located on a site that is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would create a significant hazard for the public or environment.

b. Description of Significant Effects

Construction Impacts

During construction operations, hazardous materials such as vehicle fuels, oils, and other vehicle maintenance fluids would be used and stored in construction staging yards. Accidental spills of hazardous materials during construction activities could cause soil or groundwater contamination, a potentially significant impact. Improperly maintained equipment could leak fluids during construction, resulting in soil contamination, a potentially significant impact.

c. Proposed Mitigation

HM-3 An environmental training program shall be established to communicate environmental concerns and appropriate work practices, including spill prevention, emergency response measures, and proper best management practices implementation, to all field personnel. The training program shall emphasize site-specific physical conditions to improve hazard prevention (e.g., identification of potentially hazardous substances) and include a review of all site-specific plans.

A Hazardous Substance Control and Emergency Response Plan shall be prepared, which shall include measures for quick and safe cleanup of accidental spills. This plan shall be submitted with the grading permit application. It shall prescribe hazardous-materials handling procedures for reducing the potential for a spill during construction and include an emergency response program to ensure quick and safe cleanup of accidental spills. The plan shall identify areas where refueling and vehicle maintenance activities and the storage of hazardous materials, if any, will be permitted. These directions and requirements shall also be reiterated in the project Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

HM-4 Oil-absorbent material, tarps, and storage drums shall be used to contain and control any minor releases. Emergency spill supplies and equipment shall be kept adjacent to all work areas and staging areas and shall be clearly marked. Detailed information for responding to accidental spills and handling any resulting hazardous materials shall be provided in the project's Hazardous Substances Control and Emergency Response Plan.

HM-5 If groundwater is expected to be encountered, the contractor shall test and characterize the groundwater prior to construction. The contractor shall comply with all applicable regulations and permit requirements for construction dewatering. This may include laboratory testing, treatment of contaminated groundwater, or other disposal options. The results of groundwater testing shall be included in a Phase II Environmental Site Assessment.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that any impacts from the use or storage of hazardous materials such as vehicle fuels, oils, and other vehicle maintenance fluids during construction activities would be less than significant.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of hazardous materials impacts, see Section 3H of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Description of Significant Effects

Construction Impacts

Historically, numerous oil wells were in operation on the proposed project site; 24 wells on campus were capped and abandoned under the direction of California Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (DOGGR). However, in areas located in and around oil wells, methane may exist and could pose a significant risk if it were to reach the area near the ground surface in concentrations large enough to cause asphyxiation or explosion and/or fire. If encountered or exposed during construction, oil field gas or volatile organic compounds (VOCs) could pose a hazard to construction workers or other persons in the vicinity of the construction site. Since methane was not detected in significant levels on site, no impacts related to methane gas are anticipated. However, abandoned oil wells could result in a potentially significant impact unless mitigation is implemented.

h. Proposed Mitigation

HM-6 Prior to any construction, a geotechnical study will be performed to determine if any abandoned oil wells are within the proposed building or parking lot footprints.

HM-7 During the earthwork phase of construction, any known abandoned oil wells or wells discovered during the geotechnical study located beneath the proposed project site shall be exposed to allow DOGGR to examine the well heads, assess any potential for methane, and determine if re-abandonment of any wells will be required. Additionally, any wildcat wells encountered during earthwork shall also be subject to investigation and potential re-abandonment requirements.

HM-8 The development of any enclosed structures over an abandoned oil well may require any or all of the following measures, as determined by DOGGR: passive venting systems (horizontal piping designed to collect vapors and vent them to the surface or above the structure) installed under new enclosed structures, vapor barriers installed under new enclosed structures, or active venting systems (horizontal piping or vertical wells attached to a blower and designed to capture vapors within a specified radius of soil and vent them to the surface or above the structure) installed under new enclosed structures.

i. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

j. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that any impacts from historic oil wells would be less than significant.

k. Reference

For a full discussion of hazardous materials impacts, see Section 3H of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

l. Description of Significant Effects

Construction Impacts

The potential exists for encountering asbestos-containing material (ACM) and lead-based paint during renovation or demolition of existing buildings. Some lead-based paint may be located under the several coats of paint that cover some of the original doors of these buildings. Damaged ACM could pose a potential threat to building occupants as well as construction workers during renovation work if the material were to become airborne. Any demolition occurring on campus is required to conform to the California Health and Safety Code and SCAQMD Rule 1403. This is a potentially significant impact.

m. Proposed Mitigation

HM-9 Prior to renovation or demolition of any buildings on campus, the CSUDH environmental compliance specialist from the Office of Environmental Health and Occupational Safety shall conduct a survey to determine the presence or absence of ACM and lead-based paints. Abatement of asbestos and lead-based paint shall be conducted in accordance with SCAQMD Rule 1403 and DTSC's Interim Guidance, Evaluation of School Sites with Potential Soil Contamination as a Result of Lead from Lead-Based Paint, Organochlorine Pesticides from Termiticides, and Polychlorinated Biphenyls from Electrical Transformers (June 9, 2006), prior to any demolition or construction activities.

n. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

o. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of mitigation measures would ensure that any impacts from ACM and lead-based paint during renovation or demolition of existing buildings would be less than significant.

p. Reference

For a full discussion of hazardous materials impacts, see Section 3H of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

q. Cumulative Impacts

Any cleanup and disposal of contaminated soil and/or groundwater resulting from construction of the proposed master plan and from other related projects is a beneficial impact. Cleanup of contaminated sites related to other projects becomes an adverse impact when the combined volume of contaminated soil requiring treatment from the proposed project and other projects exceeds the capacity of the available treatment facilities. However, no significant quantities of contaminated soil are expected to be encountered during construction of the proposed master plan. Therefore, a less-than-significant impact would result.

With implementation of the mitigation measures in this EIR, effects of the proposed master plan would not be cumulatively considerable.

3-1.8 Hydrology and Water Quality

a. Significance Criteria

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the environment" (CEQA Section 21068). Significance criteria used in this analysis are based on Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines.* The proposed project would have a significant impact on hydrology and water quality if implementation were to have any of the effects listed below.

Criteria for determining the significance of impacts related to hydrology and water quality were developed using the environmental checklist form in Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines* (14 California Code of Regulations [CCR], Section 15000 et seq.). Accordingly, the proposed project would have a significant impact on hydrology and water quality if it would

- violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade water quality;
- substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, resulting in a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of local groundwater (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level that would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted);
- substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner that would result in substantial erosion or siltation on site or off site;
- substantially degrade the existing surface and groundwater quality as a result of erosion and siltation;
- substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner that would result in flooding on site or off site;
- create or contribute runoff water that would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff;
- place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area, as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map;
- place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures that would impede or redirect floodflows;
- expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam; or
- contribute to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

b. Description of Significant Effects

Operational Impacts

The near-term components of the master plan, when complete, would result in approximately 65 acres of new impervious surfaces, which would result in an incremental reduction in the amount of natural soil surfaces available for filtration of rainfall and runoff, potentially generating additional runoff during storm events. Additional runoff could contribute to the flood potential of the Dominguez Channel and provide an efficient means of transport for pollutants entering waterways, resulting in localized flooding. This impact is considered potentially significant.

c. Proposed Mitigation

HYD-1 Implement a Drainage Concept Plan. As part of the master plan, the applicant shall implement a drainage concept plan. This plan shall address the following topics:

- A calculation of pre-development runoff conditions and post-development runoff scenarios using appropriate engineering methods. This analysis shall evaluate potential changes in runoff through specific design criteria and account for increased surface runoff;
- An assessment of existing drainage facilities within the project area and an inventory of necessary upgrades, replacements, redesigns, and/or rehabilitation;
- A description of the proposed maintenance program for the on-site drainage system;
- Standards for drainage systems to be installed on a project-specific basis; and
- Measures to eliminate localized flooding hazards.
- If structures are proposed in localized flood areas, measures shall be implemented to eliminate localized flooding hazards prior to construction of the proposed structures.

Drainage systems shall be designed in accordance with California State University and applicable agencies' flood control design criteria (including the City of Carson and the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works, if applicable). As a performance standard, measures to be implemented shall provide no net increase in peak stormwater discharge relative to current conditions and ensure that localized flooding and potential impacts are maintained at or below current levels. The measures shall also ensure that people and structures are not exposed to additional flood risk. The project shall implement measures provided in the drainage concept plan.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

( ) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures, provided under the Drainage Concept Plan, would reduce construction impacts on hydrology and water quality to a less-than-significant level.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts to hydrology and water quality, see Section 3I of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Cumulative Impacts

Surface Waters

Contamination of water bodies is generally a function of cumulative discharges. Point and nonpoint sources contribute various constituents in the form of effluent or stormwater runoff. EPA and the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) have established several programs, including National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permits, to minimize polluted discharges. In the Dominguez watershed, surface and groundwater resources are impaired for several contaminants. Stringent NPDES and county Municipal Separate Storm Sewer Systems (MS4) requirements for waste load allocations and BMPs should begin to reduce the amount of constituents in the watershed's receiving waters, including the Dominguez Channel.

The proposed project would implement BMPs that would meet the pollutant removal requirements of the General Construction Permit and the county's MS4 permit. It is anticipated that these BMPs would also be effective in meeting the Los Angeles RWQCB's basin plan standards for pollutants from stormwater discharged to the Dominguez watershed. Consequently, the proposed project's contribution to adverse cumulative water quality impacts would not be cumulatively considerable.

Groundwater

As discussed above, the proposed project would not result in any adverse significant effects on groundwater resources, including recharge and groundwater quality. Hence, the project would not contribute to any cumulative adverse effects from related projects in the groundwater basin.

Drainage

As discussed above, mitigation measure HYD-1 would ensure the proposed project would not result in any adverse effects on drainage patterns. Hence, the project would not contribute to any cumulative adverse effects from related projects in the watershed.

Flood Hazards

The proposed project would not place structures in a designated floodplain. Therefore, the project would not contribute to an adverse cumulative effect related to floodplains or cumulative flood hazard impacts.

3-1.9 Noise

a. Significance Criteria

A significant impact is defined as "a substantial or potentially substantial adverse change in the environment" (CEQA Section 21068). Significance criteria used in this analysis are based on

Appendix G of the *State CEQA Guidelines*. The proposed project would have a significant noise impacts if implementation were to have any of the following effects:

- an exposure of persons, including nearby residents, students, and faculty, to exterior noise levels in excess of 65 A-weighted decibels (dBA) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or a generation of noise levels in excess of adopted local agency noise standards;
- an increase of 5 dBA or more where the noise levels without the proposed project are below the standard for residential uses and the increase in noise from the proposed project does not cause the applicable noise thresholds to be exceeded;
- a permanent increase of more than 3 dBA CNEL in ambient noise levels in the proposed project vicinity above levels existing without the proposed project for areas where existing ambient noise levels, or the projected ambient noise levels after implementation of the proposed project, would exceed acceptable noise levels as adopted in local agency noise ordinances or general plan goals; or
- temporary or periodic noise levels in excess of City of Carson noise standards.

b. Description of Significant Effects

Construction-Period Impacts

Construction of the various projects would result in impacts on sensitive receptors (e.g., faculty, staff, and students who work or live near the new building sites on campus and residents). Construction of new facilities on infill sites on the central campus would, however, occur at distances of less than 140 feet from existing and future sensitive receptors and result in noise levels that would exceed the significance criteria. Additionally, the existing single-family residences south of University Drive are located within 150 feet of proposed master plan construction. This would be a significant impact.

c. Proposed Mitigation

N-1 Prior to initiation of construction of a specific development project, the university shall approve a construction noise mitigation program, which shall be implemented for each construction project. This shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- construction equipment that is properly maintained and has been outfitted with feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise;
- stationary noise sources such as generators or pumps that are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible;
- laydown and construction vehicle staging areas that are located at least 100 feet away from noise-sensitive land uses as feasible;
- whenever possible, informing academic, administrative, and residential areas subject to construction noise of pending construction in writing at least a week before the start of each construction project;

- not scheduling loud construction activity (i.e., jackhammering, concrete sawing, asphalt removal, and large-scale grading operations) within 100 feet of a residential or academic building during finals week;
- not scheduling loud construction activity as described above within 100 feet of an academic or residential use, to the extent feasible, during holidays, Thanksgiving break, Christmas break, spring break, or summer break;
- restricting loud construction activity within 100 feet of a residential building to the hours between 7:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. Monday through Saturday; and
- scheduling loud construction activity within 100 feet of an academic building, to the extent feasible, on weekends.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

Mitigation measure N-1 would be implemented to control construction noise on campus to the extent practicable and feasible, which would reduce the potential impact on most locations to a less-than-significant level. However, there could be some construction sites on campus where, even with the recommended mitigation, noise levels would not be reduced to levels below the thresholds. Therefore, this impact is considered significant and unavoidable.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts to noise, see Section 3M of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative noise impacts could occur from development of other projects within the area. Approximately 14 projects in the general vicinity (an approximate 1.5-mile radius) could generate noise impacts similar to those of the proposed project. Noise from construction and operation of those projects would tend to be localized, thereby potentially affecting the areas

immediately surrounding each prospective project site. Of those projects, those within 0.25 mile could result in construction noise that exceeds significance thresholds, depending upon the timing of construction. Four such projects (Dominguez Technology Center, Dominguez Hills Village, Cain Library addition, and CSUDH/Home Depot Center Phase II) are proposed within 0.25 mile of the proposed project site. Although there is the potential for cumulative noise impacts from construction noise if construction activities for the nearby projects take place at the same time as the proposed project, implementation of mitigation measures would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

No related projects are located close enough to the proposed project to have the potential to create a cumulative long-term operational noise impact. Off-site operational noise sources would consist primarily of vehicle trips along adjacent streets. The increase in traffic volumes, which includes volumes from related projects, was accounted for in the traffic analysis conducted for the proposed project. Cumulative impacts associated with the proposed project and identified related projects are anticipated to be less than significant.

3-1.10 Transportation/ Circulation

a. Significance Criteria

City of Carson

The City of Carson has established a threshold criterion to determine if a project has a significant traffic impact at a specific location. A project impact is considered significant if the volume/capacity (V/C) ratio at an intersection increases by 0.02 or more due to the project and the resultant level of service (LOS) is E or F.

County of Los Angeles

The impact analysis used the Los Angeles County Congestion Management Program (CMP) threshold of significance. The CMP states that a project impact is significant if it causes a net increase in the demand-to-capacity (D/C) ratio on a freeway segment of 2 percent or more (V/C ratio increase greater than or equal to 0.02), which causes LOS F conditions. If the facility is already at LOS F, a significant impact occurs when the proposed project increases traffic demand on a CMP facility by 2 percent of capacity (V/C increase of 0.02 or more).

b. Description of Significant Effects

Operational Impacts

The project would result in a significant traffic impact at four intersections in the AM peak hour. These intersections are as follows (with the resultant LOS in parentheses):

- Victoria Street and Interstate 110 (I-110) southbound (SB) off-ramp (LOS F),
- Avalon Boulevard and Del Amo Boulevard (LOS E),
- Central Avenue and Artesia Boulevard westbound (WB) (LOS E), and
- Central Avenue and Artesia Boulevard eastbound (EB) (LOS E).

The project would result in significant traffic impacts at five intersections in the PM peak hour. These intersections are as follows (with the resultant LOS in parentheses):

- Victoria Street and Figueroa Street (LOS E),
- Avalon Boulevard and Victoria Street (LOS E),
- Avalon Boulevard and Del Amo Boulevard (LOS F),
- Avalon Boulevard and Interstate 405 (I-405) northbound (NB) ramps (LOS E), and
- Central Avenue and Artesia Boulevard WB (LOS E).

The intersection of Avalon Boulevard and Del Amo Boulevard would operate at LOS F without the proposed project. The remaining four affected intersections would operate at LOS E without the proposed project and would continue to operate at LOS E with the proposed project.

Significant improvements for Avalon Boulevard and the I-405 northbound ramps have been finalized by the City of Carson and the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) for the Carson Marketplace project. No further mitigation evaluation was pursued for the proposed project. The future improved configuration for this intersection may eliminate the significant impact caused by the proposed project.

c. Proposed Mitigation

Victoria Street and I-110 Southbound Off-Ramp

T-1 Restripe the I-110 southbound off-ramp at Victoria Street for one right-turn lane and one shared right-/left-turn lane.

Victoria Street and Figueroa Street

T-2 Restripe the westbound approach of Victoria Street to the intersection from one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right lane to one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.

Avalon Boulevard and Victoria Street

Since the release of the draft EIR for public review in November 2007, improvements at this intersection have been carried out as part of another project in the City of Carson. The improvements made at the intersection included restriping of the westbound approach of Victoria Street to the intersection from one left-turn lane, one through lane, and one shared through/right lane to one left-turn lane, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane. With these improvements, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts at this intersection.

Avalon Boulevard and Del Amo Boulevard

T-4 Convert the northbound single left-turn lane at Avalon Boulevard to a dual left-turn lane.

Central Avenue and Artesia Boulevard Westbound

T-5 Reconfigure the westbound approach of Artesia Boulevard from one left-turn lane, one shared left/through lane, and one shared through/right-turn lane to two left-turn lanes, one through lane, and one right-turn lane.

Central Avenue and Albertoni/Artesia Boulevard Eastbound

T-6 Reconfigure the northbound approach of Central Avenue from two right-turn lanes and two through lanes to two right-turn lanes and three through lanes.

Avalon Boulevard and I-405 Northbound Ramps

Since release of the draft EIR for public review in November 2007, improvements at this intersection have been fully funded under the Carson Marketplace project. However, because the final design has yet to be approved, impacts in the PM peak hour are considered potentially unmitigated for purposes of this EIR. This would be an unavoidable significant impact.

d. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

e. Rationale for Finding

With implementation of the mitigation measures for intersection improvements, impacts of the proposed project on the levels of service of all but one of the intersections would be less than significant. Improvements for Avalon Boulevard and the I-405 northbound ramps have been fully funded as part of the Carson Marketplace project. However, because the final design has yet to be approved, impacts in the PM peak hour are considered potentially unmitigated for purposes of this EIR. Depending on the final future configuration of this intersection, as improved for the Carson Marketplace project, this may or may not remain a significant impact.

f. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts on traffic and circulation, see Section 3O of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

g. Cumulative Impacts

The intersection analysis discussed above showed that three of the 27 study intersections in the AM peak hour are projected to operate at LOS E under cumulative without-project conditions in 2017. With the addition of project-generated traffic, one of these three intersections would deteriorate to LOS F. In addition, one intersection operating at LOS D under the without-project conditions would operate at LOS E under with-project conditions.

The intersection analysis showed that five study intersections in the PM peak hour are projected to operate at LOS E or worse under cumulative without-project conditions in 2017; one of the five intersections would operate at LOS F. With the addition of project-generated traffic, LOS at the intersections would not change for the five intersections. However, two intersections that were operating at LOS D under without-project conditions would operate at LOS E with the project; the remaining intersections would operate at the same LOS with or without the project. It should be noted that the mitigation measures for the proposed project would mitigate impacts at all project-affected intersections. The proposed project would not substantially increase the number of intersections operating at LOS E or worse; therefore, the project's incremental impact on cumulative conditions is not considered significant.

3-2 Significant or Potentially Significant Cumulative Impacts

3-2.1 Biological Resources (Burrowing Owl)

Although the impacts of the proposed project would be less-than-significant after mitigation, however, if burrowing owls are located within the proposed impact area, the project has the potential to result in a significant cumulative impact on burrowing owls, which are thought to be extirpated from the Los Angeles area.

a. Finding

(X) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

( ) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

b. Rationale for Finding

The proposed project would not result in any individually significant impacts on burrowing owl after mitigation. However, cumulative impacts would be significant, if burrowing owls are found in the proposed impact area. The EIR has already identified all feasible mitigation measures. No other mitigation measures to reduce the cumulative impacts on burrowing owl are feasible.

c. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts on public services, see Section 3C of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

3-2.2 Public Services (Fire and Police Services)

Although the proposed project would result in an incremental increase in demand for fire and police services, which would not be considered a significant impact individually, the project could contribute to the potentially cumulatively considerable impacts that could occur as a result of other cumulative growth and development.

a. Finding

( ) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

(**X**) **Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.**

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

b. Rationale for Finding

The proposed project would not result in any individually significant impacts on fire and police services. However, a determination of impacts (and feasibility of mitigation measures proposed by other agencies) on public services due to cumulative growth and development in the area is outside the jurisdiction or responsibility of the agency making the finding. The enhancements to fire and police services that may be required as a result of the cumulative growth and development would depend on the discretion of the agencies with jurisdiction.

c. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts on public services, see Section 3N of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

3-2.3 Utilities and Service Systems (Water, Wastewater, Solid Waste, and Energy)

Although the California Water Service Company (Cal Water) has indicated that there is an adequate supply of water to meet the proposed project's needs, cumulative development could require new water supply facilities and infrastructure, the construction of which could have significant impacts on the environment.
Cumulative growth and development in the area served by the regional treatment plant could substantially increase wastewater treatment demand, and new treatment facilities could be required, the construction of which could have significant impacts on the environment.

Due to the diminishing landfill capacity in the region, new landfills or waste disposal facilities could be required to accommodate solid waste generated by cumulative growth and development in the county, the construction of which could have significant impacts on the environment.

New or improved transmission and distribution facilities would be required to meet increased energy demand due to population growth and maintain an adequate level of service. Construction of these facilities could have an adverse impact on the environment.

a. Finding

( ) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project to avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.

(X) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.

(X) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

b. Rationale for Finding

The proposed project would not result in any individually significant impacts on utilities and service systems. However, the determination of impacts (and feasibility of mitigation measures proposed by other agencies) on utilities due to cumulative growth and development in the area is outside the jurisdiction or responsibility of the agency making the finding. The enhancements to utility systems that may be required as a result of the cumulative growth and development would depend on the discretion of agencies with jurisdiction.

c. Reference

For a full discussion of impacts on utilities and service systems, see Section 3P of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR.

4 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

4-1 Alternative 1a — No-Project/No-Build Alternative

Section 15126.6 (e) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires the analysis of a No-Project/No-Build Alternative. This no-project analysis must discuss the existing condition as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not to be approved based on current plans and site zoning, consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, the proposed improvements in the master plan would not be constructed, and the campus would remain in its current condition. This alternative assumes that no changes to the campus would occur. The existing buildings on campus would remain in their current condition. No new educational buildings or parking structures would be constructed. No utility improvements, such as the cogeneration plant, would be constructed, and no renovation projects would be undertaken. Minimal increases in enrollment and faculty/staff levels would occur under this alternative. The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would also not result in extensive improvements to existing facilities and construction of new facilities.

Additionally, the No-Project/No-Build Alternative would offer no capacity or space enhancements, and deterioration of existing buildings would continue. This alternative would also not fulfill any of the project goals.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources: The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in construction of new buildings or renovations to existing buildings. The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in new construction, and no trees would be affected. The proposed project would result in new buildings that do not exist at present. Some of the mature trees on campus may be affected during construction of the proposed project. However, none of these impacts would be significant.

Air Quality: The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in the potentially significant air quality impacts that could occur under the proposed project. No impacts on air quality would occur under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative.

Biological Resources: The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in the potentially significant impacts on biological resources that could occur under the proposed project. However, for the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

Cultural Resources: Since the amount of construction that would occur under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative would be very limited, it would be much less likely than the proposed project to disturb, destroy, or alter any unknown archaeological or paleontological resources that may be present on site. No impacts on cultural resources would occur under this alternative.

Geology and Soils: Under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, no new construction would occur, but existing structures would remain subject to seismic hazards. Under the proposed project, existing buildings and proposed new structures would be subject to seismic hazards due to distant ground shaking or liquefaction resulting from seismic activity on earthquake faults in the region. These hazards, however, could be reduced or mitigated to an acceptable level of risk through proper building design and construction. Therefore, lesser impacts would occur under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative.

Hazardous Materials: The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in people being exposed to asbestos-containing materials or lead-based paints, which could be encountered during renovation activities for the proposed project. However, for the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in new construction that could generate pollutants, which could be conveyed by stormwater to local surface water or groundwater resources. This would be a less-than-significant impact under the proposed project since construction would employ best management practices in compliance with NPDES permit requirements to minimize polluted runoff. The No-Project/No-Build Alternative, unlike the proposed project, would not increase the amount of impervious surfaces in the project area and result in additional polluted stormwater runoff. However, best management practices would be implemented in the design of new facilities to capture, filter, or treat stormwater runoff from new facilities to the extent practicable.

Land Use: No unavoidable significant adverse land use impacts would occur under the proposed project or the No-Project/No-Build Alternative.

Mineral Resources and Agriculture: No unavoidable significant adverse mineral impacts would occur under the proposed project or the No-Project/No-Build Alternative.

Noise: The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in new construction or increased noise levels. The proposed project would result in significant construction-related noise impacts. However, these impacts would be temporary and intermittent, lasting only for the period of construction.

Population, Employment, and Housing: Under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, campus enrollment and faculty/staff employment would grow at a minimal rate. No housing would be provided on campus for students, faculty, and staff.

Public Services: The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not result in the less-than-significant impacts on public services that would result from the proposed project. The No-Project/No-Build Alternative would also not result in the increase in demand for police and fire protection services that would occur under the proposed project. However, the benefits derived from having more educational and community facilities at CSUDH would not exist under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative.

Transportation/Traffic: Under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, increased ambient traffic resulting from other development projects in the city and region would increase traffic on local streets and regional highways. However, since no on-campus housing would be constructed under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, the number of trips generated from the campus would be less compared to the number under the proposed project. Therefore, a lesser impact is assumed under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative. However, vehicle miles traveled by students, staff, and faculty would not be reduced. Also, there would be no access improvements under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative.

Public Utilities: The increases in consumption or generation under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative would be less than the increases that would occur under the proposed project, although neither alternative would result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts on utilities or service providers.

4-2 Alternative 1b — No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative

It is reasonable to assume that in the absence of a master plan, development at the campus would be piecemeal. Renovations and space upgrades would take place on an as-needed basis. It is possible that new temporary structures would be constructed to accommodate future students. The student, staff, and faculty levels would grow at a minimal rate.

Under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, it is reasonable to assume that renovations and additions to existing facilities would occur on an as-needed basis.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources: The visual impacts of No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be less than those of the proposed project given the assumption that no large-scale construction projects would be undertaken with the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative. Since this alternative would include less new development, it may also not result in some of the aesthetic or visual enhancements that could occur under the proposed project.

Air Quality: It is expected that construction and operation of the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would result in less-than-significant impacts only if relatively minor construction and renovation projects occur. Construction and operation of the proposed project would result in significant air quality impacts.

Biological Resources: The No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would not result in potentially significant impacts on biological resources, which could occur under the proposed project and affect nesting migratory birds due to the removal of trees or vegetation. However, for the proposed project, these impacts would be less than significant after mitigation.

Cultural Resources: The potential for the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative to disturb cultural resources would be less than the potential under the proposed project because of the lower level of development. The proposed project has the potential to

disturb, destroy, or alter unknown archaeological or paleontological resources that may be present on campus due to earthmoving activities to construct new facilities. Less-than-significant impacts on cultural resources would occur under either this alternative or the proposed project.

Geology/Soils/Seismicity: Under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, since no major construction would be proposed, no potentially significant impacts on geology/soils/seismicity would occur. It is assumed that any new additions or renovations would comply with building codes. A lesser impact than that of the proposed project is expected.

Hazardous Materials: Under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative, renovation of older buildings could result in people being exposed to asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint, a potentially significant but mitigable impact. The renovation activities under the proposed project would result in similar impacts.

Hydrology and Water Quality: The No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would result in a smaller increase in the amount of impervious surfaces than the increase that would occur under the proposed project. Thus, this alternative would result in less polluted stormwater runoff than the amount generated by the proposed project; however, impacts would be mitigated under both alternatives with implementation of best management practices.

Land Use: No unavoidable significant adverse land use impacts would occur under either the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative or the proposed project.

Mineral Resources and Agriculture: No unavoidable significant adverse mineral resources impacts would occur under either the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative or the proposed project.

Noise: The renovations and additions under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative are unlikely to increase noise levels to a level of significance. The proposed project would result in significant construction-related noise impacts. Therefore, lesser construction noise impacts are likely.

Population, Employment, and Housing: No new on-campus staff and student housing would be provided under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative. Therefore, there would be no increase in on-campus population.

Public Services: The No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative and the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on public services. The No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would result in less of an increase in demand for police and fire protection services than the increase that would occur under the proposed project.

Transportation/Traffic: Under this alternative, increased ambient traffic resulting from other development projects in the city and region would increase traffic on local streets and regional highways. However, since no on-campus housing would be constructed under this alternative,

the number of trips generated from the campus would be less compared to the number under the proposed project. Therefore, a lesser impact is assumed under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative. However, vehicle miles traveled by students, staff, and faculty would not be reduced. Also, there would be no access improvements under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative.

Public Utilities: The increases in consumption or generation under the No-Project/Reasonably Foreseeable Development Alternative would be less than the increases that would occur under the proposed project, although neither alternative would result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts on utilities or service providers.

4-3 Alternative 2 — Slower Enrollment Growth Rate

The master plan assumes an average annual student enrollment growth rate of approximately 2.5 percent, which is in keeping with the overall vision for growth within the California State University system. However, in the last 5 years, the growth rate has been lower. The enrollment growth target for academic year 2007–2008 is 1.3 percent. From 2001 to 2007, the enrollment growth rate fell by approximately 2.52 percent. This alternative assumes that the slower or negative growth trends will continue. This slow or negative growth rate would mean that facilities would be constructed at dates later than those anticipated in the master plan. If enrollment levels are not high enough, some facilities may not be built at all.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Under Alternative 2, fewer new buildings would be constructed; therefore, no impacts on aesthetics would occur. Since the demand for new buildings and infrastructure on campus is tied closely to enrollment levels and the availability of funds, it is likely that low growth rates would mean fewer new buildings being constructed on campus. Under both the proposed project and Alternative 2, no substantial changes in views or aesthetics would occur.

Air Quality: Under Alternative 2, fewer new buildings would be constructed; therefore, impacts on air quality would be lesser than those that would occur under the proposed project.

Biological Resources: Under Alternative 2, fewer mature trees would be affected since fewer new buildings would be constructed. Impacts on biological resources would be less than significant after mitigation under this alternative and the proposed project.

Cultural Resources: Under Alternative 2, fewer buildings would be constructed. However, the potential for discovery from construction of fewer buildings would be similar to the potential under the proposed project.

Geology/Soils/Seismicity: Compliance with building regulations would ensure that impacts on geology/soils/seismicity would remain less than significant for the alternative and the proposed project.

Hazardous Materials: Renovation of older buildings under both Alternative 2 and the proposed project could result in people being exposed to asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint, a potentially significant but mitigable impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Alternative 2 would result in a smaller increase in the amount of impervious surfaces in the project area than the increase that would occur under the proposed project. Thus, this alternative would result in less polluted stormwater runoff than the amount generated by the proposed project; however, impacts would be mitigated under both alternatives with implementation of best management practices.

Land Use: No unavoidable significant adverse land use impacts would occur under this alternative or the proposed project.

Mineral Resources and Agriculture: No unavoidable significant adverse mineral resources impacts would occur under this alternative or the proposed project.

Noise: If enrollment levels continue to increase at a slow rate or decrease, fewer buildings would be required at the campus. However, any development on campus has the potential to disturb on-campus sensitive receptors. Therefore, similar or slightly lesser noise impacts are assumed. The proposed project would result in significant construction-related noise impacts.

Population, Employment, and Housing: Student and staff housing may not be constructed under this alternative or would be constructed in years beyond 2017. The proposed project would not result in significant impacts on population, employment, or housing.

Public Services: This alternative and the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on public services.

Transportation/Traffic: The traffic generated as a result of Alternative 2 would be less than that of the proposed project.

Public Utilities: The increases in consumption or generation under Alternative 2 would be less than the increases that would occur under the proposed project, although neither alternative would result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts on utilities or service providers.

4-4 Alternative 3 — No On-Campus Student and Faculty Housing

Alternative 3 assumes a scenario where no new on-campus housing is provided. Under this alternative, students and faculty would continue to commute long distances to reach the campus. Given the high cost of real estate in the Southern California region, without on-campus faculty housing as an incentive, many qualified prospective faculty members would not choose to work at CSUDH.

Aesthetics/Visual Resources: Under Alternative 3, on-campus student and faculty housing would not be constructed; the existing unobstructed views of the South Bay would remain for those looking southward from the campus and also from areas to the east. Nonetheless, the obstruction of these views as a result of the proposed project is not considered a significant impact.

Air Quality: Lesser air quality impacts would occur under this alternative since housing would not be constructed.

Biological Resources: The site for the faculty and student housing facilities does include water features that could be jurisdictional. If housing is not constructed, no impacts on potential jurisdictional waters would occur. However, with implementation of mitigation, the impacts of the proposed project on jurisdictional waters would be less than significant.

Cultural Resources: Under Alternative 3, the potential for discovery from construction would be similar to the potential under the proposed project. The proposed project has the potential to disturb, destroy, or alter unknown archaeological or paleontological resources that may be present on the project site due to earthmoving activities to construct new facilities.

Geology/Soils/Seismicity: Under Alternative 3, since housing would not be constructed, the potential for loss of human life at an on-campus student or faculty housing facility due to a seismic event or other geologic hazard would be eliminated. However, compliance with building regulations and the use of sound engineering practices would ensure that impacts related to geology/soils/seismicity remain less than significant for the proposed project.

Hazardous Materials: Renovation of older buildings under both Alternative 3 and the proposed project could result in people being exposed to asbestos-containing materials and/or lead-based paint, a potentially significant but mitigable impact.

Hydrology and Water Quality: Alternative 3 would result in a smaller increase in the amount of impervious surfaces in the project area than the increase that would occur under the proposed project. Thus, this alternative would result in less polluted stormwater runoff than the amount generated by the proposed project; however, impacts would be mitigated under both alternatives with implementation of best management practices.

Land Use: No unavoidable significant adverse land use impacts would occur under Alternative 3 or the proposed project. Since on-campus student and faculty housing would not be provided, housing options for students and faculty would be reduced.

Mineral Resources and Agriculture: No unavoidable significant adverse mineral resources impacts would occur under Alternative 3 or the proposed project.

Noise: Since no housing would be constructed under Alternative 3, construction noise impacts on residents across from University Drive would be reduced. The proposed project would result in significant construction-related noise impacts.

Population, Employment, and Housing: Under Alternative 3, student and faculty housing would not be constructed. The on-campus population would not increase. However, the proposed project would not result in significant impacts on population, employment, or housing.

Public Services: Since on-campus population would not increase under Alternative 3, lesser impacts on public services are assumed. This alternative and the proposed project would result in less-than-significant impacts on public services.

Transportation/Traffic: With on-campus student and faculty/staff housing, students and faculty/staff who choose to live on campus would travel fewer vehicle miles because they would be able to walk to classes. The traffic generated as a result of this alternative would be more compared to the traffic generated under the proposed project.

Public Utilities: Increases in consumption or generation under Alternative 3 would be less than the increases that would occur under the proposed project, although neither alternative would result in unavoidable significant adverse impacts on utilities or service providers.

4-4.1 Environmentally Superior Alternative

The environmentally superior alternative would be the No-Project/No-Build Alternative because of the absence of significant environmental impacts. However, as discussed above, the No-Project/No-Build Alternative would not fulfill any of the project objectives. Under the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, improvements would be limited, and consequently, the needs of the campus and community would not be met.

According to the *State CEQA Guidelines*, if the environmentally superior alternative is the No-Project/No-Build Alternative, the EIR shall identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives.

The analysis presented above and summarized in Table 4-1 of the CSUDH Master Plan final EIR indicates that Alternative 2 (Slower Enrollment Growth) and Alternative 3 (No On-Campus Student and Faculty Housing) would be the environmentally superior alternatives. However, Alternative 2 would not meet the overall vision of the CSU system for campus growth of 2.5 percent annually, and it would not serve the goal of providing a regional center for intellectual, athletic, cultural, and life-long learning. Alternative 3 would result in the loss of affordable on-campus housing options for existing and future faculty and staff. Given the prohibitive cost of living in the region, CSUDH would not be able to successfully attract the most qualified faculty and staff.

5 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

The proposed project could result in potentially significant impacts on air quality, noise, and traffic and circulation and potentially significant cumulative biological (burrowing owl), public services (police and fire), and utilities (water, wastewater, solid waste, energy) impacts. There are no feasible mitigation measures within the responsibilities and jurisdiction of the California State University that would reduce the impacts.

The final EIR has identified unavoidable significant impacts. Section 15093(b) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* provides that when the decision of the public agency allows the occurrence of significant impacts that are identified in the EIR but are not at least substantially mitigated, the agency must state in writing the reasons to support its action based on the completed EIR and/or other information in the record. Accordingly, the California State University adopts the following Statement of Overriding Considerations. The California State University recognizes that significant and unavoidable impacts would result from the implementation of the preferred Alternative (proposed project). Having (i) adopted all feasible mitigation measures; (ii) rejected the alternatives to the project discussed above; (iii) recognized all significant, unavoidable impacts; and (iv) balanced the benefits of the proposed project against the significant and unavoidable effects, the California State University finds that the benefits outweigh and override the significant unavoidable effects for the reasons stated below.

Any one of the reasons for approval is sufficient to justify approval of the proposed project. These reasons summarize the benefits, goals, and objectives of the proposed project. The substantial evidence supporting the various benefits can be found in the preceding findings and elsewhere in the Record of Proceedings. These overriding considerations of economic, social, environmental, and other benefits outweigh environmental costs and justify approval of the proposed project and certification of the EIR:

1) Implementation of the projects proposed under the CSUDH Master Plan project would help fulfill the goals of master plan:

   - support the faculty and staff with appropriate teaching, research, and administrative facilities;
   - reinforce the sense of campus community by providing in-class and out-of-class opportunities for faculty, student, and staff collaboration;
   - make available the appropriate facilities for recreation and intercollegiate athletics;
   - serve as an accessible, attractive, safe, and welcoming campus for students, staff, faculty, and the community;
   - serve as a regional center for intellectual, athletic, cultural, and life-long learning;
   - adequately manage and maintain all campus facilities;
   - preserve a balance between open space and built structures;

- maintain stewardship of campus landscape and natural resources; and
- continue good relations with the City of Carson and the surrounding community.

The 2009 master plan has been prepared to address issues related to a future enrollment level of 20,000 FTE students. Enrollment for the academic year 2005–2006 was 8,718 FTE students (or 13,671 total students). Current growth rates indicate that a benchmark of 11,000 FTE students will occur around 2017, and an enrollment level of 20,000 FTE students will occur around 2089.

Although buildout with 20,000 FTE students is envisioned in the master plan, the document acknowledges that a sequential phasing plan will need to be developed because some projects cannot be justified until an actual, demonstrated need occurs. Also, some projects cannot be constructed until other projects upon which they depend are constructed. In addition, some projects may require long lead times to obtain sufficient funding.

The master plan identifies near- and long-term projects. The near-term projects are likely to be built within the next 8 years if funding is available and enrollment levels justify construction of new facilities.

Near-term projects are projects that would be needed to accommodate an enrollment level of 11,000 FTE students (or 17,368 students). According to current estimates in the 2009 master plan, an enrollment level of 10,518 FTE would be achieved in 2017. For the purposes of the EIR, a conservative higher estimate of 11,000 FTE is assumed for 2017. Near-term projects would be constructed in a phased manner over the next 8 years. If enrollment levels do not reach 11,000 FTE students by 2017, or if funding is unavailable, some of the near-term projects may not be built. The environmental impacts for the near-term projects are analyzed in detail in this EIR. The near-term projects are in various phases of design and planning. Since more information is available for these projects, greater analysis can be provided.

Long-term projects are those projects that would be required to meet the demands of 20,000 FTE students (or 31,344 students). Such projects have been defined in concept only, and no formal design efforts have begun.

2) Construction of the projects proposed under the master plan would continue through approximately 2017 for near-term projects and beyond that date for future phases of development. The proposed master plan projects would create temporary jobs during design and construction phases of the various projects over the course of 8 years. Implementation of the master plan would also increase the number of permanent college employees. In 2006, there were 972 faculty members/staff personnel employed at CSUDH. It is anticipated that there would be 1,650 faculty members/staff personnel by 2017 and 1,820 faculty members/staff personnel by 2040. The increase in the number of temporary construction workers and long-term employees would bring a boost to the local economy by means of increased consumer spending in the area and additional tax revenue.

3) Older structures on the campus could contain asbestos-containing material and/or lead-based paint contaminants. Renovation or demolition of existing buildings on the campus under the master plan and removal or remediation of the hazardous materials contamination in these buildings would eliminate a potential hazard to the health of students and employees.

For the reasons described above, the benefits of the proposed master plan outweigh its unavoidable adverse environmental effects, and consequently, the adverse environmental effects are considered "acceptable" in accordance with Section 15093(c) of the *State CEQA Guidelines*.