

## 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ANALYSIS

---

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

This section presents an analysis of each resource topic that has been identified through preliminary environmental analysis and the public scoping process as likely to be affected by the development of the Hayward campus under the proposed Master Plan. Each section describes the environmental setting of the project as it relates to that specific resource topic; the impacts that could result from implementation of the project; and mitigation measures that would avoid, reduce, or compensate for the impacts of the project.

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is a program-level environmental assessment, which evaluates the effects of adoption and implementation of the proposed Master Plan and focuses on full development of the campus under the proposed Master Plan, at a programmatic rather than project-specific level. Adoption of the proposed Master Plan does not constitute a commitment to any specific project, construction schedule, or funding priority. Each project proposed by CSUEB during the time span of the proposed Master Plan will be individually reviewed and approved by the Board of Trustees of the CSU System.

Based on the input received during the EIR scoping process, as described in **Section 1.0, Introduction**, this EIR addresses the following topics in detail:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Traffic, Circulation, and Parking
- Utilities and Service Systems

As potential impacts related to Agricultural Resources and Mineral Resources are not likely to be significant under CEQA, they are addressed at a lesser level of detail in this EIR (see **Section 6.0, Other CEQA Considerations**).

## 4.2 LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

Under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), a variety of terms are used to describe the levels of significance of adverse impacts. The definition of terms used in this EIR is presented below.

- **Significant and Unavoidable Impact.** An impact that exceeds the defined standards of significance and cannot be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures.
- **Significant Impact.** An impact that exceeds the defined standards of significance and that can be avoided or reduced to a less-than-significant level through implementation of feasible mitigation measures.
- **Potentially Significant Impact.** A significant impact that may ultimately be determined to be less than significant; the level of significance may be reduced through implementation of policies or guidelines (that are not required by statute or ordinance), or through further definition of the project detail in the future. Potentially significant impacts may also be impacts for which there is not enough information to draw a firm conclusion; however, for the purpose of this EIR, they are considered significant. Such impacts are equivalent to Significant Impacts and require the identification of feasible mitigation measures.
- **Less Than Significant Impact.** Impacts that are adverse but that do not exceed the specified standards of significance.
- **No Impact.** The project would not create an impact.

## 4.3 FORMAT OF RESOURCE TOPIC SECTIONS

Each resource topic considered in this section of the EIR is addressed under six primary subsections: Introduction, Environmental Setting, Regulatory Setting, Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures, Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures, and References. An overview of the information included in these sections is provided below.

### 4.3.1 Introduction

The introduction section describes the topic to be analyzed and the contents of the analysis. It also provides the sources used to evaluate the potential impact of the project, and lists issues and concerns relative to the resource topic identified by the public and the agencies during the EIR scoping process.

### 4.3.2 Environmental Setting

The environmental setting section for each resource topic provides a description of the applicable physical setting of the project area and its surroundings (e.g., existing land uses, existing soil conditions, existing traffic conditions). Because the proposed Master Plan is a long-term development plan for the

Hayward campus and the full development of the campus under this plan would not occur until 2030 or even later, future no-project conditions are also projected for certain resource topics, such as traffic, in order to accurately evaluate the impacts of the proposed Master Plan.

### 4.3.3 Regulatory Setting

The overview of regulatory considerations for each resource topic is organized by agency, including applicable federal, state, regional, and local policies.

### 4.3.4 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This subsection lists significance criteria that are used to evaluate impacts, followed by a discussion of the impacts that would result from implementation of the project. Impacts are numbered and shown in bold type, and the mitigation measures are numbered to correspond to the impact. Impacts and mitigation measures are numbered consecutively within each topic.

### 4.3.5 Cumulative Impacts and Mitigation Measures

The *State CEQA Guidelines* suggest that the analysis of cumulative impacts for each environmental factor can employ one of two methods to establish the effects of other past, current, and probable future projects. A lead agency may select a list of projects, including those outside the control of the agency, or, alternatively, a summary of projections. These projections may be from an adopted general plan or related planning document, or from a prior environmental document that has been adopted or certified, and these documents may describe or evaluate regional or area-wide conditions contributing to the cumulative impact. As the horizon year for the Master Plan is 2030, this EIR evaluates cumulative impacts using projections from the Alameda Countywide Travel Demand Model (ACTDM) and the City of Hayward General Plan. Cumulative impact analyses included in **Sections 4.2, Air Quality, 4.9, Noise, and 4.12, Traffic, Circulation, and Parking**, are based on the ACTDM. All other sections of this EIR include an analysis of cumulative impacts based upon the buildout of the City of Hayward General Plan.

The cumulative impacts discussion describes the cumulative impacts of the proposed Master Plan, and determines whether the Master Plan in combination with other foreseeable development would result in a significant cumulative impact, and, if so, whether the project's contribution to the significant cumulative impact would be cumulatively considerable.

Section 15130 of the *State CEQA Guidelines* provides direction regarding cumulative impact analysis as follows:

- An EIR should not discuss cumulative impacts that do not result in part from the proposed project;
- A lead agency may determine that an identified cumulative impact is less than significant, and shall briefly identify facts and analysis in the EIR supporting its determination;
- A lead agency may determine a project's incremental effect is not cumulatively considerable, and therefore is not significant, and shall briefly describe in the EIR the basis of its determination; and
- A lead agency may determine a project's cumulatively considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact may be rendered less than cumulatively considerable and therefore residually not significant, if the project implements or funds its fair share of mitigation measure or measures designed to alleviate the cumulative impact.

#### 4.3.6 References

This subsection lists the references used to prepare the environmental setting and impact analysis for each section of the EIR.