

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project that could feasibly avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts while substantially attaining the basic objectives of the proposed project. An EIR should also evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. This section sets forth potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the *State CEQA Guidelines*¹ pertaining to the alternatives analysis are summarized below:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a “rule of reason;” therefore, the EIR must evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.
- The No Project alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The No Project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published. Additionally, the analysis shall discuss what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.
- For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The range of feasible alternatives is selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are environmental impacts, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries,

¹ California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, *California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines*, Section 15126.6.

and whether the applicant could reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site.²

5.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The primary objective of the Hayward Campus Master Plan is to comply with the California State University (CSU) system-wide requirement to maintain a master plan for guiding campus development and meeting the educational mission of the University, as defined in the California Education Code. The following project objectives are based on the physical planning principles derived from the long-term academic vision for the campus as established in the CSU, East Bay (CSUEB) Strategic Plan and Hayward Campus Master Plan:

- Enhance the campus learning environment within a walkable campus core by providing adequate sites for planned and future programs and to accommodate growth in campus enrollment up to the CPEC-approved Master Plan ceiling of 18,000 FTES (Full-Time Equivalent Students).
- Create supportive student neighborhoods that would help create a sense of community for both residents and commuting students, and increase on-campus housing to accommodate 5,000 students. In addition, identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.
- Plan for other design improvements, including improved campus entry and image to help orient visitors and make destination finding easier; special landmark building sites to create a memorable impression of the campus; and improved campus pedestrian promenades
- Implement comprehensive environmentally sustainable development and operations strategies, including land use and transportation, as well as resource consumption and waste generation.
- Continue the planning and design criteria from the original campus master plan that aim at preserving views of the bay and the hills; creating a clear design vocabulary; and protecting the users from the elements.

5.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

An EIR must briefly describe the rationale for selection and rejection of alternatives. The lead agency may make an initial determination as to which alternatives are feasible, and therefore merit in-depth consideration, and which are infeasible. Alternatives considered for detailed evaluation in this EIR include a range of potential alternate projects that meet most of the CSU's objectives while eliminating or reducing significant environmental impacts identified in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**.

² California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, *California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(f)(1).

Alternatives considered in this EIR include the following:

- Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing
- Reduced Enrollment Capacity
- No Project

5.4 ALTERNATIVES ELIMINATED FROM FUTURE CONSIDERATION

Alternatives that are remote or speculative, or have effects that cannot be reasonably predicted, need not be considered.³ Two alternatives were considered by the CSUEB, but eliminated from further consideration because they were found to be infeasible. These two alternatives are described below along with a brief explanation of the reasons for their exclusion.

5.4.1 Alternate Location – Downtown Hayward

CEQA indicates that a key question in the analysis is whether any of the significant effects of the project would be avoided or substantially lessened by selecting an alternate site for the project. Only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR. Scoping comments received on the Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR requested that CSUEB consider locating a portion of the growth under this Master Plan at a location(s) in downtown Hayward. It was suggested that a downtown location for instructional facilities and proposed faculty, staff and student housing be considered. CSUEB has determined that such an alternative would not (1) be feasible, (2) meet most of the objectives of the proposed Master Plan, and (3) reduce the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

This alternative was determined to be infeasible for meeting projected instructional needs because it is not relevant to the physical capacity of the Hayward campus on Carlos Bee Boulevard. CSUEB presently maintains campuses in the cities of Concord and Oakland, co-locates classes at community colleges and other sites, and provides online instruction. These academic offerings meet a different demand for higher education as they provide access to students who would not otherwise be able to attend classes at the Hayward campus. The proposed Master Plan and this Draft EIR are specifically focused on the Hayward campus, not all CSUEB instruction. CSUEB could add instruction at facilities in downtown Hayward, but not substitute growth at the Hayward campus by offering classes downtown. The University would maintain and continue to enhance programs for its other offerings regardless of the Hayward Campus Master Plan. Therefore, an alternate off-site location is not an applicable or feasible alternative to the

³ California Public Resources Code, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, *California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines*, Section 15126.6(f)(3).

development of facilities on the campus site under the proposed Master Plan. For all of the reasons presented above, this alternative was not carried forth for detailed evaluation.

This alternative was also determined to be infeasible for University-sponsored housing for several reasons, including the fact that the CSUEB does not own land in downtown Hayward on which to develop these uses. This alternative would be more costly considering that the CSUEB would be required to purchase land in downtown Hayward instead of building on the existing campus land it presently owns. Further, the reason that the proposed Master Plan calls for student housing on campus is to create a residential learning community that enhances student success, particularly during the freshman year.

This alternative would not meet two of the key objectives of the proposed Master Plan which are to provide on-campus housing for students and faculty and create a "university village" on the Hayward campus to foster a sense of community for both residents and commuters. Furthermore, on-campus housing has the potential to greatly improve the quality of the campus experience by supporting additional student facilities (food service, entertainment, and recreation) and by increasing the critical mass of students and the perceived activity level of the campus.

Furthermore, the placement of housing and facilities off campus would not avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts resulting from the proposed project. This alternative would increase the number of vehicle trips due to the additional travel between the campus and off-campus uses, thereby increasing traffic impacts. For all of the reasons presented above, this alternative was not carried forth for detailed evaluation.

5.4.2 No Faculty/Staff Housing

This alternative would implement most aspects of the Master Plan, including a target enrollment of 18,000 FTES and 5,000 student beds, similar to the proposed Master Plan. However, this alternative would not develop any faculty and staff housing on the campus. CSUEB has determined that this alternative would (1) not meet most of the objectives of the proposed Master Plan, and (2) not reduce the environmental impacts of the proposed project.

By not developing any faculty and staff housing, this alternative would not meet a key objective of the proposed Master Plan, which is to provide on-campus housing for students and faculty and foster a sense of community for both residents and commuters.

Furthermore, this alternative would not avoid or substantially lessen any significant impacts resulting from the proposed project. In contrast, this alternative would increase vehicle trip generation due to the additional trips by 220 faculty and staff who would commute between their off-campus places of

residence and the campus. The alternative would have greater traffic and traffic-related air quality and noise impacts. For the reasons presented above, this alternative was not carried forth for detailed evaluation.

5.5 ALTERNATIVE IMPACT ANALYSIS

This subsection presents an analysis of the project alternatives, including the following:

- Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing
- Reduced Enrollment Capacity
- No Project

5.5.1 Alternative 1: Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing

Description and Analysis

The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would implement most aspects of the proposed Master Plan. Similar to the proposed project, this alternative would modernize, expand, and improve campus facilities to accommodate a student population of 18,000 FTES and house 5,000 students on campus. It would include new building construction and renovation, and the reconfiguration of campus open space amenities, entry sequences, parking facilities, and circulation.

This alternative would develop faculty and staff housing at the Carlos Bee Boulevard/Bunker Hill Boulevard and the Hayward Boulevard/Campus Drive sites for a maximum of 110 housing units, but, unlike the proposed project, would not develop any faculty and staff housing at the Grandview Avenue site. This housing site would remain as undeveloped hillside (note that in contrast, the proposed project would develop 110 additional faculty and staff housing units at the Grandview Avenue site, for a maximum of 220 units on all three faculty and staff housing sites). As a result, approximately 110 more faculty and staff households at campus buildout would live off campus.

Aesthetics

The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would alter the visual character of the developed campus core to the same degree as the proposed project. Also similar to the proposed project, this alternative would develop faculty and staff housing at the Carlos Bee Boulevard/Bunker Hill Boulevard and Hayward Boulevard/Campus Drive sites outside the developed campus core. However, under the proposed project, impacts to panoramic views of San Francisco Bay and the City of Hayward from vantage points along Grandview Avenue were determined to be potentially significant due to the

development faculty/staff housing along Grandview Avenue. Unlike the proposed project, the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would not include construction of faculty and student housing along Grandview Avenue. For this reason, significant impacts to views from vantage points along Grandview Avenue would be avoided and the impact would be less than significant.

Air Quality

Construction of the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would generate criteria pollutants and fugitive dust, which with mitigation, would not adversely affect local air quality in the vicinity of the construction site. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would construct fewer housing facilities which would in turn reduce criteria pollutants and fugitive dust related to construction.

Buildout of the Campus Master Plan would add mobile, stationary, and area sources to the project area that would result in long-term increases in criteria pollutants emissions. The Campus Master Plan would implement strategies to reduce air emissions that would reduce this impact. Implementation of the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would provide less on-site faculty and staff housing than the proposed project, but would require the same number of faculty and staff. Because more employees would reside off campus under this alternative and would commute to and from the campus, the total daily trips generated from this alternative would be greater than those generated by the proposed Master Plan. Therefore, slightly greater emissions of criteria pollutants would result under this alternative. Criteria pollutants from stationary and area sources would remain substantially the same because a central plant system would be in place. Overall, this alternative would result in slightly greater air pollutant emissions.

Biological Resources

The grassland and mixed scrub areas that generally border the developed portions of the campus could potentially support special-status plant, bird, and bat species. The proposed project includes development of peripheral faculty and staff housing at three sites within these undeveloped areas. The potential loss or disturbance of special-status species due to development at these sites would be significant. However, implementation of mitigation would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Unlike the proposed Master Plan, which would develop faculty and staff housing at all three sites, the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative does not include development at the Grandview Avenue site. Therefore, the potential for impacts to special-status species would be slightly reduced under this alternative as this site would remain undeveloped.

Cultural Resources

Campus buildings that will be at least 50 years old by 2030 are conservatively considered to represent historic resources as defined by CEQA. Where avoidance or preservation of a building is not possible, Master Plan implementation is assumed to have a potentially significant impact on historic resources. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would also potentially disturb buildings at least 50 years in age by 2030. Therefore, impacts to historic resources would be equivalent. The potential for impacts to archaeological resources would be slightly reduced as there would be no ground-disturbing activity at the Grandview Avenue site for faculty and staff housing.

Geology and Soils

With implementation of mitigation, development under the proposed Master Plan would not expose people and structures on campus to significant adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, soil erosion, or expansive soils. The same geologic conditions and mitigation would apply to any construction occurring under the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative. Therefore, impacts related to geology and soils would be comparable to those related to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Potential hazards associated with implementation of the proposed Master Plan include exposure to contaminated soil, groundwater, or building materials during demolition and construction activities. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Since no faculty and staff housing would be developed at the Grandview Avenue site under the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing, the extent and duration of construction would be incrementally less than required under the proposed Master Plan. The decrease in construction activity would not be substantial enough to lower the potential exposure to contaminated substances. Therefore, impacts would be comparable to those from the proposed project.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase impervious surfaces on the campus, but would also reduce the present volume of stormwater runoff generated on the campus through the strategic placement of vegetation to collect, store, and purify stormwater. Compliance with National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) requirements and campus stormwater management policies would result in less than significant impacts to water quality. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would increase impervious surfaces on campus, but not to the same extent as the proposed project since the Grandview Avenue site would be maintained in its current undeveloped condition. This

would decrease the volume of runoff and reduce impacts to water quality and the receiving storm drain system.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed Master Plan would generally be consistent with local land use plans. Development of faculty/staff housing at the site off of Hayward Boulevard across from the University Theatre, and along Grandview Avenue would be designed to minimize impacts to the existing adjacent neighborhoods and additional environmental review would be conducted to evaluate potentially significant environmental impacts. Under the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative, no development would occur at the Grandview Avenue site, but development would still occur at the Carlos Bee Boulevard/Bunker Hill Boulevard and Hayward Boulevard/Campus Drive sites. Therefore, this alternative would reduce the less than significant land use incompatibility impacts.

Noise

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would increase traffic noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors located along surrounding roadways. Mitigation would reduce impacts due to noise level increases exceeding the threshold of 3.0 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) to a less than significant level. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would provide less on-site faculty and staff housing than the proposed project, but would require the same number of faculty and staff. Therefore, more employees would reside off campus under this alternative. As discussed further below, the total peak-hour trips for this alternative would be almost identical to peak-hour trips generated by the proposed project. Traffic distribution would however change under this alternative because there would be no additional local traffic along Grandview Avenue and the adjacent neighborhood streets. As a result, noise levels along roadways leading to the campus would increase by a greater amount than under the proposed Master Plan. However, the increase would not be sufficient to result in a noise impact at another location in addition to the five locations that would be affected by the traffic associated with the proposed Master Plan.

The proposed project's construction noise impacts to off-site sensitive receptors, including the residences along Grandview Avenue, would be less than significant with mitigation. This alternative would not include construction of faculty and staff housing or any other use at the Grandview Avenue site. However, since residences along Grandview Avenue would be 15 feet of the nearest construction activity under the proposed project whereas they would be more than 500 feet away under this alternative, this alternative would result in a substantial reduction in construction noise that would be experienced by residents along Grandview Avenue.

Population and Housing

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the population in the City of Hayward. However, based on Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) growth projections, the impact would be less than significant. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would develop the same number of student beds but no faculty and staff housing on campus, although the enrollment capacity would still be 18,000 FTES. It is expected that the alternative would increase demand for 110 additional off-campus housing units. Specifically, the alternative would increase the housing demand in the City of Hayward by 271 housing units in 2030, or 4.0 percent of the projected additional housing units in the City, in comparison to 2 percent expected for the proposed project. The alternative would also increase housing demand in the County by 605 units, representing 0.6 percent of the ABAG projected housing demand in the County, in comparison to 0.4 percent expected for the proposed project. Therefore, while housing demand would increase slightly, the population and housing impacts would be slightly greater but still less than significant.

Public Services – Fire Protection

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for fire protection services provided by the Hayward Fire Department, resulting in a less-than-significant impact. Since the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would also increase enrollment capacity to 18,000 FTES, the demand for fire protection services and the overall associated impacts would be comparable to those of the proposed project. Given that Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative would be provided on the campus, the 110 employee households would live off campus and contribute to a population increase in other parts of the City and County. Therefore, other fire stations in the City and County would serve the population growth associated with these households. Similar to the proposed project, under this alternative, these 110 employee households would be dispersed in several Bay Area communities and there would not be a significant impact on the fire protection services of any one community.

Public Services – Law Enforcement

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for law enforcement services. Since the Hayward Police Department and the campus police department would collaborate to maintain adequate service on and around the campus, impacts would be less than significant. Since the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would also increase enrollment capacity to 18,000 FTES, the demand for law enforcement services and the associated impacts would be comparable to those of the proposed project. Given that Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative would be provided on the campus, 110 more employee households would live off campus and contribute to a population increase in other parts

of the City and County. Therefore, other police departments in the City and County would serve the population growth associated with these households. Similar to the proposed project, under this alternative, these 110 employee households would be dispersed in several Bay Area communities and there would not be a significant impact on the police department of any one community.

Public Services – Schools

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would indirectly increase enrollment in Hayward area schools as dependents of students, faculty, and staff relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. However, this increase would be less than significant. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would also increase enrollment capacity to 18,000 FTES and draw a similar number of students, faculty, and staff to the Hayward area. However, because 110 fewer employee households would live on campus and only some of 110 households would potentially live off campus within the City of Hayward, the demand for school services in Hayward would be comparable or slightly reduced compared to the proposed Master Plan. In other words, the increase in enrollment at Hayward area schools and the associated impacts would be comparable or slightly lower than those of the proposed Master Plan.

Public Services – Parks and Recreation Services

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would generate a nominal increase in the usage of off-campus recreational resources as only a limited number of students, employees and their dependents are expected to relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. However, this increase would be less than significant. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would also increase enrollment capacity to 18,000 FTES, and draw a similar number of students, faculty, and staff to the Hayward area. However, because 110 fewer employee households would live on campus, and a few more households would potentially live off campus within the City of Hayward, the impacts on recreational resources would be comparable or slightly greater than those of the proposed Master Plan.

Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at eight study intersections. Since further physical improvements to the affected intersections are not feasible, this impact would be significant and unavoidable even with incorporation of mitigation. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would provide less on-site faculty and staff housing than the proposed project, but would require the same number of faculty and staff. This alternative would generate an estimated 1,377 AM peak-hour trips and 2,255 PM peak-hour trips, which is very close to the 1,413 AM peak-hour trips and 2,271 PM peak-hour trips generated by the proposed Master Plan. As more

employees would reside off campus under this alternative the peak-hour trips to and from the campus would be slightly greater.

The traffic impacts of the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would be virtually the same as the proposed Master Plan case at all external intersections studied. However, elimination of new housing at the Grandview Avenue site would eliminate the local traffic effects on the adjacent neighborhood streets which were determined to be less than significant for the proposed project.

Utilities – Water

The proposed project would increase the water demand within the City of Hayward to accommodate growth to an enrollment capacity of 18,000 FTES. As discussed for the proposed project, because the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) states that cutbacks would be required in multiple-dry years and water demand associated with the proposed Master Plan was not included in its demand projections, the proposed project's impact related to water supply is considered a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Under the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative, on-campus demand for water would be lower because there would be 110 fewer housing units on the campus. All other aspects of the campus' future water demand would be the same. However, of the 110 employee households that would live off campus, some would reside within Hayward and therefore result in a demand for water within the City. The impact of this alternative on water supply would therefore be comparable or slightly less than that of the proposed project on the City's water supply.

Utilities – Wastewater

Sufficient capacity currently exists to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project at Master Plan buildout and to accommodate increased wastewater volumes as the Master Plan is implemented. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater service would be less than significant. For the same reasons that are presented above related to water supply, the impact of this alternative on wastewater would be comparable or slightly less than that of the proposed project on the City's wastewater treatment facilities.

Utilities – Solid Waste

Impacts related to the increase in solid waste generation as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant provided that waste diversion goals are met. For the same reasons that are presented above, the impact of this alternative on solid waste disposal would be comparable to that of the proposed project.

Utilities – Electricity and Natural Gas

Impacts related to the increase in electricity and natural gas consumption as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of required infrastructure improvements and energy conservation goals. Those employee households that would not live on campus under the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would live elsewhere in the Bay Area and would result in an equivalent demand for electricity and natural gas in these other communities. The impact related to electricity and natural gas would be comparable.

Conclusion and Relationship to Project Objectives

The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, biological resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, hydrology and water quality, and land use. Impacts related to traffic, air quality, noise, and population and housing would be comparable or slightly greater than those of the proposed project. Impacts on, public services, and public utilities, and hazards and hazardous materials would be comparable or slightly lesser than those of the proposed project.

By not developing faculty and staff housing at the Grandview Avenue site, this alternative would not achieve the following key objective to the same extent as the proposed project which is to identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.

5.5.2 Alternative 2: Reduced Enrollment Capacity

Description and Analysis

This alternative would allow the campus to increase its enrollment capacity to 15,000 FTES and student housing to 4,200 beds. Based on the current enrollment capacity of about 12,586 FTES and existing enrollment of 8,758 FTES students, this alternative would increase enrollment capacity by about 2,414 FTES, and would increase enrollment above existing conditions by 6,240 FTES. In comparison, the proposed project would allow the campus enrollment capacity to increase by 5,400 FTES, and would increase enrollment by about 9,200 FTES. Under this alternative, no faculty and staff housing would be developed on the campus. Therefore, it is assumed that the overall extent and duration of construction activity under this alternative would be lower than required for the proposed project.

Aesthetics

Physical development of the campus under this alternative is anticipated to be less extensive than envisioned by the proposed Master Plan. However, the change to the visual character of the campus is anticipated to be comparable to that of the proposed project, provided that attention to campus entry

sequences, open space amenities and key facilities is still provided. However, under the proposed project, impacts to panoramic views of San Francisco Bay and the City of Hayward from vantage points along Grandview Avenue were determined to be potentially significant due to the development of faculty and staff housing along Grandview Avenue. Unlike the proposed project, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would not include construction of faculty and staff housing along Grandview Avenue or any other sites on the CSUEB property. For this reason, significant impacts to views from vantage points along Grandview Avenue would be avoided.

Air Quality

Construction of the Campus Master Plan would generate criteria pollutants and fugitive dust, which with mitigation, would not adversely affect local air quality in the vicinity of the construction site. The Reduced Enrollment alternative would construct fewer housing, academic and campus support facilities which would in turn reduce criteria pollutants and fugitive dust related to construction.

Buildout of the Campus Master Plan would also add mobile, stationary, and area sources to the campus site that would result in long-term increases in criteria pollutants emissions. The Campus Master Plan would implement strategies to reduce air emissions that would reduce this impact. Growth under the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also contribute to increased criteria pollutant emissions from traffic, but would result in lower emissions due to a lower enrollment level at buildout. It should also be noted that since no faculty and staff housing would be constructed under this alternative, all future faculty, and staff would be required to commute to the campus. While this could increase the number of trips generated by Campus employees, the reduction in student trip generation due to the lower enrollment capacity would decrease overall mobile source emissions. Under the Reduced Enrollment alternative, however, criteria pollutants from stationary and area sources would remain substantially the same because a central plant system would be in place.

Biological Resources

The grassland and mixed scrub areas that generally border the developed portions of the campus could potentially support special-status plant, bird, and bat species. The proposed project includes development of peripheral faculty and staff housing at three sites within these undeveloped areas. The potential loss or disturbance of special-status species due to development at these sites would be significant. However, implementation of mitigation would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Unlike the proposed project, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would not develop any faculty and staff housing sites within the undeveloped areas of campus. Therefore, this alternative would

substantially reduce the potential for impacts to special-status species. Impacts to special-status species on the developed portion of the campus would be comparable to those of the proposed project.

A small drainage and associated bay woodland in the far western portion of the CSUEB property is located near the proposed Carlos Bee Boulevard/Bunker Hill Boulevard faculty and staff housing site for the proposed project. This drainage is expected to fall under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), while the bay woodland is considered to be riparian habitat likely to fall under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Construction activities and installation of infrastructure could affect this drainage or result in the loss of the associated riparian vegetation, which constitutes a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. However, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would not develop faculty and staff housing at this site, but would maintain the site in its current undeveloped condition. As a result, this alternative would substantially reduce impacts to the drainage and bay woodland located on this portion of the CSUEB property.

Cultural Resources

Campus buildings that will be at least 50 years old by 2030 are conservatively considered to represent historic resources as defined by CEQA. Where avoidance or preservation of a building is not possible, Master Plan implementation is assumed to have a potentially significant impact on historic resources. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also potentially disturb buildings at least 50 years in age by 2030. Therefore, impacts to cultural resources would be equivalent. Due to the reduced footprint of this alternative, especially because the three faculty/staff housing sites and the student housing sites would not be developed, the potential for impacts on archaeological resources would be reduced compared to that under the proposed project.

Geology and Soils

With implementation of mitigation, development under the proposed Master Plan would not expose people and structures on campus to significant adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, soil erosion, or expansive soils. The same geologic conditions and mitigation would apply to any construction occurring under the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative. Therefore, impacts related to geology and soils would be comparable.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Potential hazards associated with implementation of the proposed Master Plan include exposure to contaminated soil, groundwater, or building materials during demolition and construction activities.

Mitigation would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Due to the reduction in construction activity, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would decrease the potential for exposure to contaminated substances. Therefore, impacts related to the potential hazards during construction would be reduced.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase impervious surfaces on campus, but would also reduce the present volume of stormwater runoff generated on the campus through the strategic placement of vegetation to collect, store and purify stormwater. Compliance with NPDES requirements and campus stormwater management policies would result in less than significant impacts to water quality. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would increase impervious surfaces, but not to the same extent as the proposed project since the housing sites would remain in their current undeveloped condition. This would decrease the volume of runoff and reduce impacts to water quality and the receiving storm drain system.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed Master Plan would generally be consistent with local land use plans. Development of faculty/staff housing at the site off of Hayward Boulevard across from the University Theatre, and along Grandview Avenue would be designed to minimize impacts to the existing adjacent neighborhoods and additional environmental review would be conducted to evaluate potentially significant environmental impacts. Under the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative, no development would occur at these peripheral sites. Therefore, this alternative would further reduce this less than significant impact.

Noise

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would increase traffic noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors located along surrounding roadways but would not result in a significant noise impact. Growth under the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also contribute to increased traffic noise levels, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES. It should also be noted that since no faculty and staff housing would be constructed under this alternative, all future faculty, and staff would be required to commute to campus. While this could increase the number of trips generated by University employees, the reduction in student trip generation due to the lower enrollment capacity would decrease the overall traffic and traffic-related noise impacts.

The proposed project's construction noise impacts to nearby residences, including residences along Grandview Avenue and Campus Drive, would be significant. Mitigation restricting construction hours would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Since this alternative would not include construction of faculty and staff housing or any other use at this location, construction noise impacts to residences along Grandview Avenue and Campus Drive would be substantially reduced.

Population and Housing

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the population in the City of Hayward. However, based on ABAG growth projections, the impact would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would permit growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES as proposed by the Master Plan. Accordingly, less housing would be required. Therefore, this alternative would reduce the population and housing impacts of the proposed project.

Public Services – Fire Protection

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for fire protection services, but would not result in a significant impact related to the provision of fire protection services to the campus at buildout under the proposed Master Plan. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase the demand for fire protection services as enrollment increases, but would lessen the less than significant impact of the proposed project.

Public Services – Law Enforcement

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for law enforcement services. Since the Hayward Police Department and the campus police department would collaborate to maintain adequate service on and around the campus, impacts would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase the demand for law enforcement services as enrollment increases, but would further reduce the proposed project's less than significant impact.

Public Services – Schools

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would indirectly increase enrollment at Hayward area schools as dependents of students, faculty, and staff relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase enrollment at Hayward schools as enrollment and campus employment increases, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Public Services – Parks and Recreation Services

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would generate a nominal increase in the usage of off-campus recreational resources as students, employees and their dependents relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. However, this increase would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also generate a nominal increase in the usage of off-campus recreational resources, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at eight study intersections. Since further physical improvements to the affected intersections are not feasible, this impact would be significant and unavoidable even with incorporation of mitigation. Growth under the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also contribute to sub-standard intersection operations, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES. Since there would be fewer students and employees commuting to the campus, this alternative would generate approximately 849 AM peak-hour trips and 1,408 PM peak-hour trips. The net new trips generated by this alternative constitute about 60 percent of the net new trips generated by campus growth under the proposed Master Plan. Therefore, the alternative would reduce the overall traffic impact of the proposed project. However, given that existing levels of service at several study intersections are presently unacceptable, this alternative would substantially lessen, but not avoid, the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts associated with the proposed project.

Utilities – Water

The proposed project would increase the water demand within the City of Hayward to accommodate growth to an enrollment capacity of 18,000 FTES. However, because the City's UWMP states that cutbacks would be required in multiple-dry years and water demand associated with the proposed Master Plan was not included in its demand projections, this is considered a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase water consumption as the campus grows, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES, but not to a less than significant level and mitigation would still be required.

Utilities – Wastewater

Sufficient capacity currently exists to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project at Master Plan buildout and to accommodate increased wastewater volumes as the Master Plan is implemented. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater service would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase wastewater generation as the campus grows, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Utilities – Solid Waste

Impacts related to the increase in solid waste generation as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant provided that waste diversion goals are met. Assuming comparable waste diversion goals are met, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would result in lower solid waste generation due to the reduced enrollment capacity and smaller quantity of demolition debris. Therefore, this alternative would further reduce the proposed project's less than significant solid waste impacts.

Utilities – Electricity and Natural Gas

Impacts related to the increase in electricity and natural gas consumption as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of required infrastructure improvements and energy conservation goals. Assuming the required infrastructure improvements are developed and comparable energy conservation goals are met, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would result in lower energy consumption due to the reduced enrollment capacity. Therefore, this alternative would reduce energy impacts.

Conclusion and Relationship to Project Objectives

The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, traffic, and public utilities. Impacts related to cultural resources and geology and soils would be comparable to those of the proposed project.

By reducing enrollment capacity and not developing faculty and staff housing on campus, this alternative would not achieve the following key objectives to the same extent as the proposed project:

- Enhance the campus learning environment within a walkable campus core by providing adequate sites for planned and future programs and to accommodate growth in campus enrollment up to the CPEC-approved Master Plan ceiling of 18,000 FTES.

- Identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.

5.5.3 Alternative 3: No Project

Description and Analysis

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require the analysis of a No Project Alternative.⁴ This analysis must discuss existing conditions, 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, site zoning, and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Master Plan would not be implemented. The Hayward campus would not grow beyond the capacity of its existing facilities or those which have been approved for construction or are currently under construction. This alternative therefore includes buildout of the Pioneer Heights III student housing complex, which is currently under construction, and a recreation and wellness center that has been approved but not yet built. Based on current and pending campus facilities, enrollment capacity and the corresponding campus employment under this alternative would be approximately 12,586 FTES (17,600 headcount), 740 FTE Faculty (1,070 headcount), and 1,085 FTE staff (1,185 headcount).

Aesthetics

Since the proposed Master Plan would not be implemented under the No Project alternative, the campus would remain in its current condition, except for the completion of currently approved facilities, for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the visual character of the campus, including its overall configuration, architectural styles and landscaping, would not be substantially altered. In contrast, under the proposed project, impacts to panoramic views of San Francisco Bay and the City of Hayward from vantage points along Grandview Avenue were determined to be potentially significant due to the development of faculty and staff housing along Grandview Avenue. With implementation of mitigation, impacts would be reduced to a less than significant level. Unlike the proposed project, the No Project alternative would not include construction of any additional housing on the campus. For this reason, impacts to views from vantage points along Grandview Avenue would be avoided.

⁴ Ibid, Section 15125.6(e).

Air Quality

Construction of the Campus Master Plan would generate criteria pollutants and fugitive dust, which with mitigation, would not adversely affect local air quality in the vicinity of the construction site. Growth under the No Project alternative would also contribute criteria pollutants and fugitive dust, but the impact would be less because only one more building included in the existing Master Plan would be constructed.

Buildout of the Campus Master Plan would also add mobile, stationary, and area sources to the project area that would result in long-term increases in criteria pollutants emissions. The Campus Master Plan would implement strategies to reduce air emissions that would reduce this impact. The No Project alternative would also contribute to increased criteria pollutant emissions from traffic, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES. It should also be noted that since no faculty and staff housing would be constructed under this alternative, all future faculty, and staff would be required to commute to campus. While this could increase the number of trips generated by campus employees, the reduction in student trip generation due to the lower enrollment capacity compared to the proposed Master Plan would decrease overall emissions of criteria pollutant emissions related to traffic.

While the campus would continue the use of boilers and other stationary sources of air emissions under the No Project alternative, a central plant would not be constructed. Therefore, the impact of criteria pollutants from stationary sources would be reduced under the No Project alternative.

Biological Resources

No development, other than construction of presently approved projects, would occur on the campus under the No Project alternative. Therefore, no impacts to the grassland and mixed scrub areas that generally border the presently developed portions of the campus and potentially support special-status plant, bird, and bat species would occur. Furthermore, no impacts to the drainage and associated bay woodland in the far western portion of the CSUEB property would occur.

Cultural Resources

Campus buildings that will be at least 50 years old by 2030 are conservatively considered to represent historic resources as defined by CEQA. Where avoidance or preservation of a building is not possible, Master Plan implementation is assumed to have a potentially significant impact on historic resources. The No Project alternative would maintain existing campus structures, thereby avoiding this potential impact.

The potential impact to archaeological resources from ground-disturbing activities would be much reduced as limited ground disturbance would occur under this alternative.

Geology and Soils

With implementation of mitigation, development under the proposed Master Plan would not expose people and structures on campus to significant adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-related ground failure, soil erosion, or expansive soils. The same geologic conditions and mitigation would apply to the limited construction occurring under the No Project alternative. Therefore, impacts related to geology and soils would be reduced.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

Potential hazards associated with implementation of the proposed Master Plan include exposure to contaminated soil, groundwater, or building materials during demolition and construction activities. Mitigation would reduce these impacts to a less than significant level. Under the No Project alternative, construction of currently approved facilities on campus would still occur. However, the magnitude and duration of construction would be substantially reduced if the proposed Master Plan is not implemented. Therefore, impacts related to the potential exposure to contaminated substances during construction would be reduced.

Hydrology and Water Quality

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase impervious surfaces on campus, but would also reduce the present volume of stormwater runoff generated on the campus through the strategic placement of vegetation to collect, store and purify stormwater. Compliance with NPDES requirements and campus stormwater management policies would result in less than significant impacts to water quality. The No Project alternative would maintain the existing coverage of pervious surfaces on campus, but would not implement the storm drain plan and strategy proposed by the Master Plan to reduce the volume of stormwater entering the existing storm drain system. Therefore under the No Project alternative, the potential for impacts to water quality and the receiving storm drain system would be greater.

Land Use and Planning

The proposed Master Plan would generally be consistent with local land use plans. Development of faculty/staff housing at the site off of Hayward Boulevard across from the University Theatre, and along Grandview Avenue would be designed to minimize impacts to the existing adjacent neighborhoods and

additional environmental review would be conducted to evaluate potentially significant environmental impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, no development would occur at these housing sites. Therefore, this alternative would further reduce the less-than-significant land use impact.

Noise

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would increase traffic noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors located along surrounding roadways, although the impact would not be significant. Growth under the No Project Alternative would also contribute to increased traffic noise levels, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES. It should also be noted that since no faculty and staff housing would be constructed under this alternative, all future faculty, and staff would be required to commute to campus. While this could increase the number of trips generated by University employees, the reduction in student trip generation due to the lower enrollment capacity would decrease overall traffic noise impacts.

The proposed project's construction noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors would be significant. Mitigation restricting construction hours would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, since this alternative would not include construction of faculty and staff housing or any other use at this location, construction noise impacts to nearby residences would be substantially reduced.

Population and Housing

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the population in the City of Hayward. However, based on ABAG growth projections, the impact would be less than significant. The No Project alternative would permit growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES as proposed by the Master Plan. Accordingly, less housing would be required. Therefore, this alternative would reduce the population and housing impacts of the proposed project.

Public Services – Fire Protection

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for fire protection services, but would result in a less than significant impact. The No Project alternative would also increase the demand for fire protection services as enrollment increases, but would substantially lessen the less than significant impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES.

Public Services – Law Enforcement

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for law enforcement services. Since the Hayward Police Department and the campus police department would collaborate to maintain adequate service on and around the campus, impacts would be less than significant. The No Project alternative would also increase the demand for law enforcement services as enrollment increases, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Public Services – Schools

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would indirectly increase enrollment at Hayward area schools as dependents of students, faculty, and staff relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. The No Project alternative would also increase enrollment at Hayward schools as enrollment and campus employment increases, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES and by not building any faculty/staff housing on the campus.

Public Services – Parks and Recreation Services

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would generate a nominal increase in the usage of off-campus recreational resources as students, employees and their dependents relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. However, this increase would be less than significant. The No Project alternative would also generate a nominal increase in the usage of off-campus recreational resources, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Traffic, Circulation, and Parking

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at eight study intersections. Since further physical improvements to the affected intersections are not feasible, this impact would be significant and unavoidable even with incorporation of mitigation. Growth under the No Project alternative would also contribute to sub-standard intersection operations, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES. It should also be noted that since no faculty and staff housing would be constructed under this alternative, all future faculty, and staff would be required to commute to campus. The No Project alternative would therefore reduce the number of trips during the peak hour to 743 net new AM peak-hour trips and 1,175 net new PM peak-hour trips, substantially less

than trips generated by the proposed project. However, given that existing levels of service at several study intersections are presently unacceptable, this alternative would substantially lessen, but not avoid, the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts associated with the proposed project.

Utilities – Water

The proposed project would increase the water demand within the City of Hayward to accommodate growth to an enrollment capacity of 18,000 FTES. However, because the City's UWMP states that cutbacks would be required in multiple-dry years and water demand associated with the proposed Master Plan was not included in its demand projections, this is considered a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The No Project alternative would also increase water consumption as the campus grows, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES, but not to a less than significant level, and mitigation would still be required.

Utilities – Wastewater

Sufficient capacity currently exists to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project at Master Plan buildout, and to accommodate increased wastewater volumes as the Master Plan is implemented. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater service would be less than significant. The No Project alternative would also increase wastewater generation as the campus grows, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Utilities – Solid Waste

Impacts related to the increase in solid waste generation as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant provided that waste diversion goals are met. Assuming comparable waste diversion goals are met, the No Project alternative would result in lower solid waste generation due to the reduced enrollment capacity and smaller quantity of demolition debris. Therefore, this alternative would reduce solid waste impacts.

Utilities – Electricity and Natural Gas

Impacts related to the increase in electricity and natural gas consumption as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of required infrastructure improvements and energy conservation goals. Under the No Project alternative, the campus would not implement the Master Plan strategies for energy independence as well as the goal of overall carbon neutrality by 2030.

Therefore, although due to a lower increase in enrollment, the increase in total campus energy use would be lower than under the proposed project, however the per capita energy consumption would likely be higher and the No Project alternative could potentially result in energy impacts that are comparable or greater than those of the proposed Master Plan.

5.5.3.2 Conclusion and Relationship to Project Objectives

The No Project alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, traffic, and all public utilities except energy. Impacts related to energy use, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils would be comparable to or greater than those of the proposed project.

By not implementing the proposed Master Plan, this alternative would not achieve the following objectives:

- Enhance the campus learning environment within a walkable campus core by providing adequate sites for planned and future programs and to accommodate growth in campus enrollment up to the CPEC-approved Master Plan ceiling of 18,000 FTES.
- Create supportive student neighborhoods that would help create a sense of community for both residents and commuting students, and increase on-campus housing to accommodate 5,000 students. In addition, identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.
- Plan for other design improvements, including improved campus entry and image to help orient visitors and make destination finding easier; special landmark building sites to create a memorable impression of the campus; and improved campus pedestrian promenades
- Implement comprehensive environmentally sustainable development and operations strategies, including land use and transportation, as well as resource consumption and waste generation.
- Continue the planning and design criteria from the original campus master plan that aim at preserving views of the bay and the hills; creating a clear design vocabulary; and protecting the users from the elements.

5.7 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The findings of the alternatives impact analysis discussed above are summarized in **Table 5.0-1, Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Master Plan**. Of the alternatives analyzed in this document, the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, as it would avoid all impacts related to the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the objectives of the proposed project.

**Table 5.0-1
Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Master Plan**

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact (After Mitigation)	Alt. 1 – Reduced Faculty/ Staff Housing	Alt. 2 – Reduced Enrollment Capacity	Alt. 3 – No Project
AESTHETICS	Potentially significant (Less than significant)	Less	Less	Less
AIR QUALITY - OPERATIONAL EMISSIONS	Significant (Significant and unavoidable)	Similar	Less (still Significant and unavoidable)	Less (still significant and unavoidable)
AIR QUALITY - CONSTRUCTION	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
CULTURAL RESOURCES	Significant (Significant and unavoidable)	Similar	Similar	Less
GEOLOGY AND SOILS	Less than significant	Similar	Similar	Less
HAZARDS/HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY	Less than significant	Less	Less	Greater (Potentially significant)
LAND USE AND PLANNING	Less than significant	Less	Less	Less
NOISE	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
POPULATION AND HOUSING	Less than significant	Greater	Less	Less
PUBLIC SERVICES - FIRE PROTECTION	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
PUBLIC SERVICES – POLICE PROTECTION	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
PUBLIC SERVICES - SCHOOLS	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
PUBLIC SERVICES - PARKS AND RECREATION	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC	Significant (Significant and unavoidable)	Similar	Less (still significant and unavoidable)	Less (still significant and unavoidable)

Environmental Issue Area	Proposed Project Impact (After Mitigation)	Alt. 1 – Reduced Faculty/ Staff Housing	Alt. 2 – Reduced Enrollment Capacity	Alt. 3 – No Project
UTILITIES - WATER	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
UTILITIES - WASTEWATER	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
UTILITIES - SOLID WASTE	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
UTILITIES – ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Greater

The *State CEQA Guidelines* require that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the selected alternatives (excluding the No Project alternative).⁵ If the No Project Alternative is determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, an environmentally superior alternative must also be identified among the remaining alternatives.

The environmentally superior alternative would be the Reduced Enrollment alternative. This alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, traffic, and public utilities. Impacts related to cultural resources and geology and soils would be comparable to those of the proposed project.

By reducing enrollment capacity and not developing faculty and staff housing on campus, this alternative would not achieve the following key objectives to the same extent as the proposed project:

- Enhance the campus learning environment within a walkable campus core by providing adequate sites for planned and future programs and to accommodate growth in campus enrollment up to the CPEC-approved Master Plan ceiling of 18,000 FTES.
- Identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.

⁵ California Public Resources Code, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, *California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines*, Section 15125.6(e)(2).