6.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Sections 15126 and 15128 of the *2008 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines* states that an EIR must include a discussion of the following topics:

- Significant environmental effects which cannot be avoided if the proposed project is implemented
- Significant irreversible environmental changes
- Growth-inducing impacts of the proposed project
- A brief statement of the reasons why certain possible effects of a project have been determined not to be significant and therefore, are not evaluated in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR)

The following sections address each of these types of impacts based on the analyses included in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**.

6.2 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE EFFECTS

This section identifies significant impacts associated with implementation of the Hayward Campus Master Plan project that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level. As part of the certification process, the Board of Trustees of the California State University will make a final decision as to the significance of impacts and the feasibility of mitigation measures in this EIR. As detailed in **Section 4.0**, implementation of the Hayward Campus Master Plan project would result in the following significant impacts that could not be mitigated to a less than significant level:

MP Impact AIR-2: **Campus development under the proposed Master Plan would generate long-term operational emissions of criteria pollutants that would exceed the BAAQMD thresholds and could therefore conflict or obstruct with implementation of the regional air quality plan.**

MP Impact AIR-6: **The Proposed Project would result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of criteria pollutants for which the project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.**

MP Impact CULT-2: **Implementation of the proposed Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical building or structure, as a result of alteration, removal, or demolition of the building, or alteration of the site associated with project development.**

MP Impact TRANS-1: **Full buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan, with and without the Third Entrance, will contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at eight study intersections, in either the AM peak hour or PM peak hour, or both peak hours.**

MP Impact TRANS-5: **Campus development under the proposed Master Plan will substantially increase volumes on several segments of the CMP or MTS networks.**

6.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* states that an EIR must include a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused by a proposed project. Generally, a project would result in significant irreversible environmental changes if

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

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would continue to commit the Hayward campus to institutional uses, thereby ruling out other land uses during operation of the campus. The California State University System's ownership of the campus represents a long-term commitment of campus lands to an institutional use. Restoration of the campus to pre-developed conditions is not feasible given the levels of disturbance and capital investment.

Resources that would be permanently and continually consumed by project implementation include water, natural gas, and fossil fuels; however, the consumption of these resources would not represent unnecessary, inefficient, or wasteful use of resources. However, construction activities related to the proposed Master Plan would result in the irretrievable commitment of nonrenewable energy resources,

primarily in the form of fossil fuels (including fuel oil, natural gas, and gasoline) for automobiles and construction equipment.

The proposed Master Plan includes a chapter called the Sustainable Campus Framework. The purpose of the Sustainable Campus Framework section of the Master Plan is to present an overview of the University's vision for sustainability at CSUEB utilizing a comprehensive approach which addresses the full range of focus areas. The focus areas included in the Sustainable Campus Framework include land use and site development, landscape, energy, carbon, transportation, water and wastewater, solid waste, and materials.

The Hayward campus has instituted several water conservation measures. These include the installation of low-flow fixtures in new buildings to minimize water consumption and a program to retrofit fixtures in existing buildings. The Hayward campus is also studying the feasibility of a recycled water system. The proposed Master Plan outlines strategies to minimize campus water consumption including water efficient landscaping, fixture retrofits, efficient fixtures in new buildings, and building cooling efficiency.

The campus has also instituted lighting and other energy conservation measures and has been replacing in-building lighting systems with up-to-date energy-saving equipment. The Hayward campus has a 1-megawatt (MW) photovoltaic system, which is one of the largest photovoltaic installations in northern California, and is in the final stages of procuring a multi-resource fuel cell installation. In addition, the Campus would continue to construct new facilities under the proposed Master Plan in accordance with specifications contained in Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations (CCR), and with the California State University (CSU) Green Building Standards.

In addition to the measures included in the proposed Master Plan, the Hayward campus would comply with all applicable building codes, campus conservation features, and would ensure that all natural resources, including water, are conserved to the maximum extent feasible. It is also possible that new technologies or systems will emerge, or will become more cost-effective or user-friendly, to further reduce the campus' reliance upon nonrenewable energy resources. Overall, the consumption of natural resources would increase at a lesser rate than the projected population increase due to the variety of energy and water conservation measures that the Campus has implemented and would continue to implement.

The *State CEQA Guidelines* also require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by an accident associated with the project. While the Campus uses, transports, stores, and disposes of hazardous wastes, as described in **Section 4.6, Hazards and Hazardous Materials**, the campus complies with all applicable state and federal laws and existing campus programs, practices, and

procedures related to hazardous materials, which reduces the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible environmental damage. In the history of the campus, there have been no accidents resulting in irreversible environmental damage, indicating that current practices with respect to hazardous materials handling are adequate, and thus the potential for the proposed Master Plan to cause irreversible environmental damage from an accident or upset of hazardous materials, is considered low.

6.3 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

This section evaluates the potential for growth inducement as a result of implementation of the proposed Master Plan. Section 15126.2(d) of the *State CEQA Guidelines* requires that an EIR include a discussion of the potential for a proposed project to foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

The *State CEQA Guidelines* do not provide specific criteria for evaluating growth inducement and state that it must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. Growth inducement is generally not quantified, but is instead evaluated as either occurring, or not occurring, with implementation of a project. The identification of growth-inducing impacts is generally informational, and mitigation of growth inducement is not required by CEQA. It should be noted that the *State CEQA Guidelines* require that an EIR "discuss the ways" a project could be growth inducing and "discuss the characteristics of some projects that may encourage…activities that could significantly affect the environment." However, the *State CEQA Guidelines* do not require that an EIR predict or speculate specifically where such growth would occur, in what form it would occur, or when it would occur.

6.3.1 Overview of Growth Inducing Impacts

Potential growth inducing impacts of the proposed Master Plan are evaluated with respect to a study area that includes the City of Hayward, Alameda County, and the nine-county Bay Area. This area is within a reasonable commuting distance of the campus. Under the proposed Master Plan, 3,700 new student beds would be provided on campus and a maximum of 220 faculty housing units may be constructed. Proposed on-campus housing would increase the resident population on the Hayward campus by a maximum of 3,700 students, 220 faculty and staff, and their dependents (headcount). When considering the resident and nonresident population increase resulting from the proposed increase in the student, faculty, and staff populations on the Hayward campus, the Master Plan would result in a population increase of 14,583 persons. Because a substantial number of Hayward campus students would already be living in the Bay Area at the time of their enrollment and only a small number would relocate to the area and because a substantial amount of on-campus housing is planned under the proposed

Master Plan, based on **Table 4.10-3** (in **Section 4.10, Population and Housing**), practically no new students would be added to the population of the City of Hayward or other Bay Area communities. Of the additional faculty and staff, approximately 220 employee households would live on campus and about 134 employee households would be added to Hayward. Overall, the indirect population increase in the City of Hayward would be about 402 persons (134 employees plus their dependents). In the rest of Alameda County, the proposed Master Plan would increase the population by about 1,209 persons.

The remainder of the CSUEB Hayward-related population that will live outside of Alameda County would likely be distributed among a large number of communities, and therefore would not be expected to substantially affect those communities.

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

- It would directly increase the study area population by providing facilities so that campus student population would increase from approximately 8,758 Full Time Equivalent students (FTES) in 2007 to approximately 18,000 FTES by 2030. In terms of headcount, the increase would be of approximately 12,910 students. It would also cause employment on the campus to increase from about 1,585 to about 3,258 (headcount) by 2030.

- The proposed Master Plan would also indirectly increase employment and population in the region through the expenditures made by the campus and by students, faculty, and staff which could create or support additional jobs.

6.3.2 Direct Population and Employment Growth

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the total CSUEB Hayward campus population (not including dependents of new students, faculty, and staff) from a total of 13,809 in 2007 to an estimated 28,392 by 2030. This increase of about 14,583 persons would consist of about 12,910 students and 1,673 faculty and staff.

Historically, the majority of new CSUEB Hayward students already lived in the Bay Area region at the time of their enrollment at CSUEB Hayward. Therefore, this Draft EIR assumes that about 16.5 percent of all the additional students (or about 2,130 students) would relocate in order to attend CSUEB Hayward and would therefore be "new" to the study area. This Draft EIR also assumes that all of the faculty would be new to the study area, as the majority of faculty is likely to be recruited from outside the area. Although staff positions are typically filled by persons already living in the Bay Area, conservatively this Draft EIR assumes that 30 percent of additional staff will also be "new" to the study area. Based on these assumptions, approximately 3,177 CSUEB Hayward affiliates would be "new" to the study area and therefore would seek housing in the study area.

As discussed in **Section 4.10, Population and Housing**, because more than adequate on-campus housing is proposed under the Master Plan to adequately handle the increase in student population, the additional students at the campus would not result in a demand for off-campus housing. With respect to housing needed for the new faculty and staff, the housing demand in Hayward and Alameda County associated with new CSUEB Hayward affiliates is expected to be within the projected supply. Similarly, housing demand in the Bay Area region associated with new CSUEB Hayward affiliates would also be well within the projected supply. Therefore, there would be no substantial shift in demand to more distant communities outside the Bay Area region, nor would the project stimulate additional new housing beyond what is already projected.

To minimize the environmental effects of new housing construction and other urban development, the General Plans of the affected jurisdictions contain policies to control urban encroachment, especially on agricultural lands and sensitive habitats. Furthermore, the environmental review process of each affected jurisdiction is designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects of specific development projects as they are proposed. However some significant and unavoidable impacts, especially related to traffic and habitat conversion, would be expected. By contributing to the regional demand for new housing and urban amenities, the Hayward campus would also contribute to these environmental impacts, as they are created by overall growth in regional housing and other urban amenities. However, the contribution by the Hayward campus would not be considerable.

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

6.3.3 Indirect Employment Growth

Employment growth resulting from new or expanded businesses in the area in response to the increased demand for goods and services would also contribute to regional changes in population. Therefore, apart from the direct jobs on the campus, the operation of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would result in the creation of new indirect and induced jobs. Indirect jobs are those that are created or supported when the campus purchases goods and services from businesses in the region, and induced jobs are created or supported when wage incomes of those employed in direct and indirect jobs or students are spent on the purchase of goods and services in the region.

Based on a number of studies prepared for other campuses in the CSU system, campus growth under the proposed Master Plan could result in about 1.3 to 1.8 indirect and induced jobs in the study region for every one job at the CSUEB Hayward campus (CSUS 2003; CSUF 2006; CSULB 2007; SFSU 2008). Given the urban/suburban environment of Hayward and the greater Bay Area region, most of the spending by the Campus and CSUEB Hayward affiliates would be captured within the study area and therefore the higher multiplier (1.8 indirect and induced jobs for every direct job) would be appropriate for CSUEB Hayward.

Based on a multiplier of 1.8 indirect/induced jobs for every new direct job on the campus, it is estimated that about 3,010 indirect and induced jobs would be created or supported in the City of Hayward and the Bay Area. It is expected that most of these indirect and induced jobs would be created in the food, entertainment, and service sectors within the City of Hayward and other Bay Area communities.

It is also expected that campus-related indirect and induced employment growth would result in some commercial development on lands that are underutilized, especially in those parts of Hayward that are near the campus. If and when specific commercial development projects are proposed, they will be subject to environmental review.

6.3.4 Indirect Population Growth

The indirect and induced employment that would result from the implementation of the proposed Master Plan could theoretically result in additional population growth if individuals move into the study area to fill these jobs. However, an increase of non-local population into Hayward and the Bay Area region is not expected to result from the estimated 3,010 indirect and induced jobs. Hayward and the Bay Area region have a large number of employed residents who presently commute for work. It is anticipated that some of these persons would stop commuting and would take up the new indirect and induced locally available jobs related to campus growth. In addition, there should be a pool of local labor available to fill these jobs, given current unemployment rates. Furthermore, most of the anticipated indirect and induced jobs would be in the retail and services sectors and would not require special skills, and therefore could be filled by students or by dependents/spouses of persons who move to the area to fill jobs on the campus. Therefore the indirect and induced jobs are not expected to result in substantial population growth in Hayward or other Bay Area communities.

6.4 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

This section describes other resource topics, including agricultural resources and mineral resources that would either not be affected by implementation of the proposed Master Plan or that the impacts would

be less than significant. Any issues not addressed in this section are evaluated in detail in **Section 4.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, of this EIR.

6.4.1 Agricultural Resources

Would the project

- convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?
- conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?
- Involve other changes in the existing environment, which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use?

The Hayward campus is developed with buildings, paved areas, or landscaped open space and is surrounded by suburban uses and open space. No farmland or agricultural activities are present in the vicinity of the campus. Therefore, implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not result in conversion of farmland—including Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance—to non-agricultural uses.

The campus is currently designated for academic uses by the City of Hayward and is surrounded by urban/suburban development and open space. No impacts related to possible conflicts with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract would occur.

As no farmland, agricultural land, or related uses are found in the area or on the campus, implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

6.4.2 Mineral Resources

Would the project

- result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of future value to the region and the residents of the state?
- result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan, or other land use plan?

According to the City of Hayward General Plan, the campus is not located within a regionally significant aggregate resources zone. In addition, implementation of the proposed Master Plan would not result in

any substantial loss of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region or state because the campus area is not available for extraction of mineral resources. Further development of the campus would not result in the additional loss of important mineral resource recovery. Therefore, no impact would occur.

6.5 REFERENCES

California State University, Fresno. 2006. *The Economic Impact of California State University, Fresno on the San Joaquin Valley's Economy*. Prepared by Department of Economics, California State University, Fresno.

California State University, Long Beach. 2005. *CSULB Economic Impact Report 2005*. http://csulb.edu/colleges/cba/alumni_development/economic_impact.htm

California State University, Sacramento. 2003. *Impacts of California State University, Sacramento on the Sacramento Region*. Prepared by Sacramento Regional Research Institute.

San Francisco State University. 2007. *SFSU Campus Master Plan EIR*. Prepared by URS Corporation.