

CHAPTER 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The California State University (CSU) has prepared this Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) to inform the community, responsible agencies, trustee agencies, and other interested agencies and organizations, of the potential significant environmental effects resulting from implementation of the proposed California State University Monterey Bay (CSUMB) Master Plan (Project).¹ The Project provides a guide for the physical development of the campus. This Executive Summary lists the potentially significant environmental impacts and feasible mitigation measures or project alternatives that would avoid or substantially reduce those impacts. It also provides a brief description of the Master Plan background, Project overview, Project impact summary, alternatives to the Project and areas of controversy known to CSUMB. This Draft EIR was prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Cal. Pub. Resources Code § 21000-21189.3) and the CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15000 *et seq.*).

1.2 MASTER PLAN BACKGROUND

CSUMB is one of 23 campuses in the CSU system and is located on the former Fort Ord military base. Through the base conversion process, the Economic Development Conveyance (EDC) process, and Public Benefit Conveyance (PBC) process, CSU received approval in May 1994 for the conveyance of property at Fort Ord to establish the new CSUMB campus. The Fort Ord base was officially closed in 1994 based on the recommendations of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Commission. Subsequently, the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) was created to oversee the planning, financing, and implementation of the reuse and recovery programs described in the 1997 Fort Ord Base Reuse Plan (BRP). On June 30, 2020, FORA's legal mandate expired and the authority dissolved. The Fort Ord BRP identifies CSUMB and two other higher education institutions—the University of California Monterey Bay Education, Science, and Technology Center (UC MBEST) and Monterey Peninsula College, that also received Fort Ord property conveyances pursuant to the BRAC process—as catalysts for the economic revitalization of the region and integral to the community-building strategy for the base. The CSUMB campus opened in the fall of 1995.

¹ The Board of Trustees of the California State University is the State of California acting in its educational capacity and is responsible for the oversight of the California State University system, including the CSUMB campus. The Board has authority over curricular development, use of property, development of facilities, and fiscal and human resources management. As such, the Board of Trustees is the lead agency under CEQA and is responsible for review and certification of the EIR and for consideration of Project approval. CSUMB will act as point of contact for the CEQA process.

The 2007 Master Plan for the CSUMB campus authorized an on-campus traditional student enrollment of 8,500 full-time equivalent students (FTES) and 3,500 FTES non-traditional, primarily off-campus students² for a total of 12,000 FTES, with 1,833 FTE faculty and staff. This 2007 Master Plan was approved and the EIR certified by the Board of Trustees of the California State University (CSU Board of Trustees) in 2009.

In 2016, several projects were approved and resulted in revisions to the 2007 Master Plan. These revisions provided for: (1) the necessary changes to site the Monterey Bay Charter School off of Colonel Durham Street between Sixth and Seventh Avenues; (2) changes to the campus's boundaries along Eighth Street associated with the acquisition of parcels contiguous to the campus where the Promontory housing is located; and (3) the necessary changes to site the Student Union on an existing parking lot in the campus core and consolidate existing parking in a new lot located along 7th Avenue.

1.3 OVERVIEW OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

1.3.1 Project Location and Setting

The CSUMB campus is located north of the Monterey Peninsula and west of the Salinas Valley, approximately 1 mile inland from the Pacific Ocean and 100 miles south of San Francisco. The campus footprint covers approximately 1,396 acres and physically occupies portions of three separate governmental jurisdictional boundaries, including the City of Marina, the City of Seaside, and unincorporated Monterey County. As an entity of the State of California, the California State University (CSU), including CSUMB, is not subject to local governmental planning and zoning regulations.

The campus consists of three distinct areas: Main Campus, East Campus Housing, and East Campus Open Space (ECOS). The Main Campus consists of new and renovated campus buildings, paved parking areas and other paved areas from the former military base, and open space areas. The ECOS is a large, undeveloped natural open space area bordered by Eighth Avenue to the west, Inter-Garrison Road to the north, and the campus boundary to the south and east. The East Campus Housing area is located north of Inter-Garrison Road and consists of two residential subdivisions, Schoonover and Frederick Park. All university facilities, with the exception of the East Campus Housing, are located west on the Main Campus.

² Based on the definitions provided in the 2007 Master Plan EIR, “traditional” students are resident and commuting students who primarily take classes on-campus, whereas “non-traditional” students are those students whose primary contact with the campus is via distance learning (e.g., taking courses offered over the Internet) and/or with periodic short-term and intensive on-campus resident learning experiences.

1.3.2 Project Objectives

The underlying purpose of the Project is to support and advance the University’s educational mission, as defined by the California Education Code, by guiding the physical development of the campus to accommodate gradual student enrollment growth while preserving and enhancing the quality of campus life. To do so, the Project would authorize the physical development of the campus in a manner that would accommodate an on-campus enrollment of 12,700 full-time equivalent students (FTES). The following objectives of the Project have been established in support of its underlying purpose:

1. Support and advance the University’s educational mission by guiding the physical development of the campus to:
 - Accommodate gradual student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES;
 - Provide expanded access to higher education in response to the increasing higher education needs and demands of a growing statewide population; and
 - Develop into a comprehensive university campus that graduates students that can meet the needs of regional and statewide employers, while preserving and enhancing the quality of campus life.
2. Implement strategies to facilitate student academic success, academic excellence, institutional capacity, and regional stewardship.
3. Focus new building development on existing paved and developed infill sites on the Main Campus to provide compact and clustered development and make efficient use of campus land.
4. Provide and concentrate facilities for expansion of academic programs and administrative functions on the Main Campus, in or near the campus core to:
 - Create a compact campus core;
 - Provide synergies between existing and new educational and research programs;
 - Provide for a 10-minute walking distance from transportation hubs and between classroom buildings;
 - Facilitate use of shared resources among programs, such as classroom and lab space;
 - Facilitate faculty and student interaction; and
 - Promote an environment conducive to learning.
5. Provide on-campus housing for 60 percent of FTES and 65 percent of FTE faculty and staff to reduce vehicle trips to campus, meet other Master Plan Guideline’s sustainability priorities and objectives, and promote recruitment, retention and engagement of faculty and staff.

6. Provide a diversity of housing types to serve a broad range of student, faculty and staff housing needs.
7. Create a unique campus character through buildings, outdoor spaces, pathways, bikeways, and roadways that connect those spaces while also producing a sense of community on campus.
8. Provide emphasis on pedestrian access and alternative transportation and attain a modal shift from vehicles to more pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use by:
 - Establishing bicycle and pedestrian networks that provide safe, direct, and attractive connections to work and school;
 - Establishing restrictions to general vehicle travel through the campus core and locate vehicle circulation and parking on the campus periphery to provide for a walkable campus core; and
 - Providing other land development strategies (e.g., multimodal hubs) to support TDM (Transportation Demand Management), which is intended to reduce drive-alone travel modes and encourage greater use of transit, walking, and bicycle commuting and reduce dependence on automobiles.
9. Preserve and enhance natural open spaces and develop formal open spaces so they become integral to the character of the campus.
10. Integrate natural and formal open spaces into the framework for capital development. Organize the built environment around an open space network to integrate the natural and built environments and enhance outdoor learning, social interaction, recreation, and the overall campus ambiance.

1.3.3 Project Overview

The Project and the subject of this Draft EIR is the proposed CSUMB Master Plan, including Project Design Features (PDFs) drawn from the CSUMB Master Plan Guidelines (Master Plan Guidelines), including five “near-term” development components to be constructed pursuant to the proposed Master Plan within the next 10 years. The Project would provide a blueprint for land uses and building and facility space requirements to support an on-campus enrollment of 12,700 FTES and 1,776 FTE faculty and staff by the year 2035. Achieving this growth would result in an increase of approximately 6,066 FTES and 752 FTE faculty/staff over existing levels. The Project also would result in a net increase of approximately 2.6 million gross square feet (GSF) of new academic, administration, student life, athletic and recreational, and institutional partnership facilities, and housing. On-campus housing would be constructed sufficient to continue to accommodate 60 percent of FTES and existing housing would accommodate 65 percent of FTE faculty and staff, with a projected increase of 3,820 student beds and 757 converted residential units for faculty and staff. The Project also would accommodate

redevelopment and growth in outdoor athletics and recreation facilities to serve campus needs, with space set aside for additional athletic fields, tennis courts, and pools, as well as for replacement of the existing stadium, field house, and pool house.³

As part of the Project, numerous PDFs are included that address various topics including open space, transportation, water and wastewater systems, energy systems and greenhouse gas reduction, and design. For example, transportation PDFs will enhance and expand the campus's existing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program in order to further reduce vehicle trips and prioritize pedestrian and bicycle movement.

As noted previously, the Project includes specific development components identified in the proposed Master Plan and expected to be constructed in the next 10 years; these Project components are referred to throughout this EIR as “near-term development components.” These near-term development components include: Student Housing Phase III (600 student housing beds); Academic IV (95,000 GSF of classroom/instructional space); Student Recreation Center (70,000 GSF of recreation space); Student Housing Phase IIB (400 student housing beds); and Academic V (76,700 GSF of classroom/instructional space). A full description of the Project is provided in Chapter 3, Project Description.

Portions of the campus not currently proposed for development under this Project could be the subject of future development proposals. Such development proposals could be institutional partnerships or campus projects. Separate environmental review under CEQA would be pursued if and when such development proposals are pursued.

1.4 ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROJECT

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6 requires that an EIR describe and evaluate alternatives to the proposed project that feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. The following alternatives are evaluated in Chapter 6, Alternatives. A two-step process was used to conduct the alternatives analysis in this Draft EIR. First, potential alternatives were examined for their feasibility and ability to meet most of the Project objectives. Those that clearly were found to be infeasible were rejected without further environmental review. Alternatives that may be feasible and that would attain at least some of the basic Project objectives were carried forward and analyzed with regard to whether they would reduce or avoid any significant impacts of the Project. Chapter 6 evaluates three alternatives to the Project:

³ The Freeman Stadium Facilities Renovation Project, approved by the CSU Board of Trustees in September 2021, was the subject of separate CEQA review and will implement renovations to the stadium in the interim, prior to replacement contemplated by the proposed Master Plan.

- **Alternative 1: No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan** – This alternative assumes the continued implementation of the 2007 Master Plan. Planned growth as anticipated in the 2007 Master Plan would continue up to its planned capacity (8,500 FTES enrollment on campus), which would allow for limited development of academic facilities.
- **Alternative 2: Reduced Enrollment Alternative** – This alternative would involve reduced enrollment growth on the campus, to a maximum of 10,500 FTES enrollment and an associated reduction in new building space and housing, as compared to the Project, which provides for 12,700 FTES.
- **Alternative 3: Expanded Housing Growth Alternative** – This alternative would maintain the same proposed student enrollment growth, to a maximum of 12,700 FTES as proposed under the Project; however, additional student beds would be provided on campus to house approximately 70 percent of students on campus, in comparison to 60 percent of students under the Project. The net increase in building space also increases under this alternative to accommodate the additional housing.

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[a]) requires that an EIR’s analysis of alternatives identify the “environmentally superior alternative” among all of those considered. In addition, Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Furthermore, Public Resources Code Sections 21002 and 21081 require lead agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives in order to substantially lessen or avoid otherwise significant adverse environmental effects, unless specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other conditions make such mitigation measures or alternatives infeasible.

Alternative 2 (Reduced Enrollment Alternative) is the environmentally superior alternative, as it would reduce impacts in numerous impact categories, as well as reduce the significant and unavoidable operational noise impact at one off-campus location to less than significant. However, Alternative 2 does not fully meet the project objectives. In particular, while Alternative 2 would allow for an increase of approximately 3,900 FTES up to an increased enrollment cap of 10,500 FTES, it would not fully support the University’s educational mission to accommodate student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES. Such an increase in enrollment to 12,700 FTES would provide expanded access to higher education in response to the increasing higher education needs and demands of a growing statewide population and would allow CSUMB to develop into a comprehensive university campus that graduates students who can meet the needs of regional and statewide employers.

1.5 ISSUES TO BE RESOLVED

CEQA Guidelines Section 15123(b)(3) requires that an EIR identify issues to be resolved, including the choice among alternatives and whether or how to mitigate significant impacts. Regarding the Project, the major issues to be resolved include decisions by the CSU Board of Trustees as CEQA lead agency related to:

- Whether this EIR adequately describes the environmental impacts of the Project.
- Whether the benefits of the Project override environmental impacts, if any, that cannot be feasibly avoided or mitigated to a level of insignificance.
- Whether there are other mitigation measures that should be applied to the Project besides those mitigation measures identified in the EIR.
- Whether there are any alternatives to the Project that would substantially lessen any of the significant impacts of the Project and achieve most of the basic objectives.

1.6 AREAS OF KNOWN CONTROVERSY

The Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this Draft EIR was circulated for a 30-day comment period from May 12, 2017 to June 12, 2017. The NOP was circulated to the State Clearinghouse and to state, regional, and local agencies in accordance with the CEQA Guidelines. A public scoping meeting regarding the scope of the analysis for the Draft EIR was held on May 23, 2017. A total of eight comment letters were received on the NOP during the scoping period, including comments from six agencies and two individuals. A Revision to Previously Issued NOP was circulated for a 30-day comment period from August 12, 2019 through September 10, 2019, to notify agencies, organizations, and other interested parties that the methodology to be used in the Draft EIR in assessing potential transportation-related impacts had been modified from that indicated in the original NOP to reflect changes in the CEQA Guidelines. Two comment letters were received from two agencies on the Revision to Previously Issued NOP. For a complete list of public comments received during the public scoping periods refer to Appendix B.

The following is a discussion of issues that are likely to be of interest to agencies and interested members of the public during the environmental review process. Every concern applicable to the CEQA process is addressed in this Draft EIR, but this list is not necessarily exhaustive; rather, it attempts to capture concerns or issues that are likely to generate the greatest interest based on the input received during the scoping processes.

- **Biological Resources:** Protection of native oak woodland habitat on the CSUMB campus as part of contiguous areas of native oak woodland habitat on the former Fort Ord.
- **Cultural Resources:** Potential impacts related to the construction planned for under the Project.

- **Hydrology and Water Quality:** Incorporation of methods into the Project to reduce impacts of stormwater runoff (e.g., Low-Impact Development [LID] measures).
- **Public Services:** Potential impacts related to the need for new or physically altered fire protection, police protection, school, and parks and recreation facilities due to the increase in population under the proposed Master Plan.
- **Transportation:** Potential traffic impacts of the Project.⁴ Incorporation of the following into the Project: the provision of additional transit and shuttle services, increased bicycle and pedestrian access on campus and related incentives, minimizing motor vehicles in the inner campus, identification of proposed transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, determining intersection control type for intersections identified as “Campus Entry,” and design recommendations for transit and wayfinding.
- **Utilities and Energy:** Incorporation of sustainable water sources (e.g., water conservation programs, graywater treatment/recycling, stormwater reuse, low-flow water fixtures) into the Project. Identification of areas requiring extension of sanitary sewer trunk mains outside of areas currently served.

More comprehensive and detailed listings of issues raised during scoping are provided in the beginning of each section in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Comments received during the public scoping periods for the Project are included as Appendix B.

1.7 IMPACT AND MITIGATION MEASURES

This subsection provides a summary of the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Project. Table I-1 provides a complete list of the Project’s environmental impacts including the level of significance before and after mitigation, based on the analysis and conclusions presented in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. Most of the potentially significant impacts can be reduced to less than significant through incorporation of mitigation measures identified in Chapter 4.

The Project, however, would have a significant and unavoidable impact related due to Impact NOI-2. Given that there are no feasible mitigation measures that the University can implement to reduce roadway noise to less than significant at one off-campus location (ST-7), located at Sixth Avenue and Gigling Road, the Project roadway noise impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. However, as indicated in Impact NOI-4, the cumulative impact of the Project related to roadway noise is less than significant, as the Project’s contribution to the cumulative impact does not exceed the threshold. See Section 4.10, Noise and Vibration, for additional information about this impact.

⁴ Based on revisions to the CEQA Guidelines that resulted from SB 743, the metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts has changed from level of service (LOS) to vehicle miles travelled (VMT); thus, an assessment of traffic congestion based on the LOS metric is no longer the basis upon which significant impacts are identified under CEQA.

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Aesthetics			
Impact AES-1: Scenic Vistas. The Project would not have a substantial adverse impact on a scenic vista.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact AES-2: Visual Character or Quality. The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact AES-3: Light and Glare. The Project would not introduce a new source of substantial light and glare.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact AES-4: Cumulative Aesthetic Impacts. The Project and other cumulative development would not have significant cumulative impacts related to scenic vistas, visual quality and light and glare.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Air Quality			
Impact AIR-1: Conflict with an Applicable Air Quality Plan. The Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact AIR-2: Criteria Pollutant Emissions. The Project would result in emissions of criteria pollutants, but would not exceed adopted thresholds of significance, violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation. Therefore, the Project would	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
not result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of a criteria pollutant for which the Project region is in nonattainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard.			
Impact AIR-3: Exposure of Sensitive Receptors. The Project would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact AIR-4: Other Emissions Adversely Affecting a Substantial Number of People. The Project would not result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact AIR-5: Cumulative Air Quality Impacts. The Project would not result in a considerable contribution to a significant cumulative impact related to air quality.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Biological Resources			
Impact BIO-1: Special-Status Species. The Project could result in substantial adverse effects to special-status plant and wildlife species and their habitat.	Potentially Significant	MM-BIO-1a: Project-Specific Biological Assessments (HMP Species). The CSUMB CPD Department shall require that a biological survey of development sites be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if the development could potentially impact HMP species or potential habitat (HMP Species include: California tiger salamander, Smith's blue butterfly, Northern California legless lizard, Monterey ornate shrew, Monterey spineflower, sand gilia, sandmat manzanita, Hooker's manzanita, Toro manzanita, Monterey ceanothus, seaside bird's-beak, sand-loving wallflower, Eastwood's goldenbush and Yadori's piperia). A report describing the results of the surveys shall be provided to the CSUMB CPD Department prior to any ground disturbing activities. The report shall include, but not be limited to: 1) a description of the biological conditions at the site; 2) identification of the potential for HMP	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>species to occur or HMP species observed, if any; and 3) maps of the locations of HMP species or potential habitat, if observed.</p> <p>If HMP species that do not require take authorization from the USFWS or CDFW are identified within the development site, salvage efforts for these species shall be evaluated by a qualified biologist in coordination with CSUMB CPD Department to further reduce impacts per the requirements of the HMP and BO. Where salvage is determined feasible and proposed, seed collection should occur from plants within the development site and/or topsoil should be salvaged within occupied areas to be disturbed. Seeds shall be collected during the appropriate time of year for each species by qualified biologists. The collected seeds and topsoil shall be used to revegetate temporarily disturbed construction areas and reseeded and restoration efforts on- or off-site, as determined appropriate by the qualified biologist and CSUMB CPD Department. For impacts to the HMP species within the development site that do require take authorization from the USFWS and/or CDFW, the CSUMB CPD Department shall comply with ESA and CESA and obtain necessary permits prior to construction. If non-HMP special-status species are identified during the implementation of this measure, MM-BIO-1b shall also be implemented.</p> <p>MM-BIO-1b: Project-Specific Biological Assessments (Non-HMP Species). The CSUMB CPD Department shall require that a biological survey of development sites be conducted by a qualified biologist to determine if the development could potentially impact a special-status species or their habitat. A report describing the results of the surveys shall be provided to the CSUMB CPD Department prior to any ground disturbing activities. The report shall include, but not be limited to: 1) a description of the biological conditions at the site; 2) identification of the potential for special-status species to occur or special-status species observed, if any; 3) maps of the locations of special-status species or potential habitat, if observed; and 4) recommended mitigation measures, if applicable. If special-status species are determined not to occur at the development site, no additional mitigation is necessary.</p> <p>If special-status species are observed or determined to have the potential to occur, the project biologist shall recommend measures necessary to avoid, minimize, and/or</p>	

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>compensate for identified impacts. Measures shall include, but are not limited to, revisions to the project design and project modifications, pre-construction surveys, construction buffers, construction best management practices, monitoring, non-native species control, restoration and preservation, and salvage and relocation.</p> <p>MM-BIO1c: Pre-Construction Surveys for Protected Avian Species. Construction activities that may directly (e.g., vegetation removal) or indirectly (e.g., noise/ground disturbance) affect protected nesting avian species shall be timed to avoid the breeding and nesting season. Specifically, vegetation and/or tree removal can be scheduled after September 16 and before January 31. Alternatively, a qualified biologist shall be retained by the CSUMB CPD Department to conduct pre-construction surveys for nesting raptors and other protected avian species within 500 feet of proposed construction activities if construction occurs between February 1 and September 15. Pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than 14 days prior to the start of construction activities during the early part of the breeding season (February through April) and no more than 30 days prior to the initiation of these activities during the late part of the breeding season (May through August). Because some bird species nest early in spring and others nest later in summer, surveys for nesting birds may be required to continue during construction to address new arrivals, and because some species breed multiple times in a season. The necessity and timing of these continued surveys shall be determined by the qualified biologist based on review of the final construction plans and in coordination with the USFWS and CDFW, as needed for protected avian species nests.</p> <p>If raptors or other protected avian species nests are identified during the pre-construction surveys, the qualified biologist shall notify the CSUMB CPD Department and an appropriate no-disturbance buffer shall be imposed within which no construction activities or disturbance shall take place (generally 500 feet in all directions for raptors; other avian species may have species-specific requirements) until the young of the year have fledged and are no longer reliant upon the nest or parental care for survival, as determined by a qualified biologist.</p>	

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-BIO-1d: <u>Implement Open Space Protection Requirements.</u> For open space areas adjacent to proposed campus development, the following measures shall be implemented:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conduct an access assessment to identify necessary access controls. In some cases, structures including fences or other appropriate barriers may be required within the new development parcel to control access into the habitat areas. An assessment of access issues and necessary controls shall be completed as part of planning for the development and submitted to the CSUMB CPD Department for review and approval, prior to development. • Signs, interpretive displays, trailhead markers, or other information shall be installed and maintained at identified urban/wildland interface that illustrate the importance of the adjacent habitat area and prohibit trespass, motor vehicle entry, dumping of trash or yard wastes, pets off-leash, capture or harassment of wildlife, impacts to special-status species, and other unauthorized activities. • Incorporate non-native species control features into site design. Detention ponds or other water features associated with new development shall be sited as far from the urban/wildland interface as possible. Suitable barriers shall be located between these features and the habitat area boundary to prevent these features from becoming “sinks” for special-status wildlife species, as well as sources for invasive non-natives that could then move into the adjacent habitat area. • If detention ponds or other waterbodies must be located at the urban/wildland interface, a specific management program addressing control of non-native animals (e.g., bullfrogs) must be prepared and submitted for review and approval by the CSUMB CPD Department, prior to development. • Landscaping within the areas adjacent to open space areas shall consist of native or non-native plant species that shall not colonize reserve areas in the former Fort Ord outside the campus boundaries. Any landscaping or replanting required for the Project shall not use species listed as noxious by the CDFG. All landscape plans shall be reviewed by the CSUMB CPD Department. • Limit artificial lighting at the urban/wildland interface. Outdoor lighting associated with new development shall be low intensity, focused, and directional to preclude night 	

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>illumination of the adjacent habitat area. Outdoor lighting shall be placed as far from the urban/wildland interface as possible given safety constraints. Facilities such as ball parks and fields that require high intensity night lighting (i.e., flood lights) shall be sited as far from the urban/wildland interface as possible. High-intensity lighting facing the habitat areas shall be directional and as low to the ground as possible to minimize long distance glare.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and implement erosion control measures to prevent sediment transport into and within habitat areas. Erosion control measures shall be required where vegetation removal or soil disturbance occurs as a result of all facility construction and maintenance, including trail, road, or fuel break construction/maintenance, access controls, or stormwater management, consistent with existing stormwater management plans. Specific measures to be implemented shall be detailed in an erosion control plan. The erosion control plan shall include, at a minimum, the following measures. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Re-contour eroded areas. ○ Maintain and grade areas along the reserve perimeter and main roads as appropriate to avoid washouts. Gullies shall be repaired as needed. ○ Install drainage features such as outlet ditches, rolling dips (similar to waterbars), and berms as needed to facilitate the proper drainage of storm runoff. ○ Add soil amendments such as fertilizers and gypsum for designated development areas only. ○ Prevent sediments from entering basins or swales that could be used by HMP species during erosion control activities. ○ Design and conduct erosion control measures to minimize the footprint of the structures and repairs, and design structures to minimize potential impacts on CTS that may be moving between breeding and upland habitats. ○ Use weed-free mulch, weed-free rice, sterile barley straw, or other similar functioning product where needed for erosion control. Seed native plant species to stabilize soils disturbed by erosion control activities and prevent colonization by invasive weeds. Incorporate native plant species to the extent practicable. 	

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>MM-BIO-1e: Pre-Construction Bat Assessment and Surveys. To avoid and reduce impacts to Townsend’s big-eared bat, a qualified bat specialist or wildlife biologist shall conduct site surveys during the reproductive season (May 1 through September 15) to characterize bat utilization of the site and potential species present (techniques utilized to be determined by the biologist) prior to structure removal. Based on the results of these initial surveys, one or more of the following shall occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If it is determined that bats are not present at the site, no additional mitigation is required. • If it is determined that bats are utilizing the site and may be impacted by the development, pre-construction surveys shall be conducted no more than 30 days prior to any structure removal. If, according to the bat specialist, no bats or bat signs are observed in the course of the pre-construction surveys, structure removal may proceed. If bats and/or bat signs are observed during the pre-construction surveys, the biologist shall determine if disturbance will jeopardize the roost (i.e., maternity, day, or night). • If a single bat and/or only adult bats are roosting, removal of buildings may proceed after the bats have been safely excluded from the roost. Exclusion techniques shall be determined by the biologist and depend on the roost type; the biologist shall prepare a mitigation plan for provision of alternative habitat to be approved by the CDFW. • If an active maternity roost is detected, avoidance is preferred. Work in the vicinity of the roost (buffer to be determined by biologist) shall be postponed until the biologist monitoring the roost(s) determines that the young are no longer dependent on the roost. The monitor shall ensure that all bats have left the area of disturbance prior to initiation of structure removal. If avoidance is not possible and a maternity roost must be disrupted, a depredation permit would be required prior to removal of the roost. <p>MM-BIO-1f: Pre-Construction Monterey Dusky-Footed Woodrat Surveys. Not more than thirty (30) days prior to the start of construction (including vegetation removal), a qualified biologist shall conduct a survey of the development sites to locate existing Monterey dusky-footed woodrat nests. All Monterey dusky-footed woodrat nests shall be mapped and flagged for avoidance. Graphics depicting all Monterey dusky-footed woodrat nests shall be</p>	

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>provided to CSUMB and the construction contractor. Any Monterey dusky-footed woodrat nests that cannot be avoided shall be relocated according to the following procedures. Each active nest shall be disturbed by the qualified biologist to the degree that the woodrats leave the nest and seek refuge elsewhere. After the nests have been disturbed, the nest sticks shall be removed from the impact areas and placed outside of areas planned for impacts. Nests shall be dismantled during the non-breeding season (between October 1 and December 31), if possible. If a litter of young is found or suspected, nest material shall be replaced and the nest left alone for 2-3 weeks, after this time the nest shall be rechecked to verify that young are capable of independent survival before proceeding with nest dismantling.</p> <p>MM-BIO-1g: <u>Smith's Blue Butterfly Habitat Avoidance/ESA Compliance.</u> Smith's Blue Butterfly habitat (i.e., dune buckwheat) shall be avoided to the greatest extent feasible. Smith's Blue Butterfly habitat that will not be impacted by the Project shall be protected prior to and during construction to the maximum possible using exclusionary fencing and/or flagging. A biological monitor shall supervise the installation of protective fencing/flagging and monitor at least once per week until construction is complete to ensure that the protective fencing/flagging remains intact.</p> <p>If all Smith's Blue Butterfly habitat is avoided, no additional mitigation is necessary. If the Project will impact SBB habitat, CSUMB shall comply with the FESA and obtain necessary authorizations prior to construction due to the assumed presence of the federally listed SBB. CSUMB shall be required to initiate consultation with the USFWS to receive take authorization. Take authorization would be granted through the issuance of an individual, project-specific incidental take permit. Mitigation for take likely will require restoration at a 3:1 ratio of impacted habitat. Dune buckwheat plants and/or seed salvage may also be required prior to ground disturbing activities.</p>	
<p>Impact BIO-2: Riparian and Wetland Habitat. The Project could result in a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive community as identified in local or regional plans, policies, or</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-BIO-2: <u>Project-Specific Sensitive Natural Community Assessments.</u> The CSUMB CPD Department shall require that for any development that could potentially impact a sensitive natural community, a survey of the site by a qualified biologist shall be required. A report describing the results of the survey shall be provided to CSUMB prior to any ground-disturbing activities. The report shall include but shall not be limited to: 1) a description of</p>	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or on state or federally protected wetlands.		<p>the biological conditions at the site; 2) identification of the potential for sensitive habitats or sensitive habitats observed, if any; 3) maps of the locations of sensitive habitats or potential sensitive habitat, if observed; and 4) recommended avoidance and minimization measures, if applicable. If a potential state or federally protected wetland is newly identified to be present on the site, a formal wetland delineation shall be conducted in accordance with ACOE methodology.</p> <p>If a proposed development cannot avoid impacts to sensitive habitat areas, CSUMB shall require a compensatory habitat-based mitigation to reduce impacts. Compensatory mitigation must involve the preservation, restoration, or purchase of off-site mitigation credits for impacts to sensitive habitats. Mitigation must be conducted in-kind or within an approved mitigation bank in the region. The specific mitigation ratio for habitat-based mitigation shall be determined through consultation with the appropriate agency (i.e., CDFW, USFWS, or ACOE) on a project-by-project basis.</p> <p>Impacts to sensitive habitats, including but not limited to, vernal pools, streambeds, waterways, or riparian habitat, protected under FGC Section 1600 and Sections 401 and 404 of the Clean Water Act, require regulatory permitting to reduce impacts. Acquisition of permits and implementation of the approved mitigation strategy would ensure impacts are fully mitigated and “no net loss” of wetland habitat would occur.</p>	
Impact BIO-3: Wildlife Corridors. The Project would not result in interference with wildlife migration or corridors.	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant
Impact BIO-4: Biological Resource Policies and Ordinances. The Project would not conflict with local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, including tree preservation policies.	Less than Significant	No mitigation required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact BIO-5: Adopted Habitat Conservation Plans. The Project would not conflict with any adopted HCP, NCCP, or other approved conservation plan.	No Impact	Mitigation not required.	No Impact
Impact BIO-6: Cumulative Biological Resources Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts on special-status species, protected avian species and sensitive habitat, with the implementation of mitigation.	Less than Significant	No additional mitigation required beyond those mitigation measures identified for Impact BIO-1 and Impact BIO-2 (MM-BIO-1b through MM-BIO-1f, and MM-BIO-2).	Less than Significant
Cultural Resources and Tribal Cultural Resources			
Impact CUL-1: Archaeological Resources. The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of unique archaeological resources or historic resources of an archaeological nature.	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-CUL-1a: Sensitivity Training. CSUMB shall include a standard clause in every construction contract for the Project that requires cultural resource sensitivity training by a qualified archaeologist for workers prior to conducting earth disturbance in the vicinity of a documented cultural-resource-sensitive area, should one be identified in the future. Additionally, campus staff involved in earth-disturbing work in the vicinity of a documented resource sensitive area will also receive such training.</p> <p>MM-CUL-1b: Inadvertent Discovery Evaluation and Recordation. CSUMB shall include a standard inadvertent discovery clause in every construction contract for the Project, which requires that in the event that an archaeological resource is discovered during construction (whether or not an archaeologist is present), all soil-disturbing work within 100 feet of the find shall cease until a qualified archaeologist can evaluate the find and make a recommendation for how to proceed. For an archaeological resource that is encountered during construction, the campus shall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Retain a qualified archaeologist to determine whether the resource has potential to qualify as a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource as outlined in the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code § 21083.2). 	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the resource has potential to be a historical resource or a unique archaeological resource, the qualified archaeologist, in consultation with CSUMB, shall prepare a research design and archaeological evaluation plan to assess whether the resource should be considered significant under CEQA criteria. • If the resource is determined significant, CSUMB shall provide for preservation in place, if feasible. If preservation in place is not feasible, in consultation with CSUMB, a qualified archaeologist will prepare a data recovery plan for retrieving data that is specific to the site's geographic extent and the significance of any resources encountered. The data recovery plan shall be developed prior to site development and implemented prior to or during site development (with a 100-foot buffer around the resource). The archaeologist shall also perform appropriate technical analyses, prepare a full written report and file it with the Northwest Information Center, and provide for the permanent curation of recovered materials. <p>MM-CUL-1c: Construction Monitoring. A Native American and archaeological monitor shall be present for earth-disturbing work in native soils within 750 feet of a documented archaeological resource or tribal cultural resource, if such resources are discovered and documented in the future. Depth to native soils on specific project sites is typically identified in project-specific geotechnical investigations.</p>	
<p>Impact CUL-2: Disturbance of Human Remains. The Project could inadvertently disturb human remains.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-CUL-2: Proper Handling of Human Remains. Should human remains be discovered at any time, work will halt in that area and procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (§ 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (§ 7050.5) will be followed, beginning with notification to CSUMB and the County Coroner. If Native American remains are determined to be present, the County Coroner will contact the Native American Heritage Commission to designate a Most Likely Descendant, who will arrange for the dignified disposition and treatment of the remains. The Ohlone/Costanoan-Esselen Nation (OCEN) shall be notified of the discovery even if not assigned as Most Likely Descendant.</p>	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact CUL-3: Tribal Cultural Resources. The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.	Potentially Significant	MM-CUL-1a: See Impact CUL-1 for this mitigation measure MM-CUL-1b: See Impact CUL-1 for this mitigation measure. MM-CUL-1c: See Impact CUL-1 for this mitigation measure. MM-CUL-2: See Impact CUL-2 for this mitigation measure.	Less than Significant
Impact CUL-4: Cumulative Cultural Resource and Tribal Cultural Resource Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts to buried historical or archaeological resources, human remains, and tribal cultural resources, with the implementation of mitigation.	Less than Significant	No additional mitigation required beyond those mitigation measures identified for Impact CUL-1 through Impact CUL-3 above (MM-CUL1a-c and MM-CUL-2).	Less than Significant
Geology, Soils, and Paleontology			
Impact GEO-1: Seismic Hazards The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving strong seismic ground shaking and seismic-related ground failure.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-2: Landslides. The Project would not directly or indirectly cause potential adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving landslides	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact GEO-3: Soil Erosion. Project-related grading and construction would potentially result in soil erosion.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
<p>Impact GEO-4: Unstable Geologic Units or Soils. New Project construction would be located on dune sand, which could become unstable as a result of the Project and potentially result in collapse.</p>	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact GEO-5: Paleontological Resources. Project construction could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-GEO-1: <u>Monitoring, Discovery, and Treatment of Paleontological Resources.</u> Prior to the commencement of any grading activity, CSUMB shall retain a qualified paleontologist, as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, to determine when, where, and the duration of paleontological monitoring that is warranted. The qualified paleontologist shall make these determinations based on construction plans, geotechnical reports if available, and subsurface geological observations that indicate the likely depth to undisturbed native sands that possess high paleontological sensitivity. The level of monitoring may range from full-time, part-time (spot-check), or unnecessary based on the qualified paleontologist's review of plans and relevant documentation as well as observations. Monitoring shall not be required under any conditions if excavations for proposed development do not extend into undisturbed native sands that possess high paleontological sensitivity. If it is determined that paleontological monitoring is required, qualified paleontologist shall attend any preconstruction meetings and manage the paleontological monitor(s) if he or she is not doing the monitoring.</p> <p>For monitoring that is required in a given work area, the paleontological monitor shall be equipped with necessary tools for the collection of fossils and associated geological and paleontological data. The monitor shall complete daily logs detailing the day's excavation activities and pertinent geological and paleontological data. In the event that paleontological resources (e.g., fossils) are unearthed during grading, the paleontological monitor shall temporarily halt and/or divert grading activity to allow recovery of paleontological resources. The area of discovery shall be roped off with a 50-foot radius buffer. Once documentation and collection of the find is completed, which in most circumstances, is less than a day, the monitor shall remove the rope and allow grading to recommence in the area of the find. If it will require more than one (1) day to document and/or salvage the find, the qualified paleontologist shall work with CSUMB to determine an</p>	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>appropriate treatment plan to ensure the protection of fossil resources while not impeding development.</p> <p>Following the paleontological monitoring program, a final monitoring report shall be submitted to CSUMB for approval. The report should summarize the monitoring program and include geological observations and be accompanied by any paleontological resources recovered during paleontological monitoring for the development. The qualified paleontologist shall be responsible for ensuring that all fossils associated with the paleontological monitoring program are permanently curated with an accredited institution that maintains paleontological collections.</p>	
<p>Impact GEO-6: Cumulative Geology, Soils and Paleontological Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to seismic-related ground shaking and/or failure, landslides, soil erosion, unstable soils and/or paleontological resources, with the implementation of mitigation.</p>	Less than Significant	No additional mitigation required beyond the mitigation measure identified for Impact GEO-5 above (MM-GEO-1).	Less than Significant
Greenhouse Gas Emissions			
<p>Impact GHG-1: Greenhouse Gas Emissions. The Project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.</p>	Potentially Significant	<p>MM-GHG-1: <u>Building Decarbonization: Replace Natural Gas with Electricity in New and Existing Buildings.</u> CSUMB shall replace natural gas energy use with electricity energy use in new and existing buildings to reduce natural gas consumption and associated greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions generated by CSUMB. Building electrification shall result in a minimum natural gas reduction of 174,590 therms (17,459 Metric Million British Thermal Unit [MMBTU]), which equates to an approximately 16 percent reduction in the 2035 Master Plan's estimated natural gas consumption (1,106,827 therms Master Plan buildout in 2035 – 174,590 therms reduction in natural gas = 932,237 therms in 2035 [110,683 MMBTU – 17,459 MMBTU = 93,224 MMBTU]). Replacing 174,590 therms of natural gas is estimated to require an increase in approximately 4,472 megawatt hours of electricity to achieve a reduction of approximately 600 metric tons per year of carbon</p>	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
		<p>dioxide equivalent per year (MT CO_{2e}) because electricity is a less GHG intensive energy source.</p> <p>This building decarbonization requirement in new and existing buildings can be met using different combinations of building electrification in new and existing residential and non-residential buildings, provided that 174,590 therms of natural gas is replaced with 4,472 megawatt hours of electricity by 2035. To ensure that a minimum of 174,590 therms of natural gas is replaced by electricity-provided energy in new and existing buildings by 2035, building energy demand projections will be calculated and reported on during the building design phase for new and existing buildings to be retrofitted. Prior to the schematic design approval for each new building or existing building to be retrofitted, CSUMB shall provide a natural gas estimate with and without electrification, which shall be tracked internally. Annually, CSUMB shall review the amount of natural gas replaced by electricity in new buildings to ensure that substantial progress is being made towards meeting the 174,590 therms replacement requirement for new and existing buildings under the Master Plan by 2035.</p> <p>CSUMB may pursue and implement other GHG-reducing strategies (e.g., additional solar PV, heat pump conversion) as a mechanism for achieving the required GHG reductions (approximately 600 MT CO_{2e}) by 2035. To ensure GHG emissions reductions from such strategies are properly accounted for, the GHG emissions reductions associated with such strategies shall be calculated and reported on during the design phase of these strategies. Annually, CSUMB shall review the amount of GHG emissions reductions associated with these other GHG-reducing strategies, along with the GHG reductions associated with building electrification, as indicated previously, to ensure that substantial progress is being made towards meeting the required GHG reductions under the Master Plan by 2035.</p>	
<p>Impact GHG-2: Conflict with an Applicable Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan. The Project may conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. The Project may conflict with an</p>	<p>Potentially Significant</p>	<p>MM-GHG-1: See Impact GHG-1 for this mitigation measure.</p>	<p>Less than Significant</p>

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Specifically, the Project may conflict with CARB's Scoping Plan and related GHG reduction targets for 2030 and 2050, but would not conflict with the CSU Sustainability Policy, the CSUMB Campus Sustainability Plan, or AMBAG's 2040 MTP/SCS.			
Impact GHG-3. Cumulative Greenhouse Gas Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to GHG emissions, with the implementation of mitigation.	Less than Significant	No additional mitigation required beyond the mitigation measure identified for Impact GHG-1 above (MM-GHG-1).	Less than Significant
Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire			
Impact HAZ-1: Routine Transport, Use, or Disposal of Hazardous Materials. The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact HAZ-2: Upset and Release of Hazardous Materials. The Project would not potentially create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset or accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment from known or potential areas of contamination, including due the presence of hazardous materials sites.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HAZ-3: Hazardous Materials Near Schools. The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact HAZ-4: Impair Emergency Response. The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact HAZ-5: Wildfire Hazards. The Project would not substantially impair an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan, exacerbate wildfire risk, require the installation or maintenance of infrastructure that would exacerbate wildfire risk, cause a significant risk of loss, injury, or death, involving wildland fires, or expose people or structures to significant post-fire risks.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact HAZ-6: Cumulative Hazardous Materials, Emergency Response, and Wildfire Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to hazardous materials, emergency response, and wildfire.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Hydrology and Water Quality			
<p>Impact HYD-1: Surface Water Quality Standards and Waste Discharge Requirements. The Project would not directly or indirectly violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality.</p>	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact HYD-2: Groundwater. The Project would not substantially decrease groundwater supplies, interfere substantially with groundwater recharge, or impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.</p>	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
<p>Impact HYD-3: Alteration of Stormwater Drainage Patterns. The Project would not substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would (i) result in substantial erosion or siltation on or off site, (ii) substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on or off site, or (iii) increase or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff.</p>	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact HYD-4: Cumulative Hydrology and Water Quality Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to hydrology and water quality.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Land Use and Planning			
Impact LDU-1: Physically Divide Community. The Project would not physically divide an established community.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact LDU-2: Conflict with Land Use Plan, Policy, or Regulation. The Project would not cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact LDU-3: Cumulative Land Use Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to land use.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Noise			
Impact NOI-1: Substantial Temporary Increase in Ambient Noise Levels. The Project would generate a substantial temporary construction-related increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in	Potentially Significant	MM-NOI-1: CSUMB shall require that construction contractors implement the following practices and measures: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Construction activity shall generally be limited to the daytime hours between 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m. on weekdays and between 8:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. on weekends and holidays. If nighttime construction is required, noise levels shall not exceed 65 dB L_{max} (slow response) when measured at the construction site boundary between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m. Loud construction activity (e.g., asphalt removal, large- 	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.		<p>scale grading operations) shall not be schedule during finals week and preferably will be scheduled during holidays, summer/winter break, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All construction equipment shall be properly maintained and equipped with noise-reducing air intakes, exhaust mufflers, and engine shrouds in accordance with manufacturers' recommendations. Equipment engine shrouds shall be closed during equipment operation. • Electrical power, rather than diesel equipment, shall be used to run compressors and similar power tools and to power any temporary structures, such as construction trailers. • All stationary construction equipment (e.g., electrical generators, pumps, refrigeration units, and air compressors) and equipment staging areas shall be located as far as feasible from occupied residences or educational land uses. • When anticipated construction activities are expected to occur less than 175 feet from an existing on-campus or off-campus residential land use, one or more of the following techniques shall be employed to keep noise levels below an eight-hour A-weighted energy-equivalent level (L_{eq8h}) of 80 dBA at the potentially affected sensitive receptors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduce construction equipment and vehicle idling and active operation duration. ○ Install or erect on-site a temporary, solid noise wall (or acoustical blanket having sufficient mass, such as the incorporation of a mass-loaded vinyl skin or septum) of adequate height and horizontal extent so that it linearly occludes the direct sound path between the noise-producing construction process(es) or equipment and the sensitive receptor(s) of concern. ○ Where impact-type equipment is anticipated on site, apply noise-attenuating shields, shrouds, portable barriers or enclosures, to reduce the magnitudes of generated impulse noises. 	
Impact NOI-2: Substantial Permanent Increase in Ambient Noise Levels. The Project could generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels	Potentially Significant	MM-NOI-2: Stadium Noise. To minimize noise levels generated by the replacement of the existing stadium with an expanded stadium with additional seating capacity, a noise assessment shall be conducted by a qualified acoustical engineer or noise specialist to evaluate potential increases in noise levels associated with the proposed new and	Significant and Unavoidable (Roadway Noise Only at

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, due to roadway noise and stadium noise.		expanded stadium. The assessment shall be conducted prior to final design. Noise reduction measures shall be incorporated into the design to reduce increases in existing operational noise levels at nearby noise-sensitive land uses to below the applicable threshold (i.e., less than 65 dBA CNEL). Such measures may include, but are not limited to, the incorporation of structural shielding, enclosed bleachers, and revised placement for amplified sound system speakers.	One Off-campus Location)
Impact NOI-3: Excessive Vibration. The Project would not generate excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels.	Less than Significant	<p>MM-NOI-3: Recommended Vibration Monitoring Plan. While not required to reduce a significant impact, it is recommended that CSUMB or its designee prepare a vibration monitoring plan by a qualified acoustician prior to beginning construction of any project that involves pile driving (or any heavy construction operation known to exhibit a reference vibration velocity level of 0.2 ips PPV or greater magnitude at 25 feet) within 250 feet of an existing facility housing medical, semiconductor, testing, manufacturing, musical recording, or other instruments and processes that are known to be highly sensitive to vibration and may thus have function compromised by undue levels of groundborne-transmitted vibration. At a minimum, the vibration monitoring plan shall require data be sent to the University noise control officer or designee on a weekly basis or more frequently as determined by the noise control officer. The data shall include vibration level measurements taken during the previous work period. In the event that there is reasonable probability that future measured vibration levels would exceed FTA guidance (65 VdB or more stringent criteria as the existing facility activities may require), the University shall take the steps necessary to ensure that future vibration levels do not exceed such limits, including suspending further construction activities that would result in excessive vibration levels until either alternative equipment or alternative construction procedures can be used. Construction activities not associated with vibration generation could continue.</p> <p>In addition to the data described previously, the vibration monitoring plan shall also include the location of vibration monitors, the vibration instrumentation used, a data acquisition and retention plan, and exceedance notification and reporting procedures.</p>	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact NOI-4: Cumulative Noise and Vibration Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to noise and vibration.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Population and Housing			
Impact POP-1: Induce Substantial Unplanned Population Growth. The Project would not induce substantial unplanned population growth in the area, either directly or indirectly.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact POP-2: Displacement of People or Housing. The Project would not displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact POP-3: Cumulative Population and Housing Impacts. The Project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to substantial unplanned population growth or displacement of people or housing in the region.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Public Services and Recreation			
Impact PSR-1: New or Physically Altered Fire Protection Facilities. The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.			
Impact PSR-2: New or Physically Altered Police Protection Facilities. The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times, or other performance objectives.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact PSR-3: New or Physically Altered Schools. The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered school facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain performance objectives.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact PSR-4: New or Physically Altered Parks. The Project would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered parks, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact PSR-5: Deterioration of Neighborhood and Regional Parks. The Project would not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facilities would occur or be accelerated.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact PSR-6: Cumulative Public Services Impacts. The Project would not have a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to the construction of new or expanded fire, police, schools, and park and recreational facilities.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Transportation			
Impact TRA-1: Conflict with Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy Addressing the Circulation System. The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact TRA-2: Vehicle Miles Travelled. The Project would not result in a VMT-related impact.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact TRA-3: Geometric Design Hazards. The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
Impact TRA-4: Emergency Access. The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact TRA-5: Cumulative Transportation Impacts. The Project's incremental effect would not be cumulatively considerable and would not contribute to or result in a significant cumulative impact related to transportation impacts.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Utilities and Energy			
Impact UTL-1: Construction of New or Expanded Utilities. The Project would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or replacement water, wastewater treatment, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which would result in significant effects.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-2: Adequacy of Water Supplies. Sufficient water supplies are available to serve the Project and reasonably foreseeable future development in the service area during normal, dry, and multiple-dry years.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-3: Wastewater Treatment Capacity. The Project would not exceed wastewater treatment capacity.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-4: Solid Waste. The Project would not generate solid waste in excess of state standards, or in excess of the capacity	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant

**Table 1-1
Summary of Project Impacts**

Impact	Level of Significance Prior to Mitigation	Mitigation Measures	Level of Significance After Mitigation
of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals; and the Project would comply with federal and state management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.			
Impact UTL-5: Wasteful Energy Consumption. The Project would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-6: Conflicts with Energy Plans The Project would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant
Impact UTL-7: Cumulative Utilities and Energy Impacts. The Project would not result in a cumulatively considerable contribution to significant cumulative impacts related to utilities and energy.	Less than Significant	Mitigation not required.	Less than Significant