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1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose

This statement of Findings of Fact addresses the environmental effects associated with the California State University, Sacramento (CSU Sacramento) Campus Master Plan 2015 project located on the CSU Sacramento campus in Sacramento, California. These Findings are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Sections 21081 and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. 15000, et. seq. The potentially significant impacts were identified in both the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the Final EIR, as well as additional facts found in the complete record of proceedings.

Public Resources Code 21081 and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines require that the lead agency prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation for the rationale for each finding. The California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees is the lead agency responsible for preparation of the EIR in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines states, in part, that:

(a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:

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

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

(3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.
In accordance with Public Resource Code 21081 and Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, whenever significant impacts cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered "acceptable." In that case, the decision-making agency may prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines state that:

a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."

b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the Final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.

c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091. As required by CEQA, the Board of Trustees, in adopting these findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program for the project. The Board of Trustees finds that the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

The Final EIR for the project identified potentially significant effects that could result from project implementation. However, the CSU Board of Trustees finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those effects to less than significant levels. Those impacts that are not reduced to less than significant levels are identified and overridden due to specific project benefits in a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees adopts these findings as part of its certification of the Final EIR for the project. Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the Public Resources Code,
the Board of Trustees also finds that the Final EIR reflects the Board's independent judgment as the lead agency for the project.

1.2. Organization and Format of Findings

Section 1.0 contains a summary description of the project and background facts relative to the environmental review process. Section 2.0 discusses the CEQA finding of independent judgment. Section 3.0 identifies the impacts of the project that were studied in the EIR. Section 3.1 of these Findings identifies the significant impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, even though all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project.

Section 3.2 identifies the potentially significant effects of the project that would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Section 3.3 identifies the project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant and, therefore, do not require mitigation measures. Section 4.0 discusses the feasibility of project alternatives. Section 5.0 discusses findings with respect to mitigation of significant adverse impacts, and adoption of the Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP).

1.3 Summary of Project Description

The project is the adoption and implementation of the Campus Master Plan 2015 for CSU Sacramento. The Campus Master Plan will guide the future physical development of the University’s campus through the year 2035 planning horizon. The University conducted over a year-long, wide-ranging planning process to develop the Campus Master Plan. The aim of that process was to develop a comprehensive plan for campus development that will maintain and enrich the campus as an attractive, accessible, safe and functional environment for learning, living, recreation, and culture for the University’s faculty, staff and visitors, and for the surrounding communities. To do so, the Campus Master Plan incorporates Design Guidelines, Landscape Guidelines, Sustainability Guidelines, and Implementation Guidelines. The Campus Master Plan maintains the 25,000 full-time equivalent (FTE) students enrollment level established by the current Master Plan.

The Campus Master Plan provides for the integration of the campus into a framework of eight functional and geographic zones (or precincts). The future development within the zones is planned to effectively concentrate the use of land within each zone and provide space for a broad range of programs. Within these zones, the Campus Master Plan focuses on the facilities needed by the University’s academic programs; campus life programs, including housing, recreation, esthetics, and facilities maintenance; and campus infrastructure, including roadways, parking, and utilities. Many of the existing academic, student housing, and other facilities have reached the end of their functional life and are in need of renewal or replacement. Therefore, the replacement and provision of remodeled facilities are large components of the Campus Master Plan. These include:
Facilities: 1.3-1.5 million square feet of new academic and administrative facilities, including new engineering and science academic facilities, a performing arts center, an administrative/student services center, new offices, expansion of the existing University Union and Well facilities, new Student Events Center facilities; informal and intramural sports facilities, and parking facilities;

Student Housing: replacement of seven older student housing facilities, and the construction of four new housing facilities for undergraduate students and four facilities for faculty, staff, and graduate students;

Open Space and Landscaping: major open space, aesthetic, and design enhancements, including developing quads, courtyards, and other open spaces, reinforcing the pedestrian environment of the campus, expanding the University’s Arboretum with a better connection to the rest of the campus, enhancing the identity of the University and its campus through landscape and identification at campus entries, developing landscape and pedestrian connections in newly developed areas of the campus;

Infrastructure: improvements and enhancements to campus infrastructure that will showcase and maximize the sustainability features of the campus and optimize the campus’ physical assets, including the Hornet Greenway, a unique organizing landscape and pedestrian feature providing a new sustainable central greenway that serves to enhance the campus landscape, and manage and clean the stormwater before it is reintroduced into the American River system, and modifications and augmentations of the campus utilities systems to serve the new and renewed facilities;

Connectivity: supporting the use of public transit by continuing to provide shuttle connections and bus stops and parking for University and regional transit vehicles; enhancing campus entries and roadways to improve the flow of on-campus traffic; redistributing parking facilities to better accommodate on-campus traffic; re-organizing the pedestrian pathway system to create a more integrated and aesthetically-pleasing campus; restructuring bicycle routes through the campus and identifying bicycle and pedestrian zones that increase safety and functionality; and improving signage and wayfinding to make it easier for visitors to navigate throughout the campus.

1.4. Project Objectives

CEQA states that the statement of project objectives should be clearly written and define the underlying purpose of the project, in order to permit the development of a reasonable range of alternatives and aid the Lead Agency in making findings.

The principal objective of the Campus Master Plan is to support and advance the University’s educational mission by providing a guide to the development of the physical campus and its facilities. In support of this objective, the Campus Master Plan provides guidelines and framework for creating a campus environment that:
- Fosters and emphasizes academic excellence
- Elevates the University’s presence in the global higher education arena
- Provides a vibrant and satisfying “Live-Work-Teach-Learn-Play” campus environment that serves students, faculty, and staff
- Maximizes connectivity with the surrounding community
- Maximizes intra-campus connectivity
- Optimizes physical assets through an integrated and comprehensive planning approach that responds to the academic strategic plan and campus life needs

These project objectives guided the proposed Campus Master Plan development process and the identification of physical improvements necessary and appropriate for the CSU Sacramento campus to fulfill its educational mission as well as implement its strategic vision and core values.

1.5. Environmental Review Process

Initial Study and Notice of Preparation: In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, to determine the number, scope and extent of environmental issues, the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of the Draft Environmental Impact Report was circulated for public review for a period of 30 days, beginning on October 9, 2014 and ending on November 7, 2014.

Draft EIR: In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, a Draft EIR was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects associated with the Campus Master Plan 2015 project identified during the NOP process. Based on the NOP and Initial Study scoping process, the EIR addressed the following potential potentially significant environmental issues:

- Aesthetics
- Air Quality and Greenhouse Gases (GHG)
- Traffic and Circulation
- Fire and Police Protection Services
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Construction Effects
- Long-term and Cumulative Effects

The Draft EIR was released for public and agency review 45-day period, from January 27, 2015 to March 12, 2015. The University also held a public meeting on February 24, 2015 to provide the public an opportunity to comment on the adequacy of the information presented in the Draft EIR. No comments were received at the meeting. During the Draft EIR public review period, the University received four comment letters.

Final EIR: Section 15088 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the Lead Agency responsible for the preparation of an EIR evaluate comments on environmental issues and prepare a written response addressing
each of the comments. The intent of the Final EIR is to provide a forum to address comments pertaining to the
information and analysis contained within the Draft EIR, and to provide an opportunity for clarifications, corrections, or minor revisions to the Draft EIR as needed.

The Final EIR assembles in one document all of the environmental information and analysis prepared for the proposed project, including comments on the Draft EIR and responses by the University to those comments.

Pursuant to Section 15132 of the State CEQA Guidelines, the Final EIR consists of the following:

(a) The revised Draft EIR, including all of its appendices.
(b) A list of persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR.
(c) Summaries of all oral comments received on Draft EIR and responses to those comments.
(d) Copies of all letters received by the University during the Draft EIR public review period and responses to the comments.
(e) Any other information added by the Lead Agency.

2.0 CEQA FINDING OF INDEPENDENT JUDGMENT

The Final EIR reflects the Board of Trustees’ independent judgment. The Board of Trustees has exercised independent judgment in accordance with Public Resources Code 21082.1(c)(3) in retaining its own environmental consultant in the preparation of the EIR, as well as reviewing, analyzing and revising material prepared by the consultant.

Having received, reviewed, and considered the information in the Final EIR, as well as any and all other information in the record, the Board of Trustees of the California State University hereby makes findings pursuant to and in accordance with Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code.

3.0. FINDINGS OF FACT

3.1 Environmental Effects of the Project which are Considered Unavoidable Significant Impacts

This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued by the Board of Trustees, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the project is approved. Based on the analysis contained in the Final EIR, the following impacts have been determined to be significant unavoidable: 
Short-term project-specific and cumulative construction effects on air quality and noise associated with construction of individual facilities and improvements pursuant to the Campus Master Plan 2015

Summary of Short-term Construction Impacts on Air Quality (Project-Specific and Cumulative) and Noise (Project-Specific)

An evaluation of the short-term and intermittent construction impacts associated with the project is found in Section 3.6, Construction Effects, of the Final EIR.

**Air Quality:** The construction of individual new and renewed facilities and improvements on campus will include demolition, grading, and other site preparation activities. All construction activities will proceed in compliance with the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District (SMAQMD) rules and regulations, including Rules 403, 404, and 405, governing fugitive dust, particulate matter, and dust, respectively. Nonetheless, a “worst-case” peak day construction emissions, where it is assumed that construction of some facilities on campus will proceed concurrently and that each phase of the construction (demolition, grading, construction, etc.) of each facility will also occur concurrently, even though such scenario is unlikely, the short-term peak day construction emissions could be above the SMAQMD threshold amounts for NOx.

**Noise:** Construction activities will result in a temporary increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of individual construction sites from heavy equipment, power and air tools, compressors, trucks, and from loading and unloading that will occur with varying frequency and intensity. These temporary noise levels will not be continuous but will vary as equipment is used for varying lengths of time throughout the construction period and high levels of construction noise usually are limited to the immediate vicinity of construction activities. Nonetheless, since construction activities of some specific facilities or improvements could be audible at the nearby residence halls, academic facilities, or other campus sensitive uses, mitigation measures have been identified to reduce this potentially significant impact.

**Mitigation Measures**

The University will implement the following mitigation measures to reduce identified significant impacts by imposing conditions on the construction contractor.

1. Construction hours will be limited to between 6:00 am and 8:00 pm during the week and 8:00 am and 7:00 pm on weekends.

2. Contractors will be required to minimize exhaust emissions by maintaining equipment engines in good condition and properly tuned.

3. The hours of operation of heavy-duty equipment will be minimized.
4. The idling time of construction equipment at the construction site will be limited to no more than 5 minutes.

5. The contractor will ensure that diesel particulate filters are installed on diesel equipment and trucks.

6. Trucks carrying contents subject to airborne dispersal will be covered.

7. Alternative fueled or electrical construction equipment will be used when feasible.

8. The minimum practical engine size for construction equipment and electric carts and other smaller equipment will be used when feasible.

9. Throughout the construction period of individual facilities and improvements in close proximity to student residence halls, campus academic facilities, health and wellness facilities, and/or other sensitive uses on campus, ventilation systems in those facilities will be tested more frequently to provide for the maintenance schedule that ensures proper ventilation.

10. Muffled heavy construction equipment will be used.

11. Construction staging areas will be located as far as possible from student residence halls, campus academic facilities, health and wellness facilities, and other places where students gather.

12. The contractor will ensure that each piece of operating equipment is in good working condition and that noise suppression features, such as engine mufflers and enclosures, are working and fitted properly.

13. The contractor will locate noisy construction equipment as far as possible from nearby sensitive uses.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the implementation of the identified measures will reduce construction impacts on solid waste facilities to a less than significant level.

The identified mitigation measures will reduce air pollutant emissions; however, even with the implementation of these identified feasible mitigation measures, peak day emissions of NOx could remain above the SMAQMD threshold of significance amount and therefore this impact is considered significant and unavoidable. Since all construction results in pollutant emissions, the combined construction effects on air quality of future
development on campus, together with future development within the City of Sacramento, could be cumulatively significant, even with full implementation of the identified mitigation measures, as well as mitigation measures required of development occurring within the city and the region.

The impact of noise from construction activity on the closest sensitive uses in the vicinity of some facilities construction sites, albeit reduced and intermittent, could remain significant and unavoidable. The campus is separated from the nearby development by its physical boundaries – the American River, the railroad, the water treatment plant, and roadways. Therefore, it is unlikely that construction in the interior of the campus would result in a cumulatively significant noise effects.

Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, make infeasible the alternatives identified in the EIR and the identified short-term and intermittent construction impacts are thereby acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Statement of Overriding Considerations).

3.2  Environmental Effects Evaluated in the Final EIR Which Can Be Avoided or Substantially Lessened to Less Than Significant Levels with Implementation of the Identified Mitigation Measures

This section identifies significant adverse impacts of the project that require findings to be made under Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines. Based on information in the Final EIR, the Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce the identified significant impacts to less than significant levels.

Based on the analysis contained in the Final EIR, the following impacts have been determined to be impacts that can be reduced to less than significant levels with implementation of the mitigation measures set forth below:

- Construction-related impacts on traffic and solid waste facilities

Construction Impacts on Traffic and Solid Waste Facilities

Construction trucks and equipment may cause localized congestion at some locations, and may adversely affect pedestrian flows on campus at some locations. Construction activities also may temporarily affect bus and bicycle circulation routes at some locations on campus. Demolition of existing facilities and construction of the new facilities and associated infrastructure improvements will generate construction materials waste. Even though construction of individual campus facilities and infrastructure improvements will be phased over the 20-year span of the Campus Master Plan (and will thus represent relatively small activities at any given time which do not involve massive construction activities that could generate significant amounts of solid waste), mitigation measures have been identified to reduce this potential
Mitigation Measures

1. A flag person will be employed as needed to direct traffic when heavy construction vehicles enter the campus from J Street, Folsom Boulevard, and College Town Drive.

2. Construction trucks will avoid travel on residential areas to access campus and use the City of Sacramento designated truck routes to travel to and from campus.

3. Construction-related truck traffic will be scheduled to avoid peak travel time on the US Highway Route 50 (US 50), as feasible.

4. If major pedestrian or bicycle routes on campus are temporarily blocked by construction activities, alternate routes around construction areas will be provided, to the extent feasible. These alternate routes will be posted on campus for the duration of construction.

5. If any bus stop or other transit facility on campus is obstructed by construction activity, the University, in cooperation with the transit service providers, will temporarily relocate such transit facility on campus as appropriate.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential transportation and solid waste construction-related impacts to less than significant levels. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the potentially significant traffic impacts as identified in the Final EIR.

3.3 Environmental Effects Found to Be Less Than Significant

This section identifies impacts of the project that are less than significant and do not require mitigation measures. Based on information in the Final EIR, the Board of Trustees finds that based upon substantial evidence in the record, the following impacts have been determined to be less than significant:

- Traffic impact on intersections
- Fire and police protection services
- Short-term construction-related water quality
- Cumulative impacts, other than short-term construction-related air quality
Growth-inducing impacts

Traffic Impact on Intersections

An evaluation of project’s traffic impact on study intersection is found in Section 3.3 Traffic and Circulation, of the Final EIR.

The implementation of the Campus Master Plan is not projected to result in a change in level service (LOS) at any of the 15 study intersections, and will not result in any significant traffic impact; in fact it will reduce traffic delay at some study intersections.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impact related to the project’s traffic impact on study intersections is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Fire and Police Protection Services

An evaluation of project’s impacts on fire and police protection services is found in Section 3.4, Fire and Police Services, of the Final EIR.

While with more residents and facilities on campus, the implementation of the Campus Master Plan will result in incremental increase in demand for fire and police protection services, it does not result in the need for new fire or police protection facilities. Enhanced operating procedures, incorporation of required fire suppression and safety features, continued emergency response training, and appropriate staffing of the University Police Department will work to minimize increased demand for service.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential project impact on fire and police protection services is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Short-term Construction Related Water Quality

An evaluation of project’s short-term construction-related impacts on water quality is found in Section 3.6, Construction Impacts, of the Final EIR.

In compliance with existing regulations, all construction activities will implement a Storm Water Pollution
Prevention Plan (SWPPP), which includes best management practices (BMPs), such as scheduling grading during dry weather and replanting vegetation as soon as possible, and/or other measures.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential the potential short-term construction-related impacts on water quality is less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Cumulative impacts on Traffic at Intersections and Public Services

An evaluation of cumulative impacts associated with the project is found in Section 4.0, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIR.

The Campus Master Plan and future growth within the city of Sacramento will incrementally increase demand for fire and police protection services. Given that the campus vicinity is largely developed, the Campus Master Plan’s contribution to cumulative demand will be relatively minor. In addition to incorporating fire safety features in design and operations of all its campus facilities, the University will continue to educate students, faculty, and staff to increase awareness about fire prevention and emergency preparedness, and will continue to cooperate with the City of Sacramento to minimize demand for service. This will ensure that no substantial new fire protection facilities will be required. While the provision of new facilities on campus - including student housing – is anticipated to result in an incremental increase in demand for police protection services, this increase will be minimized through enhanced operating procedures, continued campus safety training, and appropriate staffing of the University Police Department. Therefore, no substantial new fire protection facilities will be required. The Campus Master Plan also provides for relocation of the University’s Police and Public Safety Services onto the site adjacent to the new Parking Structure PS5 in the north campus, at a new location where police vehicles will have access to a bollarded roadway that is not accessible to the public for fast access to all areas of the campus in case of emergency, enhancing the emergency response times.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential impacts of the project on utilities and service systems are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

Growth-inducing and Irreversible Effects

An evaluation of growth-inducing and irreversible effects associated with the project is found in Section 4.0, Cumulative Effects, of the Final EIR.

The Campus Master Plan maintains the University’s enrollment level of 25,000 FTE students established by the current Master Plan and thus, the Campus Master Plan will not foster population growth beyond the growth
already anticipated in the region. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan will result in infill facilities and reinvigoration of the existing CSU Sacramento campus. The campus is located within a fully urbanized area that is well served by existing infrastructure. The project will not result in excess capacity that may induce growth.

Implementation of the Campus Master Plan will commit non-renewable resources during construction and operation. During construction, the use of building materials (e.g., aggregate, sand, cement, steel, glass, etc.) and energy resources (e.g., gasoline, diesel fuel, electricity) largely would be irreversible and irretrievable. Energy would be consumed in processing building materials and for transporting these materials and construction workers to the individual facility sites. The new buildings at the campus provided pursuant to the Campus Master Plan can be expected to have a life span of approximately 50 to 70 years. Resources consumed during buildout of the Campus Master Plan (such as fuel, building materials, water, etc.), will be used in quantities proportional to similar development in Central California. As discussed in this EIR, an integral part of the Campus Master Plan is its Sustainability Guidelines that will guide the campus development. As a result, the implementation of the Campus Master Plan will result in significant reductions in the use of water and energy by the campus, and in a net reduction in commute vehicular travel with the corresponding reduction in consumption of motor fuels, which is a beneficial impact on resources. Therefore, the typical campus operations will not result in a wasteful use of resources.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential growth-inducing and irreversible effects of the project are less than significant and no mitigation measures are required.

3.3.2 Environmental Effects Determined Not to be Significant in the NOP Scoping Process and Not Discussed in the EIR

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. The Executive Summary and Appendix A of the Final EIR addresses the potential environmental effects that have been found not to be significant as a result of the Initial Study analysis completed as part of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) process, the NOP public review process, and the responses to the NOP. Based on the NOP process, the implementation of the Campus Master Plan was determined to result in either no impact, or a less than significant impact without the implementation of mitigation measures on the following resources, and were therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR:

- Agricultural and forest resources
- Biological resources
- Cultural resources
- Geology and soils
- Hazards and hazardous materials
- Hydrology
- Land use and planning
- Mineral resources
- Noise
- Population and housing
- Recreation

3.4 Environmental Impacts Found to Be Beneficial

The Final EIR identifies the following project-specific and cumulative effects of the Campus Master Plan 2015 that are beneficial:

- Reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMTs): By providing additional housing for students, faculty, and staff on campus, the Campus Master Plan will result in reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) by at least 25,000 VMTs per day.

- Reducing vehicular air pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases (GHG): By reducing vehicular commute, the Campus Master Plan will result in reducing long-term air pollutant emissions (NOx and ROG) by at least 2.6 and 6.1 pounds per day, respectively, and reducing GHG by at least 1,558 metric tons of CO2e per year.

- Improving pedestrian and bicycle circulation networks on campus: The Campus Master Plan will result in new and re-configured pedestrian and bicycle networks and amenities throughout the campus.

- Increasing energy efficiency and reducing the use of electrical power for campus facilities and operations: The Campus Master Plan includes Sustainability Guidelines that define energy efficiency goals to reduce energy consumption and promote the utilization of renewable energy resources. The Campus Master Plan includes the following energy efficiency goals: move toward “zero net” energy consumption for 50% of the square footage of existing state-owned buildings by 2025; zero net energy consumption from all new or renovated state buildings beginning design after 2025; and providing up to 60% of the peak campus load by on-site solar PV electricity, among others.

- Reducing the use of water and generation of wastewater on campus: The Campus Master Plan includes the guidelines to promote water efficiency for new and existing buildings, including using water-saving fixtures to reduce potable water use in new and existing buildings by at least 30% and to reduce sewage conveyance in new buildings 50% below the baseline case usage, as well as to reduce the overall water use on campus by 20% by the year 2020.
Reducing stormwater flows and improving water quality: The Campus Master Plan includes a number of features that will reduce stormwater flows, including the Hornet Greenway that will traverse the entire campus and incorporate bioswale areas to capture and filter stormwater and irrigation water runoff before it returns to the American River. This will result in an estimated reduction in stormwater peak flows by 41% for the 10-year storm event and by 38% for the 100-year storm event. Similarly, the total volume of stormwater entering the American River will be reduced by 29%. Furthermore, it is estimated that approximately 90% of the campus’ stormwater will receive primary biotreatment before entering the American River. This represents a nine-fold increase in clean water entering the American River from the campus.

Enhancing aesthetics and visual character of the campus: The Campus Master Plan will result in substantially enhancing the visual and aesthetic campus character and quality. With the Master Plan’s Design Guidelines, Landscape Guidelines, and Sustainability Guidelines, the new and renewed buildings and other facilities, landscaping, open space, signage, and other elements will create a visual appearance of the campus that is both distinct and cohesive.

Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the potential project-specific and cumulative effects of the Campus Master Plan 2015 on reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMTs); reducing vehicular air pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases (GHG); improving pedestrian and bicycle circulation networks on campus; increasing energy efficiency and reducing the use of electrical power for campus facilities and operations; reducing the use of water and generation of wastewater on campus; reducing stormwater flows and improving water quality; and enhancing aesthetics and visual character of the campus are beneficial and no mitigation measures are required.

4.0 Findings Regarding Considerations That Make Alternatives Analyzed In the Final EIR Infeasible

Based on the entire record, the Board of Trustees finds that the Final EIR identified and considered a reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the proposed project which are capable, to varying degrees, of reducing identified impacts. The EIR evaluated the following alternatives in accordance with CEQA Guidelines:

Alternative 1: “No Project” – Continuation of Current Master Plan alternative, required by CEQA
Alternative 2: Smaller Facility Development
Alternative 3: More Housing on Campus
Alternative 4: Increasing Enrollment Level to 35,000 FTEs
Alternative 1: “No Project” – Continuation of Current Master Plan

The “No Project” alternative, required to be evaluated in the EIR, considers "existing conditions…as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services” [CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(2)]. Pursuant to this alternative, the current Campus Master Plan would continue to be implemented.

**Campus Development**: Pursuant to this alternative, development according to the current Master Plan (adopted in 1964 and revised in 2004) would continue, with student enrollment level at the campus capped at 25,000 FTE students. As most of the current Master Plan facilities have already been developed, this alternative would basically retain the existing conditions on campus. Existing facilities, including obsolete and inefficient buildings would not be renewed or replaced with the needed modern facilities, and no new on-campus housing for students, faculty, and staff would be provided. Also, no infrastructure improvements, open space, stormwater management system, enhanced pedestrian and bicycle circulation, and other improvements proposed in the Campus Master Plan would be provided pursuant to this alternative.

**Environmental Effects**: The No Project alternative would result in new adverse environmental effects as it would not eliminate vehicle trips associated with the commute to campus and the related exhaust air pollutant and GHG emissions, since the No Project alternative would not provide new housing for students, faculty, and staff on campus. With the same level of student enrollment but without the system-wide improvements proposed under the Campus Master Plan to improve efficiency and reduce demand for energy, water, sewer, and stormwater utilities and services, the existing impacts would continue while the Campus Master Plan’s beneficial impacts on these utilities and services would not be achieved. With less construction, this alternative would reduce short-term construction-related noise and air quality impacts, although peak day impacts associated with construction of remaining facilities would be expected to remain significant.

**Relation to Campus Master Plan Objectives**: The No Project alternative would not achieve any of the major Campus Master Plan objectives to: foster and emphasize academic excellence; elevate the University’s presence in the global higher education arena; provide a vibrant and satisfying “Live-Work-Teach-Learn-Play” campus environment that serves students, faculty, and staff; maximize connectivity with the surrounding community; maximize intra-campus connectivity; or optimize the campus’ physical assets through an integrated and comprehensive planning approach that responds to the academic strategic plan and campus life needs. With this alternative, no Design Guidelines, Sustainability Guidelines, or Landscape Guidelines would be adopted to provide frameworks and tools needed to achieve the project objectives.

Most of all, the continuation of the current Master Plan is not feasible because it does not provide for the facilities and programs needed to support the University’s academic programs. To adequately support the University’s programs and its academic mission requires providing facilities and improvements beyond those considered in the current Master Plan.
Alternative 2: Smaller Facility Development

This alternative considers the provision of fewer facilities and improvements on campus to reduce the identified significant and unavoidable short-term construction-related impacts.

Campus Development: A smaller project could potentially reduce environmental impacts. Reducing short-term construction-related unavoidable significant impact on air quality below the SMAQMD significance threshold would require reducing peak day construction emissions of oxides of nitrogen (NOx) by roughly 50%. To do so, a commensurate reduction in construction activities for new and renewed facilities would be needed. Theoretically, such a reduction might be achieved by proportionally reducing development of new facilities on campus by 50% overall, which would eliminate half of the facilities provided for in the Campus Master Plan. The potential that construction of some facilities could be audible at the closest residence halls, academic facilities, or other campus sensitive uses could theoretically be reduced by not developing new facilities near such uses. Considering that such uses are typical campus uses and are present throughout the campus, this alternative would result in out-of-place development with clusters of facilities concentrated in very few locations.

Environmental Effects: This alternative could theoretically reduce short-term emissions to below the SMAQMD daily threshold amount of 85 pounds of NOx per day, resulting in a less than significant impact under the SMAQMD criteria. However, the development with half of the needed facilities on campus would result in less housing for students, faculty, and staff. As a consequence, this alternative would result in more students commuting to campus, which would generate new potentially significant long-term impacts associated with additional traffic, air pollutant, and GHG emissions. If no facilities are built or renewed near the existing residence halls, academic facilities or other campus sensitive uses, the construction-related noise would be a less than significant impact under this alternative.

Relation to Campus Master Plan Objectives: While this alternative might provide a few of the needed facilities on campus, the needed replacement and/or renewal of existing obsolete buildings would not be achieved to the same extent as with the Campus Master Plan, and the vitality created by the provision of campus student housing and associated facilities would not be realized. Therefore, this alternative would fall short of the University’s aims to foster academic excellence and achieve greater distinction for campus life and the environment, and would not achieve the Campus Master Plan’s major objectives.

Most of all, this alternative represents a theoretical supposition and is not a feasible alternative. The campus development pursuant to the Master Plan will result in beneficial environmental impacts of reducing vehicular travel, reducing air pollutant emissions and GHG, reducing consumption of energy and water, reducing stormwater and sewer flows, and improving water quality, among others. To reduce that development by 50% in order to bring the short-term and intermittent peak day construction emissions below the threshold would eliminate most of the environmental benefits of the Campus Master Plan and would result in new adverse environmental impacts. Peak day construction emissions and noise associated with that development could also
be theoretically reduced by prolonging the construction of individual facilities and constructing only one facility at a time so that NOx emissions do not reach 85 pounds on any given day. While this would reduce the impact below the level of significance, the actual total emissions associated with construction would be the same but would be just spread over a longer period of time. With longer construction of each facility, the construction effects would not be any more intermittent or short term – resulting in a new significant adverse impact.

**Alternative 3: More Housing on Campus**

Under this alternative, more housing would be provided on campus for students, faculty, and staff. As with the Campus Master Plan, the campus enrollment level would be maintained at 25,000 FTE students pursuant to this alternative, but by increasing on-campus housing, commuter trips would be further reduced.

**Campus Development:** Pursuant to this alternative, a total of up to 5,000 new beds for undergraduate students and 500 new apartments for graduate students, faculty, and staff would be provided on campus. This is about 1,500 more student beds and 150 more apartments, than provided for by the Campus Master Plan, or an increase of more than 40% in on-campus housing. Additional housing could either be provided in larger buildings of the planned student residence halls, or in additional buildings that could be located in the vicinity of the existing and planned residence halls in the North and South Housing Villages, or elsewhere within developed portions of campus.

Other components provided for in Campus Master Plan would remain the same pursuant to this alternative, including replacement of obsolete academic and other facilities, as well as the implementation of Design, Landscape, and Sustainability Guidelines.

**Environmental Effects:** Provision of more on-campus housing would further reduce commute trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMTs) from at least 25,000 VMTs per day to at least 35,500 VMTs per day from commuting trips. With fewer trips, the less than significant effect on the local intersections would be further reduced as would be exhaust air pollutant emissions and GHG. Therefore this alternative would expand the project’s beneficial environmental impacts.

Pursuant to this alternative, with additional housing, the demand for fire protection services would slightly increase but as with the Campus Master Plan, impact would be less than significant. Demand for police services would increase in greater proportion, and may require an expansion of campus police department services. With the implementation of the Campus Master Plan’s infrastructure improvements and Sustainability Guidelines impact on water, sewer, stormwater and energy utilities and service systems would remain beneficial. With implementation of the Design Guidelines and Landscape Guidelines this alternative would not change the beneficial aesthetic impact on the campus’ visual character, including enhancing the existing open space. Other impacts would be similar to those associated with the Campus Master Plan.
**Relation to Campus Master Plan Objectives:** This alternative would achieve all of the Campus Master Plan’s objectives, including those to foster and emphasize academic excellence; elevate the University’s presence in the global higher education arena; provide a vibrant and satisfying “Live-Work-Teach-Learn-Play” campus environment that serves students, faculty, and staff; maximize intra-campus connectivity and connectivity with the surrounding community; and optimize campus’ physical assets through an integrated and comprehensive planning.

**Alternative 4: Increased Student Enrollment to 35,000 FTEs**

Since the CSU Sacramento is one of the larger urban campuses in the CSU system, encompassing approximately 300 acres, accommodating a larger share of the statewide growth in student enrollment could be considered as an alternative. With continuing population growth in California the demand for higher education has been, and is expected to continue, to steadily increase. With growing demand, and in compliance with the State Legislative mandate expressed in the State Master Plan for Education whereby the CSU system is obligated to continue to accommodate all fully eligible graduates from California high schools and community college transfer students, the CSU campuses will need to accommodate higher enrollment levels. Therefore, this alternative considers accommodating the enrollment level of 35,000 FTE students at the CSU Sacramento campus.

**Campus Development:** With more students, additional facilities could be required to accommodate educational instructions and programs, which could result in more and/or larger buildings on campus. To accommodate the additional facilities, the campus’ pedestrian and bicycle systems would likely need to be reconfigured, as well as the campus’ open space and landscaping. Additional on-campus housing would likely need to be provided, which could result in a more compact development with taller buildings in the campus areas along the American River.

**Environmental Effects:** More and/or larger facilities on campus could affect the campus’ open space and visual character. With more students attending the University, more vehicular commute trips would be generated resulting in greater or additional traffic impacts and new air quality and GHG impacts. However, with implementation of the Design Guidelines, Sustainability Guidelines, and Landscape Guidelines, as well as the vehicle, pedestrian and bicycle improvements provided for in the in the Campus Master Plan these effects would substantially reduced. But with additional buildings and improvements on campus to accommodate more students, the significant unavoidable short-term construction-related air quality impacts could be greater pursuant to this alternative.

However, if no future student enrollment growth from the Sacramento and Central California region is accommodated at the CSU Sacramento campus, that growth would have to be accommodated at other universities elsewhere in the state. As a result, this alternative would eliminate the environmental effects associated with accommodating those students elsewhere, including vehicular trips and the associated traffic impacts; exhaust emissions and the resultant air quality and GHG impacts; demand for fire and police protection services; water and other public utilities; and others. Overall, these indirect effects of
accommodating the students at another locations would likely result in either similar or greater overall environmental impacts than those associated with accommodating 35,000 FTEs enrollment at the CSU Sacramento campus.

Relation to Campus Master Plan Objectives: This alternative would achieve all major Campus Master Plan major objectives, including those to foster and emphasize academic excellence; elevate the University’s presence in the global higher education arena; provide a vibrant and satisfying “Live-Work-Teach-Learn-Play” campus environment that serves students, faculty, and staff; maximize intra-campus connectivity and connectivity with the surrounding community; and optimize campus’ physical assets through an integrated and comprehensive planning. This alternative would also achieve the objective of improving, updating, and replacing outdated, inefficient and obsolete facilities and providing necessary improvements. However, since more, and likely larger, facilities would be constructed on campus, this alternative may not achieve the objective of maintaining and enhancing the campus open space and visual character to the same degree as with the Campus Master Plan.

Findings

Among the alternatives considered, none of the alternatives discussed is considered clearly environmentally superior to the project. Each alternative results in potential impacts, with a number of impacts that may be greater and some impacts that may be lesser than those associated with the Campus Master Plan. Overall, when both direct and indirect impacts of each alternative are considered together, the alternatives are either environmentally comparable or inferior to the Campus Master Plan project.

5.0 Findings With Respect to Mitigation of Significant Adverse Impacts, and Adoption of Mitigation Monitoring Program

Based on the entire record before the Board of Trustees, and having considered the unavoidable significant impacts of the project, the Board of Trustees hereby determines that all feasible mitigation within the responsibility and jurisdiction of the University has been adopted to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts identified in the Final EIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts. The feasible mitigation measures are discussed in Section 3.1 and 3.2, above, and are set forth in the Mitigation Monitoring Program.

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires the Board of Trustees to adopt a monitoring or compliance program regarding the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the CSU Sacramento Campus Master Plan 2015 project is hereby adopted by the Board of Trustees because it fulfills the CEQA mitigation monitoring requirements:
- The Mitigation Monitoring Program is designed to ensure compliance with the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed on the project during project implementation; and
- Measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through conditions of approval, permit conditions, agreements, or other measures.
STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered "acceptable" (CEQA Guidelines 15093(a)). CEQA requires the agency to state, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines 15093(b)).

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Program, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the Final EIR for the California State University, Sacramento Campus Master Plan 2015 Project. However, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are short-term and intermittent construction-related air quality and noise. The Final EIR provides detailed information regarding these impacts.

The Board of Trustees finds that all feasible mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR within the purview of the University will be implemented with the project, and that the remaining significant unavoidable effects are outweighed and are found to be acceptable due to the following specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits based upon the facts set forth above, the Final EIR, and the record, as follows:

1. Supporting and advancing the University’s educational mission by providing a guide to the development of the physical campus and its facilities

2. Creating campus environment that fosters and emphasizes academic excellence

3. Providing vibrant and satisfying “Live-Work-Teach-Learn-Play” campus environment through expanded student housing and on-campus student life support facilities

4. Maximizing connectivity with the surrounding community and maximizing intra-campus connectivity with enhanced pedestrian, bicycle, and transit connections
5. Substantially enhancing the visual and aesthetic character and quality of the campus with the Master Plan’s Design Guidelines, Landscape Guidelines, and Sustainability Guidelines

6. Optimizing physical assets through an integrated and comprehensive planning approach that responds to the academic strategic plan and campus life needs

7. Providing a framework for the decisions concerning the allocation and management of resources, capital outlay programs, and construction planning for facilities and improvements

8. Improving, updating, and replacing outdated, inefficient and obsolete facilities

9. Protecting and enhancing open spaces, pedestrian corridors, and campus architecture

10. Providing needed infrastructure and utility improvements

11. Providing additional student, faculty, and staff housing on campus reducing commuter trips and vehicle miles traveled (VMTs), and reducing vehicular air pollutant emissions and greenhouse gases (GHG)

12. Increasing energy efficiency and reducing the use of electrical power for campus facilities and operations

13. Reducing the use of water and generation of wastewater on campus

14. Reducing stormwater flows and improving water quality

15. Continuing to provide positive state and local economic benefits

Considering all factors, the Board of Trustees finds that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological and other considerations associated with the project that outweigh the project's significant unavoidable effects, and these adverse effects are therefore considered acceptable.