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1. **Project Title:** Campus Master Plan 2015

2. **Lead Agency Name and Address:** The Board of Trustees of the California State University; California State University, Sacramento 6000 J Street Sacramento, CA 95819-6002

3. **Contact Person and Phone Number:** Victor Takahashi, Director Facilities Planning and Construction Services (916) 278-7612

4. **Project Location:** California State University Sacramento, Sacramento, Sacramento County

5. **Project Sponsor's Name and Address:** Same as Lead Agency

6. **General Plan Designation:** Campus Master Plan – various designations

7. **Zoning:** n/a

8. **Project Description:** The project is the adoption and implementation of the CSU Sacramento Campus Master Plan 2015.

**University Objectives:** 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 over the next 20 years.

**Project Characteristics:** The Campus Master Plan provides guidelines and framework for creating a campus environment that:

- Fosters and emphasizes academic excellence
- Provides a vibrant and satisfying “Live-Work-Teach-Learn-Play” campus environment that serves students, faculty, and staff
- Elevates the University’s presence in the global higher education arena
- Maximizes connectivity with the surrounding community
- Maximizes intra-campus connectivity
- Showcases and maximizes engagement with the American River
- Optimizes physical assets through an integrated and comprehensive planning approach that responds to the academic strategic plan and campus life needs

To do so, the campus will be integrated into a framework of eight functional and geographic precincts as illustrated in Figure 1. The future development within the precincts is planned to effectively concentrate the use of land within each precinct and provide space for a broad range of programs, to achieve the following objectives:
• Making efficient use of University-owned land currently occupied by facilities that have reached the end of their useful life cycles
• Avoiding using significant campus open spaces for new building sites
• Reinforcing the campus open space system by using building edges to create new open spaces or delimiting the boundaries to existing open spaces
• Reinforcing the pedestrian pathway system by orienting buildings entrances to campus walkways

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. To do so, the Campus Master Plan also incorporates Landscape Guidelines, Sustainability Guidelines, Design Guidelines, and Phasing/Implementation Guidelines.

To renew campus facilities, the Campus Master Plan provides for five new facilities, including an academic facility, a performing arts building, an administrative/student services building, a new science facility and new offices. In addition, seven facilities that have reached the end of their useful life will be remodeled or renovated, including Sequoia Hall, Lassen Hall, Shasta Hall, Capistrano Hall, Eureka Hall, Amador Hall, and the Library.

Increasing student housing supports academic excellence and a vibrant “live-work-teach-learn-play” campus environment. To accommodate students within the 25,000 enrollment cap established by the current Master Plan, the Campus Master Plan provides for 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, as well as a remodeling of the dining hall.

To create a vibrant campus environment for the University’s students the Campus Master Plan provides for expanding the existing University Union facilities; expanding the existing Well fitness facility; developing a new Student Events Center; and providing sufficient facilities for informal and intramural sports activities.

The Campus Master Plan provides for functional enhancements to support the goals of optimizing the campus’ physical assets and maximizing intra-campus connectivity. They include supporting the use of public transit by continuing to provide shuttle connections and bus 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 to increase safety and functionality; and improving signage and wayfinding to make it easier for visitors to navigate throughout the campus.

Improvements and enhancements to campus infrastructure will showcase and maximize engagement with the American River and optimize the campus’ physical assets. They include constructing the Hornet Greenway - a unique organizing landscape and pedestrian feature providing a new sustainable central greenway system and stormwater management for the campus; developing new landscape areas in a sustainable manner; and modifying and
augmenting campus utilities systems to serve the new and renewed facilities.

Open space, aesthetic, and design enhancements will elevate the University’s presence in the global higher education arena and the academic and living environment of the campus. These include developing quads, courtyards, and other open spaces as part of building plans to encourage social interactions for students, faculty, staff, and visitors; reinforcing the pedestrian environment of the campus; conserving open space; 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; and using design guidelines in development of new facilities.

Figures 2 through 7 illustrate the Campus Master Plan’s facilities, open space, pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicular circulation.

9. **Surrounding Land Uses and Setting:** The CSU Sacramento 300-acre urban campus is bound by the American River and its flood control levee to the east, a railroad to the west, Folsom Boulevard and Lincoln Highway (US 50) to the south, and J Street to the north. With these physical boundaries, the campus is separated from the nearby development within the City of Sacramento. The Hornet Tunnel, a pedestrian/bicycle route through the railroad embankment, serves as a link to the 65th Street area, the Light Rail Station, and the Eastside Lofts.

10. **CSU and Other Public Agencies whose approval and/or input will be sought:**

   - CSU Board of Trustees
     Approval and adoption of the Campus Master Plan
   - City of Sacramento
     Input on connectivity with the surrounding community, including pedestrian, bicycle, and circulation improvements and enhancements
   - Office of the State Architect
     Checks for ADA compliance for facility plans
   - State Fire Marshall
     Facility fire safety review and approval
   - Regional Water Quality Control Board
     Issuance of Construction Storm Water General Permit for construction of new facilities
   - Others, as may be necessary
Campus Master Plan Landscape Improvements

Figure 3
Campus Master Plan Design Illustrations

Figure 5

- New Riverfront Student Housing (North Housing Village)
- New Administration/Student Services Building at North Gateway
- Grand Central Quad and Hornet Greenway
- Grand Central Quad & Hornet Greenway (Aerial View)
- Courtyard of New South Housing Village
- New Student Events Center, Well and South Green Student Activities Quad
- Pedestrian Portal Between Renewed Hornet Stadium and Student Events Center with PS3 at Right
Campus Master Plan Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation

Figure 6
Campus Master Plan Bicycle Circulation

Figure 7
Environmental Factors Potentially Affected

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

- Aesthetics
- Transportation/Traffic
- Air Quality

- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions

- Geology/Soils
- Hazards & Hazardous Materials
- Hydrology/Water Quality

- Land Use/Planning
- Mineral Resources
- Noise

- Population/Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation

- Utilities/Service Systems
- Mandatory Findings of Significance

Determination

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

☒ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect (1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and (2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature 8-25-14

Date
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State scenic highway? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

a through d. The Campus Master Plan provides for numerous open space, landscape, and design improvements within the CSU Sacramento campus that will result in a long term beneficial impact of enhancing the aesthetic and visual attributes of the campus and creating visually profound and attractive campus identity. While the long-term aesthetic impact is anticipated to be beneficial, since the campus is adjacent to the American River designated as a Wild and Scenic River, with its channel and banks located within the American River Parkway corridor – and the Campus Master Plan provides for new and renewed student, faculty, and staff housing facilities in the campus area close to the Parkway as well as new connections to the Parkway and the American River, these issues will be further addressed in the EIR.
II. AGRICULTURE AND FOREST RESOURCES: In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement technology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:

a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract?

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code section 12220(g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources section 4256) or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code section 51104(g))?

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a through e.** The campus does not contain farmland or forest land. Therefore, the implementation of the Campus Master Plan will not conflict with any zoning for agricultural or forest use. No property under Williamson Act contract or land designated as forest land exists on the campus. Therefore, no adverse impact will occur as a result of the Campus Master Plan and these issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

**III. AIR QUALITY** -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? ☑ ☐ ☑ ☒

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? ☑ ☐ ☒ ☐

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? ☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? ☑ ☐ ☑ ☐
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. The implementation of the Campus Master Plan will not conflict with nor obstruct the implementation of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District Plan. The Master Plan will not create additional regional growth, and within the University’s 25,000 FTE enrollment level established by the current Master Plan will accommodate the projected growth in student enrollment caused by the regional population, housing, and employment growth. The Air Quality Management Plan is based on these regional growth projects and the implementation of the Sacramento State Campus Master Plan will not affect these regional projections. In addition, the Campus Master Plan includes additional student, staff, and faculty housing and other improvements that will have a beneficial effect of reducing vehicular commute trips to and from the campus, and thus reducing vehicular emissions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b through d. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan has the potential to generate short-term emissions associated with the development of new facilities and improvements on campus. These issues will be addressed in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. The campus’ development and operations are not associated with the generation of objectionable odors that could affect a substantial number of people. No adverse impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:**

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or US Fish and Wildlife Service? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a through f. The CSU Sacramento campus is an urban campus developed with University facilities and is surrounded by the urban development of the City of Sacramento. No habitat or natural community conservation plan applies to the campus. The Campus Master Plan enhances and preserves open space on campus, including the University’s Arboretum. No natural habitat or any special status, candidate or sensitive species, riparian habitat, wetland or wildlife corridor will be affected. No adverse impact will result and these issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in §15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to §15064.5? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a. The Campus Master Plan provides for enhancements and improvements to create a vibrant and sustainable campus and will not affect any known historic resources. Therefore, no adverse impact will result and this issue will not be further addressed in the EIR.
b through d. No known paleontological or archaeological resources are located within the campus. The potential for uncovering such significant resources is considered remote, given that no such resources have been discovered during prior development of the campus, which has been developed with University facilities and infrastructure. In an unlikely event that any unknown paleontological or archaeological resources, or human remains, are accidently discovered, compliance with the existing regulations, including CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 (which include stopping work when such remains are accidentally discovered, bringing in a certified archaeologist/paleontologist to determine historic significance, preserve and/or document the resources, and following steps of a prescribed process for treatment of accidently discovered human remains) will ensure that potential effect, if any, would be reduced to a less than significant level. Therefore, these issues will not be further addressed in the EIR.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?

iv) Landslides?

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?
Issues:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a through d. The campus is located in the seismically active central California region and therefore all design and construction of the new facilities will be in compliance with the California State University seismic safety rules and regulations, which are more stringent that those of the California Building Standards Code. The buildings provided for in the Campus Master Plan will be designed and use engineering techniques specific to the soil conditions on campus. The campus is located on relatively flat terrain away from hillsides; thereby it is not at risk for landslides. Impact will be less than significant. No significant impact will result and these issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

e. The campus will continue to be served by sewer systems and no septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are needed for the project. No impact will result.

VII. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS --
Would the project:

a) Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

b) Conflict with applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☒

a and b. The implementation of the Campus Master Plan will neither conflict nor obstruct the implementation of the Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management Plan which aims at reducing overall emissions, including greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The Master Plan will not create additional regional growth but will accommodate the projected growth in student enrollment caused by the regional population, housing, and employment growth. The Air Quality Management Plan is based on these regional growth projections and the implementation of the Master Plan on campus will not affect these regional projections. In addition, the Campus Master Plan includes improvements intended to increase the use of public transit, reduce student commuter travel by providing housing for students, faculty, and staff on campus; increase pedestrian and bicycle transportation; and provide sustainable infrastructure that will have the beneficial effect of reducing GHG emissions. Long-term impact will beneficial; no adverse impact will result.

The development of new facilities and improvements pursuant to Campus Master Plan will generate the short-term construction-related emissions associated construction and renovation of the individual facilities- which include greenhouse gas. While no significant impact is anticipated these short-term effects will be addressed in the EIR.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**VIII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS** -- Would the project:

a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?  

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?  

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?  

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?  

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?  

g) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?
h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands?

a through c. For most of the new facilities on-site use and storage of hazardous materials will be limited to small amounts of everyday household cleaners and common chemicals used for landscaping and maintenance. Materials used for laboratory academic research and instructions will be handled and disposed of in accordance with established University safety procedures. The limited use of such materials is subject to California State University Guidelines. No adverse impact will result.

d. The campus is not included on the Department of Toxic Substances Control Hazardous Waste and Substance List (Cortese List) or any other list of hazardous materials sites. No adverse impact will result.

e and f. The campus is not located within two miles of a public use airport or private airport. No adverse impact will result.

g. All new facilities developed pursuant to the Campus Master Plan will include the provision of all necessary emergency access in compliance with existing regulations and the University’s Multi-Hazard Emergency Plan. Therefore, the project will not impair implementation nor physically interfere with any adopted emergency response or evacuation plans. No adverse impact will result.

h. There are no wildland fire hazard areas within the CSU Sacramento campus. No adverse impact will result.

IX. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? ☒

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? ☒
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a and c through f.** New facilities and improvements developed pursuant to the Campus Master Plan will predominantly replace and/or re-use existing impervious surfaces within the campus, and thus, no changes to the existing drainage patterns are anticipated. The Campus Master Plan will implement the objective of protecting and maintaining the existing open spaces as well as providing for landscape improvements throughout the campus, including sustainable green stormwater infrastructure. The beneficial impact of these improvements will be addressed in the EIR.
Issues: | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact
---|---|---|---|---
b. Water use on campus pursuant to the Campus Master Plan is not expected to result in substantially increased ground water pumping. Nonetheless, this issue will be addressed in the EIR.

g through i. The CSU Sacramento campus is adjacent to a levee along the eastern boundary of the American River. The entire area along the American River lies within a mapped 100-year flood hazard area. The campus is protected by existing levees along the river. Therefore, all facilities developed pursuant to the Campus Master Plan will be designed and constructed in compliance with current FEMA standards. With the compliance with FEMA standards impact will be less than significant and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.

j. The campus is located behind the existing levee along the American River, which is not subject to tsunamis or a seiche. The campus is not subject to mudflows as it is relatively flat and not located adjacent to hillsides. No adverse impact will result.

X. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a. The Campus Master Plan provides for improvements within the campus and will not physically divide an established community. No other land use plans apply to the campus and no adverse impact will result.

b and c. No habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan applies to the campus; therefore the Campus Master Plan will not conflict with such plans.

XI. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a and b</td>
<td>No mineral resources are known to exist within the CSU Sacramento campus, and no impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>○</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>○</td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a and d. Implementation of the Master Plan will result in noise associated with the construction of new facilities and improvements. The construction-related noise and mitigation measures to reduce such short-term effects will be addressed in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. The facilities and improvements provided pursuant to the Campus Master Plan will continue the University uses and functions that do not involve generating excessive vibration or groundborne noise. No adverse impact will result and this issue will not be addressed further in the EIR.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e and f. The campus is not located within an airport land use plan, within two miles of an airport or public use airport, or within the vicinity of a private airstrip. No impact will result.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING --
Would the project:

a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?

a. The implementation of the Campus Master Plan provides additional on-campus student housing, as well as housing opportunities for students, faculty, and staff, and will not displace any housing or people. The Campus Master Plan is designed to accommodate the 25,000 FTE student enrollment level established by the current Master Plan, resulting from growth and development within the Sacramento region and by itself will not induce substantial population growth or housing demand. Presently, the University is primarily a commuter campus, with the majority of students and faculty already residing within Sacramento county and commuting to campus from their residences. The implementation of the Campus Master Plan will have a beneficial impact of accommodating substantially more students in new and renewed residence halls on campus. Nearby areas are fully urbanized and served by existing infrastructure, and the provision of University facilities and improvements within the campus has no potential to induce substantial growth in the surrounding areas or the region. No adverse impact will result and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

b and c. The Campus Master Plan does not involve the removal of housing or displacement of people. No impact will result.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES**

a) Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- Fire protection? [ ] [ ] [x] [ ]
- Police protection? [ ] [ ] [x] [ ]
- Schools? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]
- Parks? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]
- Other public facilities? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]

a. The City of Sacramento Fire Department provides fire protection to the campus and the University Police Department provides police protection on campus. While these existing facilities and resources are anticipated to continue to adequately serve the campus, the particulars about the existing and future fire and police protection services facilities and system will be addressed in the EIR.

The Campus Master Plan provides needed facilities and improvements to accommodate the established level of student enrollment and has no potential to generate a substantial demand for schools. The Campus Master Plan also provides for new and enhanced recreation facilities, protection and maintenance of open space, and landscape improvements within the campus, as well as for adequate student and faculty support services, including food service, student housing, parking, and other facilities. Thus, Campus the Master Plan will not generate a need for construction of new public facilities in the surrounding community. No adverse impact will result and these issues will not be addressed in the EIR.

**XV. RECREATION**

a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? [ ] [ ] [ ] [x]
b) Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues:</th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a and b.** Implementation of the Campus Master Plan will not induce new population growth that will require the construction of new parks or recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. The Campus Master Plan provides for new and improved recreational facilities within the campus for students, faculty, and staff. No adverse impact will result and these issues will not be addressed in the EIR.

**XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC --**

Would the project:

a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?

| a)      | ☐                              | ☐                                                      | ☑                            | ☐         |

b) Conflict with applicable congestion management program, including but not limited to level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?

| b)      | ☐                              | ☐                                                      | ☑                            | ☐         |

c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location which results in substantial safety risks?

| c)      | ☐                              | ☐                                                      | ☐                            | ☑         |

d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

| d)      | ☐                              | ☐                                                      | ☐                            | ☑         |

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

| e)      | ☐                              | ☐                                                      | ☐                            | ☑         |
f) Conflict with adopted policies plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the safety of such facilities? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

a and b. The Campus Master Plan provides for additional student, faculty, and staff housing on campus and the increased use of transit and bicycles which will reduce commuter vehicular trips to campus. However, since changes to the campus gateways, circulation, and parking are proposed in the Campus Master Plan, a traffic study will be prepared as part of the EIR.

c through f. The provision of University facilities and improvements will not affect air traffic patterns. The new facilities and improvements pursuant to the Campus Master Plan will include the provision of all required emergency access in compliance with existing regulations. No design features or uses that could result in increased hazards are part of the Campus Master Plan. The Campus Master Plan provides for enhanced use of public transit and bicycles, and enhanced pedestrian circulation supporting the University’s alternative transportation programs and policies. No adverse impact will result and these issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS -- Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

b) Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

c) Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

d) Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐

e) Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project’s projected demand in addition to the provider’s existing commitments? ☒ ☐ ☐ ☐
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project’s solid waste disposal needs?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Comply with federal, State, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The new facilities and uses developed pursuant to the Campus Master Plan will generate wastewater similar to existing flows. The quality of the wastewater flows associated with these typical urban educational uses meet all applicable requirements. No adverse impact will result and this issue will not be addressed in the EIR.

c. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan will result in the renovation or replacement of existing buildings and infill development on sites that currently developed as surface parking lots and other impervious surfaces. The Campus Master Plan provides for new sustainability improvements in the stormwater infrastructure and no adverse impact will result. The anticipated resulting beneficial effects will be addressed in the EIR.

b and d-e. The new facilities developed pursuant to the Campus Master Plan will use water and generate wastewater. Since the Campus Master Plan does not increase the level of student enrollment level for the campus, it will not induce additional population growth within the region and therefore, no significant impacts are anticipated to result. However, the particulars about the use of water and generation of wastewater associated with renewed and new facilities, as well as the Campus Master Plan’s Sustainability Guidelines anticipated to reduce water use and wastewater generation will be addressed in the EIR.

f and g. The County’s Kiefer Landfill is the only landfill facility in Sacramento County permitted to accept household waste from the public, businesses, and private waste haulers. The landfill facility sits on 1,084 acres located in Sloughhouse. Currently 250 acres, the State-permitted landfill is 660 acres in size and will be able to serve the regional waste disposal needs for many years to come. Currently, the Kiefer Landfill receives over 700,000 tons of waste per year and has the capacity to accommodate waste from the entire Sacramento County area, including the campus. To reduce solid waste, the University has a robust recycling program that includes the recycling of green waste, cardboard, paper, and other recyclable materials. In addition, the Campus Master Plan includes Sustainability Guidelines that are anticipated to further reduce generation of waste on campus. No significant impact will result and these issues will not be addressed further in the EIR.

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒
Issues:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potentially Significant Impact</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</th>
<th>Less Than Significant Impact</th>
<th>No Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (&quot;Cumulatively considerable&quot; means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?</td>
<td>☒</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan will result in infill development within the campus on sites currently developed, either as buildings or surface parking lots and other impervious surfaces. The Campus Master Plan preserves and enhances the Arboretum and other open space on campus and provides for sustainability improvements in design and operation of new and renewed facilities and infrastructure that will not affect biological resources, fish, or wildlife habitats. No important examples of California history or prehistory are present on campus and, therefore, no adverse impact will result.

b. The area-wide growth, and the growth and development within the City of Sacramento -including in the areas surrounding the campus, may result in air quality, traffic, and other impacts. While the effects of the Campus Master Plan itself will be relatively limited, when combined with the effects of the area-wide growth and development, the cumulative impact may be significant. This issue will be addressed in the EIR.

c. The Campus Master Plan will result in the provision of needed facilities and improvements at the CSU Sacramento campus. These facilities and improvements are necessary to continue the University functions and the provision of higher education opportunities to the residents of the surrounding area and the Sacramento region, with no potential to result in substantial adverse effects on people.
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