CHAPTER 6
ALTERNATIVES

6.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter describes alternatives to the Project, consistent with California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines Section 15126.6. This chapter presents the objectives of the Project, a summary of its significant environmental impacts, and a description of the alternatives that were considered but eliminated from further consideration, followed by an analysis of the three alternatives evaluated, including the No Project Alternative. A comparison of the three alternatives to the Project is provided and the environmentally superior alternative is identified.

According to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6, an environmental impact report (EIR) shall describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project or to the location of the project, that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project, and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. This section of the guidelines further requires that the discussion focus on alternatives capable of eliminating significant adverse impacts of the project or reducing them to a level of insignificance even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives or would be more costly. The alternatives analysis also should identify any significant effects that may result from a given alternative.

The lead agency is responsible for selecting a reasonable range of potentially feasible project alternatives for examination and must publicly disclose its reasoning for selecting those alternatives. The range of alternatives is governed by a "rule of reason" that requires the EIR to set forth only those potentially feasible alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to those that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project. Of those alternatives, the EIR need examine in detail only those that the lead agency determines could feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project while substantially lessening any of the significant effects of the project. An EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a project. Rather, it must consider a reasonable range of potentially feasible alternatives that will foster informed decision-making and public participation.

An EIR is not required to consider alternatives which are infeasible. "Feasible" means capable of being accomplished in a successful manner within a reasonable period of time, taking into account economic, environmental, legal, social, and technological factors (CEQA Guidelines Section 15364). Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, other plans or regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries (projects with a regionally significant impact should consider the regional context), and whether the proponent can reasonably acquire, control, or otherwise have access to the alternative site (or already owns

the alternative site). None of these factors establishes a fixed limit on the scope of reasonable alternatives. Under CEQA case law, the concept of feasibility also "encompasses 'desirability' to the extent that desirability is based on a reasonable balancing of the relevant economic, environmental, social, and technological factors." (*City of Del Mar v. City of San Diego* [1982] 133 Cal.App.3d 410, 417; *California Native Plant Society v. City of Santa Cruz* [2009] 177 Cal.App.4th 957.) In assessing the feasibility of alternatives, agency decisionmakers may also take account of the extent to which the alternatives meet or further the agency's underlying purpose or objectives in considering a proposed project. (*Sierra Club v. County of Napa* [2004] 121 Cal.App.4th 1490, 1506-1509; *Citizens for Open Government v. City of Lodi* [2012] 296 Cal.App.4th 296, 314-315; *In re Bay-Delta Programmatic Environmental Impact Report Coordinated Proceedings* [2008] 43 Cal.4th 1143, 1165, 1166.)

No public and agency comments related to alternatives were received during the public scoping periods in response to the Notice of Preparation and the Revision to Previously Issued NOP. For a complete list of public comments received during the public scoping periods refer to Appendix B.

6.2 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

Alternatives considered in the EIR should be feasible and should attain most of the basic project objectives. CEQA provides that the statement of a project's objectives should be clearly written to define the underlying purpose of a project in order to permit development of a reasonable range of alternatives and aid the lead agency in making findings when considering the Project for approval. The underlying purpose of the Project is to support and advance the University's educational mission, as defined by the California Education Code, by guiding the physical development of the campus to accommodate gradual student enrollment growth while preserving and enhancing the quality of campus life. To do so, the Project would authorize the physical development of the campus in a manner that would accommodate an on-campus enrollment of 12,700 full-time equivalent students (FTES). The following objectives of the Project have been established in support of its underlying purpose:

1. Support and advance the University's educational mission by guiding the physical development of the campus to:
    - Accommodate gradual student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES;
    - Provide expanded access to higher education in response to the increasing higher education needs and demands of a growing statewide population; and
    - Develop into a comprehensive university campus that graduates students that can meet the needs of regional and statewide employers, while preserving and enhancing the quality of campus life.

2. Implement strategies to facilitate student academic success, academic excellence, institutional capacity, and regional stewardship.
3. Focus new building development on existing paved and developed infill sites on the Main Campus to provide compact and clustered development and make efficient use of campus land.
4. Provide and concentrate facilities for expansion of academic programs and administrative functions on the Main Campus, in or near the campus core to:
    - Create a compact campus core;
    - Provide synergies between existing and new educational and research programs;
    - Provide for a 10-minute walking distance from transportation hubs and between classroom buildings;
    - Facilitate use of shared resources among programs, such as classroom and lab space;
    - Facilitate faculty and student interaction; and
    - Promote an environment conducive to learning.
5. Provide on-campus housing for 60 percent of FTES and 65 percent of FTE faculty and staff to reduce vehicle trips to campus, meet other Master Plan Guideline's sustainability priorities and objectives, and promote recruitment, retention and engagement of faculty and staff.
6. Provide a diversity of housing types to serve a broad range of student, faculty and staff housing needs.
7. Create a unique campus character through buildings, outdoor spaces, pathways, bikeways, and roadways that connect those spaces while also producing a sense of community on campus.
8. Provide emphasis on pedestrian access and alternative transportation and attain a modal shift from vehicles to more pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use by:
    - Establishing bicycle and pedestrian networks that provide safe, direct, and attractive connections to work and school;
    - Establishing restrictions to general vehicle travel through the campus core and locate vehicle circulation and parking on the campus periphery to provide for a walkable campus core; and
    - Providing other land development strategies (e.g., multimodal hubs) to support TDM (Transportation Demand Management), which is intended to reduce drive-alone travel modes and encourage greater use of transit, walking, and bicycle commuting and reduce dependence on automobiles.

9. Preserve and enhance natural open spaces and develop formal open spaces so they become integral to the character of the campus.
10. Integrate natural and formal open spaces into the framework for capital development. Organize the built environment around an open space network to integrate the natural and built environments and enhance outdoor learning, social interaction, recreation, and the overall campus ambiance.

6.3 OVERVIEW OF SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF PROPOSED PROJECT

The range of alternatives studied in the EIR must be broad enough to permit a reasoned choice by decision-makers when considering the merits of the Project. The analysis should focus on alternatives that are feasible. Under CEQA, alternatives that are remote or speculative should not be discussed in the analysis of alternatives. Furthermore, alternatives must avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project (CEQA Guidelines 15126.6[a]). Chapter 1, Executive Summary, presents a detailed summary of the environmental impacts associated with implementation of the Project (see Table 1-1). Campus growth under the Project would result in the following potentially significant impacts:

Biological Resources:

- **Impact BIO-1:** The Project could result in substantial adverse effects to special-status plant and wildlife species and their habitat.
- **Impact BIO-2:** The Project could result in a substantial adverse effect on riparian habitat or other sensitive community as identified in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, or on state or federally protected wetlands.

Cultural Resources:

- **Impact CULT-1:** The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of unique archaeological resources or historic resources of an archaeological nature.
- **Impact CULT-2:** The Project could inadvertently disturb human remains.
- **Impact CULT-3:** The Project could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource.

Geology and Soils:

- **Impact GEO-5:** Project construction could directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions:

- **Impact GHG-1:** The Project would generate GHG emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment.
- **Impact GHG-2:** The Project may conflict with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases. Specifically, the Project may conflict with CARB's Scoping Plan and related GHG reduction targets for 2030 and 2050, but would not conflict with the CSU Sustainability Policy, the CSUMB Campus Sustainability Plan, or AMBAG's 2040 MTP/SCS.

Noise and Vibration:

- **Impact NOI-1:** The Project would generate a substantial temporary construction-related increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.
- **Impact NOI-2:** The Project would generate a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the Project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies.

Most of the potentially significant impacts listed above can be reduced to less than significant through incorporation of mitigation measures identified in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. The Proposed Project, however, would have a significant and unavoidable impact related to **Impact NOI-2**. Given that there are no feasible mitigation measures that the University can implement to reduce roadway noise to less than significant at one off-campus location (ST-7), located at Sixth Avenue and Gigling Road, the Project roadway noise impact would be considered significant and unavoidable. However, as indicated in Impact NOI-4, the cumulative impact of the Project related to roadway noise is less than significant, as the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact does not exceed the threshold.

6.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT ELIMINATED

This section discusses alternatives that were considered for the Project but were eliminated from detailed consideration and evaluation because they did not meet most of the basic project objectives, were found to be infeasible for technical, environmental, or social reasons, and/or did not avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant environmental impacts of the Project. Section 15126.6(c) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that the range of potential alternatives shall include those that could feasibly accomplish most of the basic objectives of the project and could avoid or substantially lessen one or more of the significant effects. The EIR should briefly describe the rationale for selecting the alternatives to be discussed. The EIR should also identify any alternatives that were considered by the lead agency but were rejected as infeasible, and briefly explain the reasons underlying the lead agency's determination. Among the factors that may be

used to eliminate alternatives from detailed consideration in an EIR are: (1) failure to meet most of the basic project objectives, (2) infeasibility (see introduction to this Chapter), or (3) inability to avoid significant environmental impacts.

6.4.1 Alternative Site Plans

In the course of the development of the proposed Master Plan, CSUMB considered a number of urban design concept alternatives to accommodate the same growth in population and building space that is envisioned under the proposed Master Plan. These alternatives explored different configurations for the new academic facilities, housing, and other key uses on the Main Campus. However, these alternatives are not dramatically different from one another. The various urban design concept alternatives for the Main Campus are not evaluated in detail in this EIR as project alternatives, as they would not reduce or otherwise substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the Project, and the same level of growth would occur with all of these alternatives.

6.4.2 Off-Campus Alternatives

Alternative sites were not considered in detail during the master planning process for a number of reasons. CSUMB, like most university campuses, is long-established in its present location and represents a traditional campus typology, with educational instruction offered, for the most part, in a single geographic location. CSUMB is primarily an undergraduate institution with a critical mass of students and faculty and a diversity of course offerings designed to satisfy regional demand. The campus was opened in the fall of 1995 on the former Fort Ord military base following transfer of the land from the federal government to the CSU in the spring of 1994. As discussed in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, of this Draft EIR, many of the permanent buildings within Fort Ord became part of the CSUMB campus when the land was transferred to the CSU and were adapted to meet the needs of the university. Moving some of the educational programs and faculty to a new off-campus location or new satellite campus would not support the educational mission of CSUMB, as presented in the project objectives.

Additionally, CSUMB does not own or lease any other land that would be suitable for such a new off-campus site or new satellite campus that could provide for campus growth as anticipated in the proposed Master Plan. Off-campus sites are limited to the CSUMB University Corporation-owned building at Ryan Ranch, located at 8 Upper Ragsdale Drive, in the City of Monterey, that is approximately 41,000 gross square feet (GSF) and is occupied by University Corporation offices, Gear Up offices, Osher Lifelong Learning Institute (OLLI) offices and classrooms, and storage space; and 25,000 GSF of University Corporation-owned space at the Salinas City Center (National Steinbeck Center), located at 1 Main Street, in the City of Salinas, that provides office, storage, archival, and gallery space, a museum store, and meeting rooms.

Neither of these existing off-campus sites have sufficient space to support even a small portion of the proposed growth in enrollment and facilities contemplated by the Project. The two off-campus sites combined could support only approximately 3 percent of the net increase in space provided by the proposed Master Plan (approximately 2.6 million GSF). Additionally, such off-campus locations would not fulfill the basic project objectives, as they would not allow for the growth of the on-campus FTES enrollment cap to meet the needs of regional and statewide employers; would not concentrate facilities on the CSUMB campus to provide synergies between existing and new educational and research programs, a walkable campus, use of shared resources among programs, faculty and student interaction, and an environment conducive to learning; and would not provide for meeting the on-campus housing objectives to reduce vehicle trips to campus and meet other sustainability priorities and objectives.

Other off-site alternatives, such as the purchase of property for a new satellite campus, were also not considered as such off-site alternatives were considered potentially financially infeasible and would not fulfill most of the basic project objectives summarized above. Operational costs for CSU off-campus locations, such as those associated with additional staff, physical plant, and other institutional support, are additive to the budgets for campuses without any savings to that campus; for this reason, off-campus locations are typically required to be at least partially self-supporting, translating to potentially higher costs for students.

Additionally, the construction of a new satellite campus has the potential to result in additional significant and unavoidable impacts, as compared to the Project which provides infill development on the CSUMB campus on already paved or developed sites. The CSUMB campus is one of the least densely developed campuses in the CSU and has ample space within existing campus boundaries to accommodate planned growth.

6.5 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED IN DETAIL

This section describes the alternatives to the Project that were selected and analyzed according to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(a) after elimination of some considered alternatives as explained in Section 6.4, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated. As required by the CEQA Guidelines, a No Project Alternative is also analyzed. This section presents an evaluation of the three selected alternatives to the proposed Master Plan (see also Table 6-1):

- **Alternative 1: No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan** – This alternative assumes the continued implementation of the 2007 Master Plan. Planned growth as anticipated in the 2007 Master Plan would continue up to its planned capacity (8,500 FTES enrollment on campus), which would allow for limited development of academic facilities.
- **Alternative 2: Reduced Enrollment Alternative** – This alternative would involve reduced enrollment growth on the campus, to a maximum of 10,500 FTES enrollment,

and an associated reduction in new building space and housing, as compared to the Project, which provides for 12,700 FTES.

- **Alternative 3: Expanded Housing Growth Alternative** – This alternative would maintain the same proposed student enrollment growth to a maximum of 12,700 FTES as proposed under the Project; however, additional student beds would be provided on campus to house approximately 70 percent of students on campus, in comparison to 60 percent of students under the Project. The net increase in building space would also increase under this alternative to accommodate the additional housing.

Table 6-1
Alternatives Summary

Project Components	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan	Alternative 2 Reduced Enrollment Alternative	Alternative 3 Expanded Housing Growth Alternative
Enrollment Cap (FTES)	12,700	8,500	10,500	12,700
Net Increase in Building Space	2.6 million GSF	0.17 million GSF	1.7 million GSF	3 million GSF
Net Increase in Housing Beds and Units	3,820 beds 757 units	None	2,450 beds 485 units	5,020 beds 757 units
Near-Term Development Components	Yes	Only Academic IV and Academic V	Yes	Yes
Project Design Features	Yes	No	Yes	Yes

6.5.1 Assumptions and Methodology

The alternatives analysis is presented as a comparative analysis to the Project. For each alternative, a brief description is presented, followed by a summary impact analysis relative to the Project, and an assessment of the degree to which the alternative would meet the project objectives.

The impact analysis focuses on whether the alternative would avoid or reduce significant impacts of the Project or cause other new or increased impacts. The alternatives analysis assumes that all applicable mitigation measures (MM) recommended for the Project would also apply to potentially significant environmental impacts of each alternative, except for Alternative 1, No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan. However, similar project design features and mitigation measures are identified in the 2007 Master Plan EIR (DDA 2009) that would apply under the Alternative 1. The following analysis compares the potentially significant environmental impacts of the three alternatives with those of the Project for the environmental topics analyzed in Chapter 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. A significance finding for each impact is provided, as well as an indication as to whether the impact would be greater or

lesser, as compared to the Project. A summary of the alternatives analysis conclusions is provided in Section 6.5, Environmentally Superior Alternative and shown in Tables 6-2 and 6-3.

6.5.2 Alternative 1: No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan

6.5.2.1 Description

As required by the CEQA Guidelines, an EIR's alternatives analysis must include consideration of the No Project Alternative. The "No Project" analysis discusses "the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published…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" (Cal. Code Regs. tit. 14, § 15126.6 (e)(2) and (3)(A)). In certain instances, the no project alternative means 'no build,' wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not necessarily result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project's non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment" (Section 15126[e][3][B]).

Under the No Project Alternative, the proposed Master Plan and an enrollment cap increase to 12,700 FTES would not be adopted, and the campus would continue to operate under the previously adopted 2007 Master Plan, as amended most recently in 2016. As the 2007 Master Plan is the existing plan for the campus, implementation of this plan would continue if the CSU does not adopt the proposed Master Plan and associated FTES increase for the campus.

Under the No Project Alternative, the campus would not be able to increase on-campus enrollment above 8,500 FTES, as authorized by the existing 2007 Master Plan. Given that during the 2016-2017 academic school year, CSUMB's total enrollment was 6,634 FTES, some modest amount of additional FTES growth could be achieved under the existing Master Plan (approximately 1,866 FTES). While the existing Master Plan does identify multiple sites for new academic buildings, housing, and other uses, FTES capacity beyond 8,500 FTES cannot be built until an enrollment ceiling increase is approved by the CSU Board of Trustees. Based on the approved 2007 Master Plan, as amended through 2016, Academic IV and Academic V could potentially be implemented under Alternative 1, which would provide for approximately 172,000 GSF of additional space to accommodate the remaining FTES increase under the 2007 Master Plan. As indicated in Chapter 3, Project Description, Academic IV and Academic V are near-term development components of the Project but are also included in the approved 2007 Master Plan. For the purposes of this analysis, it is assumed that no new on-campus housing would be built under Alternative 1. Additionally, the proposed PDFs associated with the Project would not be implemented under this alternative.

6.5.2.2 Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Project impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare would be less than significant (see Impact AES-1 through Impact AES-3).

Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that very limited development would be implemented under this alternative, based on the approved 2007 Master Plan, which identifies Academic IV and Academic V as being located on the same sites as under the Project. Both buildings would involve infill development on existing development sites and demolition of existing buildings and parking lots. Similar to the Project overall, development on these sites under Alternative 1 would also not be visible from Highway 1 and would not otherwise significantly impact scenic vistas, scenic quality or light and glare. Development of Academic IV and V under the 2007 Master Plan and this alternative would also be subject to the CSU design review process, the CSU Outdoor Lighting Design Guide, and the CALGreen-mandated BUG (Backlight/Uplight/Glare) ratings, which would reduce impacts to visual resources and light pollution and glare (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics). Overall, aesthetic impacts under Alternative 1 would be reduced as compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Air Quality

As described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, Project impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air plan, criteria air pollutant emissions, exposure to substantial pollutant emissions, and emissions affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant (see Impact AIR-1 through Impact AIR-4).

Impacts related to air quality would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that very limited development would be implemented under this alternative, based on the approved 2007 Master Plan. Given the limits on development under Alternative 1, construction and operational emissions associated with this alternative also would not exceed the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, as reported for the Project in Section 4.1, Air Quality. Overall, air quality impacts under Alternative 1 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant; reduced)*.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Project impacts related to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-BIO-1a through MM-BIO-1g, and MM-BIO-2) (see Impact BIO-1 and Impact BIO-2). Project impacts related to wildlife corridors and conflicts with policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant (see Impact BIO-3 and Impact BIO-4). The Project would result in no impacts related to conflicts with an adopted HCP (see Impact BIO-5).

Alternative 1 impacts related to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would also be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of the mitigation measures from the 2007 Master Plan EIR. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative, and therefore the potential to result in direct or indirect impacts to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would be correspondingly reduced *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact)*.

Impacts related to wildlife corridors and conflicts with policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that very limited development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Cultural Resources

As described in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, Project impacts related to unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c, and MM-CUL-2) (see Impact CUL-1 through Impact CUL-3). The Project would result in no impacts related to historic built environment resources.

Alternative 1 impacts related to unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would also be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of the mitigation measures from the 2007 Master Plan EIR. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative and therefore the potential to encounter unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would be correspondingly reduced *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact)*.

Geology, Soils and Paleontology

As described in Section 4.5, Geology, Soils and Paleontology, Project impacts related to seismic hazards, landslides, soil erosion, and unstable geologic units or soils would be less than significant (see Impact GEO-1 through Impact GEO-4). Project impacts related to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GEO-1) (see Impact GEO-5). The Project would result in no impacts related to earthquake fault rupture, expansive soils and septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Impacts related to seismic hazards, landslides, soil erosion, and unstable geologic units or soils would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Impacts related to paleontological resources under Alternative 1 would also be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GEO-1). However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project, as the potential to encounter paleontological resources would be reduced due to the limits on development under this alternative *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact)*.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As described in Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Project impacts related to the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and conflicts with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GHG-1) (see Impact GHG-1 and Impact GHG-2).

Impacts related to GHG would be less than significant for Alternative 1 and would not require mitigation measures to reduce impacts, given the limits on development under this alternative. Similar to the Project, Alternative 1 would comply with the CSU Sustainability Policy through meeting the State building code requirements, including use of energy-efficient HVAC systems, installing LED lighting, retrofitting campus water fixtures to reduce consumption, and compliance with waste recycling requirements. Overall, impacts related to GHG emissions under Alternative 1 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire

As described in Section 4.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, Project impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; upset and release of hazardous materials; hazardous materials use near schools; emergency response; and wildfire hazards would

be less than significant (see Impact HAZ-1 through Impact HAZ-5). The Project would result in no impacts related to airport safety.

Impacts related to hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. As under the Project, construction under this alternative would comply with requirements to report on and abate hazardous building materials or other hazardous materials site conditions, as well as implement standard CSU construction specifications, in accordance with the Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM). The State Water Resources Board Construction General Permit, which requires a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), would also be implemented on each site, which would avoid or minimize the release of contaminants during construction. As under the Project, operations under this alternative would continue to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations. Additionally, review of building designs under Alternative 1 by CSU building officials and the State Fire Marshal would ensure compliance with the California Building Code regulations related to the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials, as well as related to access, fire and life safety. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, Project impacts related to surface water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, groundwater supplies and recharge, and stormwater drainage patterns would be less than significant (see Impact HYD-1 through Impact HYD-3). The Project would result in no impacts related to groundwater quality and flooding-related risks.

Impacts related to hydrology and water would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative. Similar to the Project overall, Alternative 1 would not discharge into the Monterey Bay or CWA Section 303(d)-listed water bodies (e.g., the Lower Salinas River); would implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) on each site, which would avoid or minimize erosion and sedimentation; would implement Low Impact Development (LID) features in the design of these components in compliance with the CSUMB Stormwater Master Plan to infiltrate stormwater; and would comply with Title 24 to reduce demand for potable water from groundwater. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 1 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Land Use and Planning

As described in Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning, Project impacts related to physically dividing an established community and conflicts with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for

the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would be less than significant (see Impact LDU-1 and Impact LDU-2).

Impacts related to land use and planning would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. Alternative 1 would not physically divide an established community given that Academic VI and Academic VI would be developed on infill development sites on the Main Campus and would not otherwise result in the construction of physical barriers or removal or impairment of access to the campus or surrounding areas. Alternative 1 would also not conflict with relevant local general plan policies or the Marina Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Noise and Vibration

As described in Section 4.10, Noise and Vibration, Project impacts related to temporary construction noise would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-NOI-1) (see Impacts NOI-1). Project impacts related to permanent operational noise would be significant and unavoidable at one off-campus location due to the Project's contribution to roadway noise (see Impact NOI-2). However, as indicated in Impact NOI-4, the cumulative impact of the Project related to roadway noise would be less than significant, as the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact does not exceed the threshold. Project impacts related to vibration would be less than significant (see Impact NOI-3). Lastly, the Project would have no impacts related to airport noise.

Alternative 1 impacts related to temporary construction noise would also be less than significant with the implementation of an identified mitigation measure from the 2007 Master Plan EIR. Additionally, vibration impacts of Alternative 1 would also be less than significant. However, construction noise and vibration impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative. Overall, temporary construction noise under Alternative 1 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact)*. Vibration impacts would also be reduced compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Given the limited development under Alternative 1, it is likely that the significant and unavoidable roadway noise impact associated with operations would be reduced to less than significant under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Population and Housing

As described in Section 4.11, Population and Housing, Project impacts related to inducing substantial unplanned population growth and displacing substantial numbers of existing people or

housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would be less than significant (see Impact POP-1 and Impact POP-2).

Impacts related to population and housing would also be less than significant for Alternative 1, as this alternative would also not result in substantial unplanned population growth given that the 2018 AMBAG Regional Growth Forecast assumes 12,000 FTES for campus enrollment by 2025. Like the Project, Alternative 1 would not displace people or housing. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development and enrollment under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Public Services and Recreation

As described in Section 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, Project impacts related to the provision of new or physically altered fire, police, schools and parks and recreation facilities, and the physical deterioration of parks and recreation facilities would be less than significant (see Impact PSR-1 through Impact PSR-5).

Impacts related to public services and recreation would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. While Alternative 1 would result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire, police, schools and parks and recreation services, the limited enrollment increase and building development would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire, police, schools and parks and recreation facilities that could cause significant environmental impacts. Alternative 1 would also not result in the physical deterioration of parks and recreation facilities. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Transportation

As described in Section 4.13, Transportation, Project impacts related to conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, vehicle miles travelled (VMT), design hazards, and emergency access would be less than significant (see Impact TRA-1 through Impact TRA-4).

Level of service (LOS) was the basis for evaluating transportation impacts of the 2007 Master Plan in 2007 Master Plan EIR. Recent legislation in California, Senate Bill 743, changed the metric by which significant transportation impacts under CEQA are assessed from LOS, to VMT. Transportation mitigation measures contained in the 2007 Master Plan EIR required CSUMB to conduct traffic counts to monitor increases in campus-related trip generation. A baseline traffic level tied to Fall 2008 levels was established at 8,550 average daily vehicle trips, with the allowable increase capped at 4,361 additional average daily trips, for a total of 12,911 average daily trips. Above this level, the 2007 Master Plan EIR determined that significant traffic impacts could occur, based on the LOS analysis included in that EIR. As indicated in Chapter 3, Project Description,

CSUMB is obligated to undertake further environmental review prior to exceedance of this cap to assess the potential for corresponding significant environmental impacts, or, absent further environmental review, to decrease impacts by increasing TDM measures or limiting campus growth, including enrollment growth.

Since 2008, CSUMB has conducted the required traffic counts to determine the number of vehicle trips generated by the 2007 Master Plan, and with one exception, the annual total of campus-related average daily vehicle trips has gradually increased due primarily to increasing enrollment. For the fall of 2019, which reflects existing conditions prior to COVID-19 pandemic, the campus generated 11,626 trips per day, which remains under the allowable annual cap (Higgins 2021).

If Alternative 1 is selected, the trip cap from the 2007 Master Plan EIR would continue to apply to the campus. Based on the existing trips per day presented above, there appears to be some limited remaining capacity on the campus to grow under the 2007 Master Plan and not exceed the annual cap; however, under Alternative 1, annual trip counts would continue to be conducted to verify that the campus remains under the allowable annual cap.

Academic IV and Academic V are included in the 2007 Master Plan, are assumed to be developed under Alternative 1, and are also near-term development components of the Project. Based on the evaluation in Section 4.13, Transportation, the VMT impacts of Alternative 1 would be less than significant, similar to the Project, given the limited additional enrollment and development that would result under this alternative. Other transportation impact categories including conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, design hazards, and emergency access would also be less than significant. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Utilities and Energy

As described in Section 4.14, Utilities and Energy, Project impacts related to the construction of new or replacement water, wastewater treatment, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, adequacy of water supplies and wastewater treatment capacity, solid waste, and energy use would be less than significant (see Impact UTL-1 through Impact UTL-6).

Impacts related to utilities and energy would also be less than significant for Alternative 1. Like the Project, Alternative 1 would not require new or upgraded potable water, recycled water infrastructure, or wastewater infrastructure identified in Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) Water Master Plan, Recycled Water Master Plan, and Sewer Master Plan. Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve development under Alternative 1 and reasonably foreseeable future development in the service area during normal, dry, and multiple-dry years, as CSUMB would not exceed and would be well under the University's allocated water supplies. Alternative 1 would

not generate solid waste in excess of state standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Alternative 1 would also not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, with compliance with ICSUAM and Title 24 Energy Codes. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given the limits on development under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

6.5.2.3 Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Alternative 1 would not meet most of the identified project objectives (see Table 6-3). Specifically, while Alternative 1 would allow for an increase of approximately 1,866 FTES up to the existing enrollment cap of 8,500 FTES, it would not support the University's educational mission to accommodate student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES (Objective #1). Such an increase in enrollment would provide expanded access to higher education in response to the increasing higher education needs and demands of a growing statewide population and would allow CSUMB to develop into a comprehensive university campus that graduates students that can meet the needs of regional and statewide employers.

Alternative 1 would also not implement strategies to facilitate institutional capacity (Objective #2), provide on-campus housing or a diversity of housing types (Objectives #5 and #6), contribute to providing a unique campus character (Objective #7), and provide emphasis on pedestrian access and alternative transportation and attain a modal shift from vehicles to alternatives modes of transportation (Objective #8). Alternative 1 also would not meet objectives related to natural and formal open spaces, as proposed under the Project (Objectives #9 and #10).

Given that Alternative 1 would implement Academic IV and Academic V on or near the campus core on already paved and developed infill sites, it would partially meet Objectives #3, but would not meet Objective #4, as it would not create a compact campus core.

6.5.3 Alternative 2: Reduced Enrollment Growth Alternative

6.5.3.1 Description

The primary objective of the Project is to accommodate an increase in the on-campus enrollment to 12,700 FTES, which is an increase of 4,200 FTES over the existing cap of 8,500 FTES on campus, and an increase of 6,066 FTES over existing 2016-2017 enrollment. CSU campuses typically grow in 5,000 FTES increments, as providing for lower increments of growth does not typically provide for a long enough period of growth for the campus before needing to seek another enrollment increase. Based on the proposed Master Plan, it is anticipated that the proposed 12,700 FTES cap would allow for about a 15-year period of growth on the campus.

Alternative 2 provides for a reduced enrollment growth that considers an increase in the on-campus enrollment to 10,500 FTES, which would provide about an 8-year period of growth on the campus. Ultimately, CSUMB and the CSU Board of Trustees would need to determine whether such an alternative is feasible given the time and expense involved in developing the proposed Master Plan and EIR. However, such a reduced enrollment growth alternative is potentially feasible and therefore is evaluated herein.

To support the lower enrollment growth, the net increase in building space under Alternative 2 would be reduced to approximately 1.7 million GSF, as compared to 2.6 million GSF with the Project. Likewise, the net increase in housing would be reduced to approximately 2,450 student beds and 485 units for faculty and staff, which would allow the campus to house 60 percent of students and 65 percent of faculty and staff per PDF-MO-1 and PDF-MO-2. The above growth would include development of all five of the near-term development components of the Project (i.e., Academic IV, Academic V, Student Housing IIB, Student Housing III, and Student Recreation Phases I and II). Alternative 2 would also focus development on the Main Campus on already paved and developed sites in a similar pattern as the Project; however, fewer buildings would be required to support the enrollment increase, as compared to the Project. All other proposed PDFs associated with the Project would also be implemented under this alternative.

6.5.3.2 Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Project impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare would be less than significant (see Impact AES-1 through Impact AES-3).

Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative. Given that Alternative 2 would also focus development on the Main Campus on already paved and developed sites in a similar pattern as the Project, development on these sites under Alternative 2 would also not be visible from Highway 1 and would not otherwise significantly impact scenic vistas, scenic quality or light and glare. Development under this alternative would also be subject to the CSU design review process, the CSU Outdoor Lighting Design Guide, and the CALGreen-mandated BUG (Backlight/Uplight/Glare) ratings, which would reduce impacts to visual resources and light pollution and glare (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics). Overall, aesthetic impacts under Alternative 2 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact).*

Air Quality

As described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, Project impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air plan, criteria air pollutant emissions, exposure to substantial pollutant emissions, and emissions affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant (see Impact AIR-1 through Impact AIR-4).

Impacts related to air quality would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative. Given that development would be reduced under Alternative 2, as compared to the Project, construction and operational emissions associated with this alternative also would not exceed the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, as reported for the Project in Section 4.1, Air Quality. Overall, air quality impacts under Alternative 2 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact).*

Biological Resources

As described in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Project impacts related to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-BIO-1a through MM-BIO-1g, and MM-BIO-2) (see Impact BIO-1 and Impact BIO-2). Project impacts related to wildlife corridors and conflicts with policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant (see Impact BIO-3 and Impact BIO-4). The Project would result in no impacts related to conflicts with an adopted HCP (see Impact BIO-5).

Alternative 2 impacts related to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would also be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-BIO-1a through MM-BIO-1g, and MM-BIO-2). However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative, as compared to the Project, and therefore the potential to result in direct or indirect impacts to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would be correspondingly reduced *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact).*

Impacts related to wildlife corridors and conflicts with policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact).*

Cultural Resources

As described in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, Project impacts related to unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c, and MM-CUL-2) (see Impact CUL-1 through Impact CUL-3). The Project would result in no impacts related to historic built environment resources.

Alternative 2 impacts related to unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would also be reduced to less than significant with mitigation (MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c, and MM-CUL-2). However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative and therefore the potential to encounter unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would be correspondingly reduced *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact).*

Geology, Soils and Paleontology

As described in Section 4.5, Geology, Soils and Paleontology, Project impacts related to seismic hazards, landslides, soil erosion, and unstable geologic units or soils would be less than significant (see Impact GEO-1 through Impact GEO-4). Project impacts related to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GEO-1) (see Impact GEO-5). The Project would result in no impacts related to earthquake fault rupture, expansive soils and septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Impacts related to seismic hazards, landslides, soil erosion, and unstable geologic units or soils would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact).*

Impacts related to paleontological resources under Alternative 2 would also be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GEO-1). However, impacts would be reduced, as compared to the Project, as the potential to encounter paleontological resources would be reduced given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact).*

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As described in Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Project impacts related to the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and conflicts with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted

for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GHG-1) (see Impact GHG-1 and Impact GHG-2).

Alternative 2 impacts related to GHG would be reduced as compared to the Project but the implementation of mitigation (MM-GHG-1) would likely still be required to reduce the impact to less than significant. Similar to the Project, Alternative 2 would comply with the CSU Sustainability Policy through meeting the State building code requirements, including use of energy-efficient HVAC systems, installing LED lighting, retrofitting campus water fixtures to reduce consumption, and compliance with waste recycling requirements. Overall, impacts related to GHG emissions under Alternative 2 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact).*

Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire

As described in Section 4.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, Project impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; upset and release of hazardous materials; hazardous materials use near schools; emergency response; and wildfire hazards would be less than significant (see Impact HAZ-1 through Impact HAZ-5). The Project would result in no impacts related to airport safety.

Impacts related to hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. As under the Project, construction under this alternative would comply with requirements to report on and abate hazardous building materials or other hazardous materials site conditions, as well as implement standard CSU construction specifications, in accordance with the Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM). The State Water Resources Board Construction General Permit, which requires a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), would also be implemented on each site, which would avoid or minimize the release of contaminants during construction. As under the Project, operations under this alternative would continue to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations. Additionally, review of building designs under Alternative 1 by CSU building officials and the State Fire Marshal would ensure compliance with the California Building Code regulations related to the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials, as well as related to access, fire and life safety. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact).*

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, Project impacts related to surface water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, groundwater supplies and recharge, and stormwater drainage patterns would be less than significant (see Impact HYD-1 through

Impact HYD-3). The Project would result in no impacts related to groundwater quality and flooding-related risks.

Impacts related to hydrology and water would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. However, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative. Similar to the Project overall, Alternative 2 would not discharge into the Monterey Bay or CWA Section 303(d)-listed water bodies (e.g., the Lower Salinas River); would implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) on each site, which would avoid or minimize erosion and sedimentation; would implement Low Impact Development (LID) features in the design of these components in compliance with the CSUMB Stormwater Master Plan to infiltrate stormwater; and would comply with Title 24 to reduce demand for potable water from groundwater. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 2 would be reduced as compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Land Use and Planning

As described in Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning, Project impacts related to physically dividing an established community and conflicts with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would be less than significant (see Impact LDU-1 and Impact LDU-2).

Impacts related to land use and planning would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. Like the Project, Alternative 2 would not physically divide an established community as it would build on infill development sites on the Main Campus and would not otherwise result in the construction of physical barriers or removal or impairment of access to the campus or surrounding areas. Alternative 2 would also not conflict with relevant local general plan policies or the Marina Land Use Compatibility Plan. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Noise and Vibration

As described in Section 4.10, Noise and Vibration, Project impacts related to temporary construction noise would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-NOI-1) (see Impacts NOI-1). Project impacts related to permanent operational noise would be significant and unavoidable at one off-campus location due to the Project's contribution to roadway noise (see Impact NOI-2). However, as indicated in Impact NOI-4, the cumulative impact of the Project related to roadway noise would be less than significant, as the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact does not exceed the threshold. Project impacts related to vibration would be less than significant (see Impact NOI-3). Lastly, the Project would have no impacts related to airport noise.

Alternative 2 impacts related to temporary construction noise would also be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-NOI-1). Additionally, vibration impacts of Alternative 2 would also be less than significant. However, construction noise and vibration impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative. Overall, temporary construction noise under Alternative 2 would be reduced, as compared to the Project *(less than significant with mitigation; lesser impact)*. Vibration impacts would also be reduced compared to the Project *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Given that less development would be implemented under Alternative 2, it is likely that the significant and unavoidable roadway noise impact associated with operations would be reduced to less than significant under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Population and Housing

As described in Section 4.11, Population and Housing, Project impacts related to inducing substantial unplanned population growth and displacing substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would be less than significant (see Impact POP-1 and Impact POP-2).

Impacts related to population and housing would also be less than significant for Alternative 2, as this alternative would also not result in substantial unplanned population growth given that the 2018 AMBAG Regional Growth Forecast assumes 12,000 FTES by 2025. Like the Project, Alternative 2 would not displace people or housing. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development and enrollment would result under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Public Services and Recreation

As described in Section 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, Project impacts related to the provision of new or physically altered fire, police, schools and parks and recreation facilities, and the physical deterioration of parks and recreation facilities would be less than significant (see Impact PSR-1 through Impact PSR-5).

Impacts related to public services and recreation would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. While Alternative 2 would result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire, police, schools and parks and recreation services, the reduced enrollment increase and building development would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire, police, schools and parks and recreation facilities that could cause significant environmental impacts. Alternative 2 would also not result in the physical deterioration of parks and recreation facilities. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Transportation

As described in Section 4.13, Transportation, Project impacts related to conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, VMT, design hazards, and emergency access would be less than significant (see Impact TRA-1 through Impact TRA-4).

Impacts related to transportation would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. Alternative 2 would result in less development than the Project, to accommodate a reduced enrollment increase to 10,500 FTES, and would provide for additional on campus housing to meet the same housing objectives of the Project (60 percent of students and 65 percent of faculty and staff) per PDF-MO-1 and PDF-MO-2. Given that less development would be implemented under this alternative and the above housing goals would be met, which reduces VMT, Alternative 2 would not result in significant VMT impacts. Other mobility PDFs (e.g., expansion of TDM strategies) would also be implemented under this alternative, which would reduce VMT. Other transportation impact categories including conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, design hazards, and emergency access would also be less than significant. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Utilities and Energy

As described in Section 4.14, Utilities and Energy, Project impacts related to the construction of new or replacement water, wastewater treatment, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, adequacy of water supplies and wastewater treatment capacity, solid waste, and energy use would be less than significant (see Impact UTL-1 through Impact UTL-6).

Impacts related to utilities and energy would also be less than significant for Alternative 2. Like the Project, Alternative 2 would not require new or upgraded potable water, recycled water infrastructure, or wastewater infrastructure identified in Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) Water Master Plan, Recycled Water Master Plan, and Sewer Master Plan. Sufficient water supplies would be available to serve development under Alternative 2 and reasonably foreseeable future development in the service area during normal, dry, and multiple-dry years, as CSUMB would not exceed and would be well under the University's allocated water supplies. Alternative 2 would not generate solid waste in excess of state standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. Alternative 2 would also not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, with compliance with ICSUAM and Title 24 Energy Codes. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that less development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

6.5.3.3 Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Alternative 2 would partially but not fully meet most of the identified project objectives (see Table 6-3). Specifically, while Alternative 2 would allow for an increase of approximately 3,900 FTES up to an increased enrollment cap of 10,500 FTES, it would not fully support the University's educational mission to accommodate student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES (Objective #1). Such an increase in enrollment would provide expanded access to higher education in response to the increasing higher education needs and demands of a growing statewide population and would allow CSUMB to develop into a comprehensive university campus that graduates students that can meet the needs of regional and statewide employers.

Alternative 2 would partially meet the objective to implement strategies to facilitate institutional capacity (Objective #2) and contribute to providing a unique campus character (Objective #7) given that less development would be implemented under this alternative. With less development on the Main Campus, Alternative 2 would not fully meet the objective of creating a compact campus core and walkable environment (Objective #4), which in turn would impair the ability to fully meet the objective to provide emphasis on pedestrian access and alternative transportation and attain a modal shift from vehicles to alternatives modes of transportation (Objective #8). Alternative 2 also would not fully meet objectives related to natural and formal open spaces, as proposed by under Project (Objectives #9 and #10), given that less development would result in less formal open spaces being integrated into the campus.

Alternative 2 would meet the objective of focusing development on the Main Campus on already paved and developed sites (Objective #3). Given that Alternative 2 would meet the on-campus housing goals for students, faculty and staff, this alternative would also meet the housing objectives for the Project (Objectives #5 and #6).

6.5.4 Alternative 3: Expanded Housing Growth Alternative

This alternative considers an increase in the amount of on-campus housing to reduce trip generation associated with the Project. While the Project would not result in significant transportation impacts related to VMT, it would result in a roadway noise level increase at one off-campus location (ST-7) located at Sixth Avenue and Gigling Road, along the southern edge of the Main Campus, that would be potentially significant. Additional housing could be accommodated on the Main Campus in areas identified as development reserve located in proximity to other existing and proposed housing (see Chapter 3, Project Description, Figure 3-6). This alternative would provide for a projected increase of 5,020 student beds (an increase of 1,200 student beds over the 3,820 beds contemplated by the Project), which would allow for housing approximately 70 percent of students on campus, instead of 60 percent proposed under the Project per PDF-MO-1 and PDF-MO-2. This increase in student bed spaces would also result

a greater net increase in building space (3 million GSF), as compared to the Project (2.6 million GSF). This alternative would include development of all five of the near-term development components of the Project (i.e., Academic IV, Academic V, Student Housing IIB, Student Housing III, and Student Recreation Phases I and II). Alternative 3 would also focus development on the Main Campus on already paved and developed sites in a similar pattern as the Project, with the addition of housing on one or more of the sites designated as development reserve, as previously indicated. All proposed PDFs associated with the Project would also be implemented under this alternative; however, as indicated above, Alternative 3 would increase the percent of students housed on campus under the Project, as anticipated by PDF-MO-2.

Ultimately, CSUMB and the CSU Board of Trustees would need to determine whether development of 1,200 additional on-campus student beds under Alternative 3 is feasible and whether it would be fully occupied by the anticipated enrollment (12,700 FTES). However, such an expanded housing growth alternative is potentially feasible and therefore is evaluated herein.

6.5.4.1 Impact Analysis

Aesthetics

As described in Section 4.1, Aesthetics, Project impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare would be less than significant (see Impact AES-1 through Impact AES-3).

Impacts related to scenic vistas, scenic quality, and light and glare would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development, and thus more developed square footage overall, would be implemented under this alternative compared to the Project. Alternative 3 would focus development on the Main Campus on already paved and developed sites as under the Project, with the addition of housing on development reserve land in proximity to other existing or proposed housing. However, development on these sites under Alternative 3 would still not be visible from Highway 1 and would not otherwise significantly impact scenic vistas, scenic quality or light and glare. Development under this alternative would also be subject to the CSU design review process, the CSU Outdoor Lighting Design Guide, and the CALGreen-mandated BUG (Backlight/Uplight/Glare) ratings, which would reduce impacts to visual resources and light pollution and glare (see Section 4.1, Aesthetics). Overall, aesthetic impacts under Alternative 3 would be greater as compared to the Project *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Air Quality

As described in Section 4.2, Air Quality, Project impacts related to conflicts with the applicable air plan, criteria air pollutant emissions, exposure to substantial pollutant emissions, and emissions

affecting a substantial number of people would be less than significant (see Impact AIR-1 through Impact AIR-4).

Impacts related to air quality would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative. While development would be greater under Alternative 3, as compared to the Project, construction and operational emissions associated with this alternative also would not exceed the Monterey Bay Air Resources District (MBARD) significance thresholds for ROG, NO_x, CO, PM_{10}, and $PM_{2.5}$, as reported for the Project in Section 4.1, Air Quality. While area and energy emission sources would increase somewhat with Alternative 3, mobile emission sources would be reduced with the increase in on-campus housing and percentage of students housed on campus. Overall, air quality impacts under Alternative 3 would be greater, as compared to the Project *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Biological Resources

As described in Section 4.3, Biological Resources, Project impacts related to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-BIO-1a through MM-BIO-1g, and MM-BIO-2) (see Impact BIO-1 and Impact BIO-2). Project impacts related to wildlife corridors and conflicts with policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would be less than significant (see Impact BIO-3 and Impact BIO-4). The Project would result in no impacts related to conflicts with an adopted HCP (see Impact BIO-5).

Alternative 3 impacts related to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would also be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-BIO-1a through MM-BIO-1g, and MM-BIO-2). However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative, as compared to the Project, and therefore the potential to result in direct or indirect impacts to special-status species, and riparian and wetland habitat would be correspondingly greater *(less than significant with mitigation; greater impact)*.

Impacts related to wildlife corridors and conflicts with policies and ordinances protecting biological resources would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Cultural Resources

As described in Section 4.4, Cultural Resources, Project impacts related to unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural

resources would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c, and MM-CUL-2) (see Impact CUL-1 through Impact CUL-3). The Project would result in no impacts related to historic built environment resources.

Alternative 3 impacts related to unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would also be reduced to less than significant with mitigation (MM-CUL-1a through MM-CUL-1c, and MM-CUL-2). However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative and therefore the potential to encounter unique archaeological resources, historic resources of an archaeological nature, human remains, and tribal cultural resources would be correspondingly greater *(less than significant with mitigation; greater impact)*.

Geology, Soils and Paleontology

As described in Section 4.5, Geology, Soils and Paleontology, Project impacts related to seismic hazards, landslides, soil erosion, and unstable geologic units or soils would be less than significant (see Impact GEO-1 through Impact GEO-4). Project impacts related to paleontological resources would be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GEO-1) (see Impact GEO-5). The Project would result in no impacts related to earthquake fault rupture, expansive soils and septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems.

Impacts related to seismic hazards, landslides, soil erosion, and unstable geologic units or soils would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Impacts related to paleontological resources under Alternative 3 would also be reduced to less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GEO-1). However, impacts would be greater, as compared to the Project, as the potential to encounter paleontological resources would be greater given that more development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant with mitigation; greater impact)*.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

As described in Section 4.6, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Project impacts related to the generation of greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and conflicts with an applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GHG-1) (see Impact GHG-1 and Impact GHG-2).

Alternative 3 impacts related to GHG would also be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-GHG-1). However, impacts would likely be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative. While area, energy, solid waste, water, and wastewater sources of GHG emissions would increase under this alternative with more on-campus housing and development overall, mobile sources of GHG would be reduced with the increase in on-campus housing and percentage of students housed on campus. Similar to the Project, Alternative 3 would comply with the CSU Sustainability Policy through meeting the State building code requirements, including use of energy-efficient HVAC systems, installing LED lighting, retrofitting campus water fixtures to reduce consumption, and compliance with waste recycling requirements. Overall, impacts related to GHG emissions under Alternative 3 would be greater, as compared to the Project *(less than significant with mitigation; greater impact)*.

Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire

As described in Section 4.7, Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire, Project impacts related to routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials; upset and release of hazardous materials; hazardous materials use near schools; emergency response; and wildfire hazards would be less than significant (see Impact HAZ-1 through Impact HAZ-5). The Project would result in no impacts related to airport safety.

Impacts related to hazards, hazardous materials, and wildfire would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. As under the Project, construction under this alternative would comply with requirements to report on and abate hazardous building materials or other hazardous materials site conditions, as well as implement standard CSU construction specifications, in accordance with the Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM). The State Water Resources Board Construction General Permit, which requires a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), would also be implemented on each site, which would avoid or minimize the release of contaminants during construction. As under the Project, operations under this alternative would continue to comply with all applicable state and federal regulations. Additionally, review of building designs under Alternative 1 by CSU building officials and the State Fire Marshal would ensure compliance with the California Building Code regulations related to the use, storage, and handling of hazardous materials, as well as related to access, fire and life safety. Overall, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Hydrology and Water Quality

As described in Section 4.8, Hydrology and Water Quality, Project impacts related to surface water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, groundwater supplies and recharge,

and stormwater drainage patterns would be less than significant (see Impact HYD-1 through Impact HYD-3). The Project would result in no impacts related to groundwater quality and flooding-related risks.

Impacts related to hydrology and water would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative. Similar to the Project overall, Alternative 3 would not discharge into the Monterey Bay or CWA Section 303(d) listed water bodies (e.g., the Lower Salinas River); would implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) on each site, which would avoid or minimize erosion and sedimentation; would implement Low Impact Development (LID) features in the design of these components in compliance with the CSUMB Stormwater Master Plan to infiltrate stormwater; and would comply with Title 24 to reduce demand for potable water from groundwater. Overall, hydrology and water quality impacts under Alternative 3 would be greater, as compared to the Project *(less than significant; greater impact).*

Land Use and Planning

As described in Section 4.9, Land Use and Planning, Project impacts related to physically dividing an established community and conflicts with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect would be less than significant (see Impact LDU-1 and Impact LDU-2).

Impacts related to land use and planning would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. Like the Project, Alternative 3 would not physically divide an established community as it would build on infill development sites on the Main Campus and would not otherwise result in the construction of physical barriers or removal or impairment of access to the campus or surrounding areas. Development of additional housing under this alternative on development reserve sites near other housing would not result in such physical barriers or access issues, as such development would not change the circulation system of the campus. Alternative 3 would also not conflict with relevant local general plan policies or the Marina Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan. Overall, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under Alternative 3 *(less than significant; greater impact).*

Noise and Vibration

As described in Section 4.10, Noise and Vibration, Project impacts related to temporary construction noise would be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-NOI-1) (see Impacts NOI-1). Project impacts related to permanent operational noise would be significant and unavoidable at one off-campus location due to the Project's contribution to roadway noise (see Impact NOI-2). However, as indicated in Impact NOI-4, the cumulative

impact of the Project related to roadway noise would be less than significant, as the Project's contribution to the cumulative impact does not exceed the threshold. Project impacts related to vibration would be less than significant (see Impact NOI-3). Lastly, the Project would have no impacts related to airport noise.

Alternative 3 impacts related to temporary construction noise would also be less than significant with the implementation of mitigation (MM-NOI-1). Additionally, vibration impacts of Alternative 3 would also be less than significant. However, construction noise and vibration impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative. Overall, temporary construction noise under Alternative 3 would be greater, as compared to the Project *(less than significant with mitigation; greater impact)*. Vibration impacts would also be greater compared to the Project *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Given that more on-campus housing development would be implemented under Alternative 3, it is likely that the significant and unavoidable roadway noise impact associated with operations would be reduced to less than significant under this alternative, given that more on-campus housing would reduce vehicle trips to the campus *(less than significant; reduced impact)*.

Population and Housing

As described in Section 4.11, Population and Housing, Project impacts related to inducing substantial unplanned population growth and displacing substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere would be less than significant (see Impact POP-1 and Impact POP-2).

Impacts related to population and housing would also be less than significant for Alternative 3, as this alternative would also not result in substantial unplanned population growth given that the 2018 AMBAG Regional Growth Forecast assumes 12,000 FTES by 2025. Like the Project, Alternative 3 would not displace people or housing. However, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Public Services and Recreation

As described in Section 4.12, Public Services and Recreation, Project impacts related to the provision of new or physically altered fire, police, schools and parks and recreation facilities, and the physical deterioration of parks and recreation facilities would be less than significant (see Impact PSR-1 through Impact PSR-5).

Impacts related to public services and recreation would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. Like the Project, Alternative 3 would result in an incremental increase in the demand for fire,

police, schools and parks and recreation services with the same enrollment increase as the Project. While Alternative 3 would result in more on-campus housing and associated residential population, it would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire, police, schools and parks and recreation facilities, the construction of which would result in significant impacts. Alternative 3 would also not result in the physical deterioration of parks and recreation facilities. Overall, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

Transportation

As described in Section 4.13, Transportation, Project impacts related to conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, VMT, design hazards, and emergency access would be less than significant (see Impact TRA-1 through Impact TRA-4).

Impacts related to transportation would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. Alternative 3 would result in the same enrollment but greater development than the Project, to accommodate additional on-campus housing (70 percent of students and 65 percent of faculty and staff), which exceeds the requirements of PDF-MO-2. While more development would be implemented under this alternative, the additional development would consist entirely of on-campus student housing to house a greater percentage of students on campus, which would reduce VMT, as compared to the Project, as fewer students would commute to the campus. Other mobility PDFs (e.g., expansion of TDM strategies) would also be implemented under this alternative, which would reduce VMT. Other transportation impact categories including conflicts with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, design hazards, and emergency access would also be less than significant. Overall, impacts would be reduced as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative, which would reduce VMT *(less than significant; lesser impact)*.

Utilities and Energy

As described in Section 4.14, Utilities and Energy, Project impacts related to the construction of new or replacement water, wastewater treatment, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, adequacy of water supplies and wastewater treatment capacity, solid waste, and energy use would be less than significant (see Impact UTL-1 through Impact UTL-6).

Impacts related to utilities and energy would also be less than significant for Alternative 3. Like the Project, Alternative 3 would not require new or upgraded potable water, recycled water infrastructure, or wastewater infrastructure identified in Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) Water Master Plan, Recycled Water Master Plan, and Sewer Master Plan. While Alternative 3 would result in more on-campus housing and somewhat greater water demand it would not exceed CSUMB's allocated water supplies for the campus or exceed the wastewater treatment

capacity of the regional wastewater treatment plant. Alternative 3 would not generate solid waste in excess of state standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. While electricity and natural gas use would increase under Alternative 3 with more on-campus housing, petroleum use would be reduced with the increase in on-campus housing and percentage of students housed on campus, which would reduce vehicle trips to the campus. Alternative 3 would not result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, with compliance with ICSUAM and Title 24 Energy Codes. Overall, impacts would be greater as compared to the Project given that more housing development would be implemented under this alternative *(less than significant; greater impact)*.

6.5.4.2 Ability to Meet Project Objectives

Alternative 3 would fully meet most of the identified project objectives (see Table 6-3). Specifically, Alternative 3 would fully support the University's educational mission to accommodate student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES, as it would increase the enrollment cap to 12,700 FTES and provide the physical development to accommodate such enrollment (Objective #1). Alternative 3 would fully meet the objective to implement strategies to facilitate institutional capacity (Objective #2) and contribute to providing a unique campus character (Objective #7) given that the same enrollment capacity and similar pattern of on-campus development would be implemented under this alternative. With somewhat more development on the Main Campus, Alternative 3 would fully meet the objective of creating a compact campus core and walkable environment (Objective #4), which in turn would meet the objective to provide emphasis on pedestrian access and alternative transportation and attain a modal shift from vehicles to alternatives modes of transportation (Objective #8). Given that Alternative 3 would meet and exceed the on-campus housing goals for students, faculty and staff, this alternative would also meet the housing objectives for the Project (Objectives #5 and #6).

Alternative 3 would partially meet the objective of focusing development on the Main Campus on already paved and developed sites, as it would require some housing development on development reserve sites, which are not all paved or developed (Objective #3). Likewise, Alternative 3 also would not fully meet objectives related to natural and formal open spaces, as proposed under the Project (Objectives #9 and #10), given that some development on existing open space located on campus development reserve sites could be required under this alternative.

6.6 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The CEQA Guidelines (Section 15126.6[a]) requires that an EIR's analysis of alternatives identify the "environmentally superior alternative" among all of those considered. In addition, Section 15126.6(e)(2) states that if the environmentally superior alternative is the No Project Alternative,

the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. Furthermore, Public Resources Code Sections 21002 and 21081 require lead agencies to adopt feasible mitigation measures or feasible alternatives in order to substantially lessen or avoid otherwise significant adverse environmental effects, unless specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other conditions make such mitigation measures or alternatives infeasible.

The analysis contained herein and the summary in Table 6-2 present a comparison of impacts between the Project and the alternatives. Alternative 1 (No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan) would reduce impacts in numerous impact categories and would reduce the significant and unavoidable operational noise impact at the one off-campus location (Sixth Avenue and Gigling Road) to less than significant. Given that Alternative 1 is likely the environmentally superior alternative, the EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives, as indicated previously. Alternative 3 (Expanded Housing Growth Alternative) has greater impacts in numerous impact categories but would likely reduce the significant and unavoidable operational noise impact at the one off-campus location to less than significant with the provision of additional on-campus housing, which would reduce vehicle trips to campus. Alternative 2 (Reduced Enrollment Alternative), is the environmentally superior alternative, as it would reduce impacts in numerous impact categories, as well as reduce the significant and unavoidable operational noise impact at one off-campus location to less than significant.

However, Alternative 2 does not fully meet the project objectives. In particular, while Alternative 2 would allow for an increase of approximately 3,900 FTES up to an increased enrollment cap of 10,500 FTES, it would not fully support the University's educational mission to accommodate student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES (Objective #1). Such an increase in enrollment to 12,700 FTES would provide expanded access to higher education in response to the increasing higher education needs and demands of a growing statewide population and would allow CSUMB to develop into a comprehensive university campus that graduates students that can meet the needs of regional and statewide employers.

Table 6-2
Comparison of Environmental Impacts from the Alternatives

Section # and Topic	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan	Alternative 2 Reduced Enrollment Alternative	Alternative 3 Expanded Housing Growth Alternative
4.1. Aesthetics (Scenic Resources within Scenic Highway)	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.1. Aesthetics (Scenic Vistas, Scenic Quality, Light and Glare)	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.2. Air Quality	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.3. Biological Resources (Special-Status Species, Riparian and Wetland Habitat	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↑

Table 6-2
Comparison of Environmental Impacts from the Alternatives

Section # and Topic	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan	Alternative 2 Reduced Enrollment Alternative	Alternative 3 Expanded Housing Growth Alternative
4.3. Biological Resources (Wildlife Corridors, Conflicts with Biological Resource Policies and Ordinances)	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.3. Biological Resources (Conflicts with Adopted HCP)	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.4. Cultural Resources (Historic Built Environment Resources)	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.4. Cultural Resources (Archaeological Resources, Human Remains, and Tribal Cultural Resources)	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↑
4.5. Geology and Soils (Fault Rupture, Expansive Soils, Septic Tanks)	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.5. Geology and Soils (Seismic Hazards, Landslides, Soil Erosion, Unstable Geologic Units or Soils)	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.5. Geology and Soils (Paleontological Resources)	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↑
4.6. Greenhouse Gas Emissions	LSM	LS	LSM↓	LSM↑
4.7. Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire (Airport Safety)	NI	NI	NI	NI
4.7. Hazards, Hazardous Materials, and Wildfire (Hazardous Materials, Emergency Response, Wildfire)	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.8. Hydrology and Water Quality	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.9. Land Use and Planning	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.10. Noise (Temporary Construction Noise)	LSM	LSM↓	LSM↓	LSM↑
4.10. Noise (Permanent Operational Noise)	SU	LS	LS	LS
4.10. Noise (Vibration)	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.11. Population and Housing	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.12. Public Services	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑
4.13. Transportation	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↓
4.14. Utilities and Energy	LS	LS↓	LS↓	LS↑

Notes: NI = no impact; LS = less than significant; LSM = less than significant with mitigation; SU = significant and unavoidable; ↑ = greater; ↓ = lesser.

Table 6-3
Ability of Alternatives to Meet Project Objectives

Project Objectives	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan	Alternative 2 Reduced Enrollment Alternative	Alternative 3 Expanded Housing Growth Alternative
1. Support and advance the University's educational mission by guiding the physical development of the campus to: accommodate gradual student enrollment growth up to a future enrollment of 12,700 FTES; provide expanded access to higher education in response to the increasing higher education needs and demands of a growing statewide population; and develop into a comprehensive university campus that graduates students that can meet the needs of regional and statewide employers, while preserving and enhancing the quality of campus life.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Meets Objective
2. Implement strategies to facilitate student academic success, academic excellence, institutional capacity, and regional stewardship.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Meets Objective
3. Focus new building development on existing paved and developed infill sites on the Main Campus to provide compact and clustered development and make efficient use of campus land.	Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective
4. Provide and concentrate facilities for expansion of academic programs and administrative functions on the Main Campus, in or near the campus core to: create a compact campus core; provide synergies between existing and new educational and research programs; provide for a 10-minute walking distance from transportation hubs and between classroom buildings; facilitate use of shared resources among programs, such as classroom and lab space; facilitate faculty and student interaction; and promote an environment conducive to learning.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Meets Objective
5. Provide on-campus housing for 60 percent of FTE students and 65 percent of FTE faculty and staff to reduce vehicle trips to campus, meet other Master Plan Guideline's sustainability priorities and objectives, and promote recruitment, retention and engagement of faculty and staff.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Meets Objective	Meets Objective

Table 6-3
Ability of Alternatives to Meet Project Objectives

Project Objectives	Proposed Project	Alternative 1 No Project Alternative / Existing Master Plan	Alternative 2 Reduced Enrollment Alternative	Alternative 3 Expanded Housing Growth Alternative
6. Provide a diversity of housing types to serve a broad range of student, faculty and staff housing needs.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Meets Objective
7. Create a unique campus character through buildings, outdoor spaces, pathways, bikeways, and roadways that connect those spaces while also producing a sense of community on campus.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Meets Objective
8. Provide emphasis on pedestrian access and alternative transportation and attain a modal shift from vehicles to more pedestrian, bicycle, and transit use by: establishing bicycle and pedestrian networks that provide safe, direct, and attractive connections to work and school; establishing restrictions to general vehicle travel through the campus core and locate vehicle circulation and parking on the campus periphery to provide for a walkable campus core; and providing other land development strategies (e.g., multimodal hubs) to support TDM (Transportation Demand Management), which is intended to reduce drive-alone travel modes and encourage greater use of transit, walking, and bicycle commuting and reduce dependence on automobiles.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Meets Objective
9. Preserve and enhance natural open spaces and develop formal open spaces so they become integral to the character of the campus.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective
10. Integrate natural and formal open spaces into the framework for capital development. Organize the built environment around an open space network to integrate the natural and built environments and enhance outdoor learning, social interaction, recreation, and the overall campus ambiance.	Meets Objective	Does Not Meet Objective	Partially Meets Objective	Partially Meets Objective

6.7 REFERENCES

Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc. 2007. *Draft Environmental Impact Report for the California State University Monterey Bay 2007 Master Plan* (SCH #1997091036). Prepared for California State University Monterey Bay, December 2007.

Denise Duffy & Associates, Inc. 2009. *Final Environmental Impact Report for the California State University Monterey Bay 2007 Master Plan* (SCH #1997091036). Prepared for California State University Monterey Bay, November 2008. Certified in 2009.