4.13 TRANSPORTATION

This section of the EIR presents an analysis of the potential transportation impacts associated with development and implementation of the proposed Master Plan, including five near-term development components (collectively, Project). This section presents the environmental setting, regulatory framework, impacts of the Project on the environment, and proposed measures to mitigate significant or potentially significant impacts. The analysis presented in this section is based on the Transportation Analysis technical report (Appendix H) prepared by Fehr & Peers. Additional discussion of freeway and intersection Level of Service (LOS) in the study area was prepared by Fehr & Peers for information purposes only and is also provided in Appendix H.

The original May 2017 Notice of Preparation (NOP) for this EIR indicated that intersection and freeway LOS would be the basis for the evaluation of potential transportation impacts related to vehicle travel in the EIR. However, in response to Senate Bill 743 and the associated revisions to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines that became effective December 28, 2018, the proposed analysis methods were modified. As the lead agency for the preparation of the EIR for the Project, the Board of Trustees of the California State University (Trustees) prepared a Revision to Previously Issued NOP in August 2019 to notify agencies, organizations, and other interested parties that the methodology to be used in the EIR in assessing potential transportation-related impacts had been modified from that indicated in the original NOP to reflect changes in the law. Accordingly, the transportation impact analysis presented in this section is based on an evaluation of vehicle miles traveled (VMT). As indicated above, intersection and freeway LOS discussion is provided for information purposes only in Appendix H and does not serve as the basis of transportation impact determinations nor is LOS discussed further in this section.

Consequently, NOP comments received during the original scoping period that pertain to LOS analysis were considered but are not reflected in the impact analysis presented in this section. Other transportation-related comments that were received in response to the original NOP and Revision to Previously Issued NOP included comments related to: provision of additional transit and shuttle services, increased bicycle and pedestrian access on campus with connectivity with neighboring communities including the Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway (FORTAG), incentives that support bicycles and pedestrians, minimizing motor vehicles in the inner campus, identification and analysis of proposed transportation demand management (TDM) strategies, inclusion of additional TDM strategies, determining intersection control type for intersections identified as “Campus Entry,” consideration of a roundabout at Second Avenue and the CSUMB athletics area, and design recommendations for transit and wayfinding.

To the extent that issues identified in public comments involve potentially significant effects on the environment according to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), they are identified and addressed in this EIR. For a complete list of all public comments received during the public scoping periods refer to Appendix B.
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4.13.1 Environmental Setting

4.13.1.1 Study Area

The CSUMB Main Campus is located within the geographic boundaries of the cities of Marina and Seaside and Monterey County and is generally bounded by Eighth Street, Colonel Durham Street, Lightfighter Drive, and Second Avenue. The East Campus Open Space is located east of Eighth Avenue and south of Inter-Garrison Road, and East Campus Housing is located north of Inter-Garrison Road. Figure 4.13-1 shows the location of the Project site and the surrounding transportation network.

The study area for the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) analysis presented in this section is the area that comprises Monterey County because a substantial majority of the campus population (nearly 90 percent of students, faculty, and staff) lives and, therefore, commutes to CSUMB, within the County geographic area. The study area for the other transportation analyses consists of the campus and areas immediately adjacent to the campus in the City of Seaside, the City of Marina, and the County of Monterey.

4.13.1.2 Environmental Setting

The following section uses travel data and describes those conditions existing prior to the formal shelter-in-place order issued March 17, 2020 relative to the COVID-19 Pandemic by the Monterey County Public Health Department. These conditions most accurately represent “existing conditions” (i.e., typical conditions) within the meaning of CEQA.

Existing Transportation Facilities

Existing Street System

Regional access to the CSUMB Main Campus is provided by State Route (SR) 1. Primary local access to the CSUMB campus is provided by Imjin Road from the north, Inter-Garrison Road from the west and east, and General Jim Moore Boulevard from the south. The Main Campus entrance at Lightfighter Drive and General Jim Moore Boulevard is marked by a gateway entrance sign. Traffic from Seaside or the Monterey Peninsula accesses the campus from the General Jim Moore Boulevard entrance; traffic from Salinas or Marina accesses the campus via either the Second Avenue, Imjin Road or Inter-Garrison Road entrances; while traffic from Santa Cruz County accesses the campus entrances at either Inter-Garrison and Second Avenue or Imjin Road. These roadways are described below and illustrated in Figures 4.13-1 and 4.13-2.
FIGURE 4.13-2

Existing and Planned Pedestrian Facilities

SOURCE: CSUMB 2017, Fehr & Peers 2021
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State Route 1 (SR 1) is a state highway within Monterey County, providing access to Watsonville and Santa Cruz to the north via Seaside, Marina, and Castroville, and to San Luis Obispo to the south via Monterey and Carmel. Through its connection to SR 156 in Castroville, SR 1 also provides access to US 101 and the greater San Francisco Bay Area. Through Marina and Seaside, SR 1 has a posted speed limit of 65 miles per hour (mph) and provides four lanes north of the Del Monte Boulevard interchange, six lanes south of Del Monte Boulevard interchange to the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard interchange and returns to four lanes south of the Fremont Boulevard/Del Monte Boulevard interchange. SR 1 average daily traffic (ADT) counts range between 51,560 to 96,960 for the segments between Del Monte Boulevard and Canyon Del Rey Boulevard, with the highest ADT between Imjin Parkway and Del Monte Boulevard.

Reservation Road is a major arterial extending from the Pacific Ocean at Marina State Park west of Dunes Drive, through the City of Marina. East of Del Monte Boulevard, Reservation Road is a four-lane divided street. At East-Garrison Road, east of Imjin Parkway, it narrows to a two-lane rural highway. Reservation Road is under the jurisdiction of the City of Marina west of Blanco Road and the County of Monterey east of Blanco Road. The ADT on Reservation Road ranges from 6,220 to 26,570 vehicles with the lowest ADT south of Blanco Road and the highest ADT between Imjin Road and Blanco Road.

Imjin Parkway is an arterial street within the City of Marina limits. Imjin Parkway is a two-lane road at its interchange with SR 1 and a four-lane divided street with left-turn channelization east of the northbound SR 1 ramps and two lanes east of Imjin Road. Imjin Parkway has bike lanes on each side of the road starting east of Second Avenue, with the eastbound bike lane ending at Reservation Road. The speed limit on Imjin Parkway is 45 mph. Imjin Parkway has an ADT of 22,500 east of Second Avenue and an ADT of 28,220 west of Second Avenue toward SR 1.

California Avenue/Fifth Avenue is a two-lane arterial from central Marina to Imjin Parkway, and a local street south of Imjin Parkway ending at Inter-Garrison Road. California Avenue connects Reservation Road with Imjin Parkway and CSUMB. Bicycle lanes are provided along California Avenue/Fifth Avenue between Imjin Parkway and Reservation Road. The speed limit on California Avenue is 25 mph. The ADT on California Avenue north of Imjin Parkway is 5,900.

Eighth Street is a two-lane arterial from First Avenue to Inter-Garrison Road that is currently closed (future extension is planned) between Third Avenue and Fifth Avenue. The speed limit along Eighth Street is 35 mph.

Inter-Garrison Road extends from Second Avenue to Reservation Road as a two-lane arterial. The extension of Inter-Garrison Road (referred to as the Inter-Garrison Road Connection in this analysis) to Reservation Road, completed in 2013, provides a regional connection from the Marina-Salinas area to SR 1. The speed limit on Inter-Garrison Road is 35 mph between Eighth
Avenue and Schoonover Road and 25 mph between Second Avenue and Eighth Avenue. Inter-Garrison Road has an ADT of 8,450 between Eighth Avenue and Abrams Drive, and an ADT of 2,630 between Second Avenue and Third Avenue.

Lightfighter Drive starts from the SR 1 ramps as an east-west street that continues as the north-south street Malmedy Road at the intersection of Colonel Durham Street. From the SR 1 interchange to General Jim Moore Boulevard, the street is a four-lane divided major arterial with a speed limit of 40 mph. East of General Jim Moore Boulevard, Lightfighter Drive is a two-lane minor arterial with a speed limit of 25 mph. West of General Jim Moore Boulevard, the ADT on Lightfighter range between 13,250 and 15,000 vehicles.

Divarty Street is a two-lane local street from First Avenue to Fifth Avenue providing access to the core of the CSUMB campus. The speed limit along Divarty Street is 25 mph.

Colonel Durham Street is a two-lane local street that extends between Lightfighter Drive/Malmedy Road to the west and Eighth Avenue to the east. The street has pedestrian facilities along one or both sides west of Sixth Avenue, and although it is a local street, the speed limit is 35 mph along its entirety.

Gigling Road is a two-lane arterial that starts just east of SR 1 at Noumea Road and extends to Eighth Avenue. Gigling Road has a speed limit of 30 mph and an ADT of 6,300 vehicles.

Second Avenue connects Lightfighter Drive in Seaside with Imjin Parkway in Marina, along the western edge of CSUMB. Second Avenue is a north-south arterial street in Marina and Seaside with four lanes from Imjin Parkway to Tenth Street, two lanes from Tenth Street to Divarty Street, and returns to four lanes south of Divarty Street. Second Avenue has right-turn and left-turn channelization on the entire stretch of the street, and bike lanes north of Divarty Street to Imjin Parkway. The speed limit on Second Avenue is 35 mph. The lowest ADT on Second Avenue is 2,500 vehicles south of Divarty Street. Second Avenue’s ADT is highest north of Fifth Street, with ADT of 6,330 vehicles.

General Jim Moore Boulevard is a four-lane arterial that extends from Canyon del Rey Boulevard to Lightfighter Drive in Seaside. Once it enters the campus at Lightfighter Drive, the street becomes a two-lane arterial to Fifth Street with a posted speed limit of 25 mph on campus. The ADT on General Jim Moore Boulevard ranges between 5,230 to 9,600 vehicles, with the lowest ADT north of Lightfighter Drive (on campus) and highest ADT between Lightfighter Drive and Gigling Road (south of campus).

Sixth Avenue is a north-south local street that extends from Gigling Road to Eighth Street. The two-lane connector has restricted access from CSUMB’s Student Services building, 250 feet south of A Street to B Street.
Seventh Avenue is a north-south two-lane local street that extends from Gigling Road to the south to Eighth Street/Inter-Garrison Road to the north.

Eighth Avenue is a north-south two-lane local street that extends from Gigling Road on the south to Inter-Garrison Road in the north.

Abrams Drive is a two-lane connector between Imjin Parkway and Inter-Garrison Road, with a posted speed limit of 30 mph and ADT of 5,050. Abrams Drive is the main street through East Campus Housing and connects to Bunker Hill Drive, Manassas Drive, and Schoonover Road.

Schoonover Road is a two-lane connector between Abrams Drive and Inter-Garrison Road, with a posted speed limit of 25 mph. The street travels through the eastern side of the East Campus Housing.

Existing Truck Routes

SR 1 is identified as part of the regional truck network. The freeway is intended to move goods efficiently within the cities of Marina and Seaside, between outlying agricultural uses, and packing/distribution centers. Additionally, the freeway serves to separate truck traffic from local streets where the larger vehicles may conflict with other uses.

Both the City of Marina and City of Seaside designate and describe streets that permit commercial vehicles exceeding three tons as truck routes with appropriate signage. Neither city has an existing truck route network; though, in the Circulation Element of the Seaside General Plan, the City identified establishing a truck route network as an ongoing goal to reduce impacts on residential neighborhoods. In the City of Marina, commercial trucks are prohibited from entering local residential streets and collectors except for the purpose of local deliveries.

Existing Pedestrian Facilities

The CSUMB campus has a variety of pedestrian accommodations, such as sidewalks, pedestrian malls, and trails. Some portions of the campus, such as existing pedestrian malls on Divarty Street and Sixth Avenue, which are street segments reserved for primarily pedestrian use with limited transit and service vehicle usage, have a high-quality walking environment with many destinations within a close walking distance, while other areas of campus lack sidewalks. Figure 4.13-2 shows the locations of existing sidewalks and sidewalk gaps on and near the CSUMB campus.

Arterial roads such as Lightfighter Drive, Second Avenue, and Gigling Road have sidewalks on one or both sides of the street. Several local streets within and near the campus do not have sidewalks, creating gaps in the pedestrian network.

While CSUMB has made improvements to the on-campus pedestrian network, a limited number of direct, accessible, and protected pedestrian connections are in place through parking lots and
to the existing sidewalk network. Additionally, there are no existing sidewalks along Inter-Garrison Road connecting the Main Campus to the East Campus Housing area east of Eighth Avenue. In many areas, the natural topography exceeds a five percent grade, making the construction of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-accessible pathways difficult along some streets such as Fifth Avenue, Sixth Avenue, and portions of Inter-Garrison Road. Distances between major destinations that are more than a 10-minute walk, coupled with a mild yet windy and foggy coastal climate, can deter pedestrian movement.

Existing Bicycle Facilities

There are several existing bicycle facilities on the CSUMB campus and in surrounding areas, comprised of bike routes or boulevards, bike lanes, and separated bike paths or trails. On campus and surrounding the campus, there are 3.8 miles of bike boulevards, which are low-speed and low-volume streets designated with pavement markings for shared bicycle use with motor vehicles, and other bike facilities along roadways. The campus has parking for 580 bicycles, which includes 36 indoor secure spots within the Bike Bunker parking facility, that are typically well utilized during the academic year.

Figure 4.13-3 shows the existing and regionally planned bicycle facilities as described in the 2011 Transportation Agency for Monterey County Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, 2016 FORA Regional Urban Design Guidelines, and 2018 Monterey County Active Transportation Plan.

Bikeway planning and design in California typically relies on guidelines and design standards established by the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) in the Highway Design Manual (Caltrans 2020). The Highway Design Manual provides for three distinct types of bikeway facilities that are applicable to the campus, as described below and shown in Appendix H.

Class I Bikeways (Shared-Use Paths) provide a completely separate right-of-way and are designated for the exclusive use of bicycles and pedestrians, with vehicle and pedestrian crossflow minimized. The campus recently constructed its first separated bike path, or a Class I facility, between the Promontory housing and Inter-Garrison Road. On the campus periphery, separated bicycle paths exist on the east side of Second Avenue between Lightfighter Drive and Imjin Parkway and off campus, along Imjin Parkway between Second Avenue and Imjin Road, at which point it transitions to an in-road shared bicycle route.

Class II Bikeways (Bicycle Lanes) are dedicated lanes for bicyclists generally adjacent to the outer vehicle travel lanes, that have special lane markings, pavement legends, and signage. Bicycle lanes, also known as Class II facilities, are provided on Second Avenue, General Jim Moore Boulevard from Lightfighter Drive to Inter-Garrison Road, Fifth Avenue from Divarty Street to Inter-Garrison Road and Inter-Garrison Road from Seventh Avenue to Schoonover Drive.
FIGURE 4.13-3

Existing and Planned Bicycle Facilities

SOURCE: CSUMB 2017, Fehr & Peers 2021
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Class III Bikeways (Bike Boulevards/Bicycle Routes) are designated by signs or pavement markings for shared use with motor vehicles but have no separated bike right-of-way or lane striping. On-campus bike routes, known as Class III facilities, include approximately 3.8 miles of bicycle boulevards on the following road segments: Divarty Street from Second Avenue to A Street, A Street from Divarty to Seventh Avenue, Seventh Avenue from Inter-Garrison Road Colonel Durham Street, and Inter-Garrison Road from Seventh Avenue to Second Avenue.

Class IV Bikeways (Cycle Tracks or “Separated” Bikeways) provide a right-of-way designated exclusively for bicycle travel within a roadway and are protected from other vehicle traffic by physical barriers, including, but not limited to, grade separations, flexible posts, inflexible vertical barriers such as raised curbs or parked cars. None of the existing facilities in the study area classify as Class IV bikeways.

Existing Transit Service

The public transit system that connects the CSUMB campus to the greater Monterey and Salinas area is operated by Monterey Salinas Transit (MST). Students, staff, and faculty receive free boarding and unlimited access on all MST regular bus routes with their CSUMB Otter ID card. Eight bus routes serve stops in or along the boundary of the CSUMB campus throughout the academic year: Routes 12, 16, 18, 19, 25, 26, 67, and 74.

Seven bus routes travel along Fourth Avenue and connect with a main stop that is centrally located adjacent to CSUMB’s Alumni and Visitor Center and west of the Main Campus. Routes serve a total of 21 campus bus stops – 11 stops in the Main Campus and ten stops in the East Campus Housing. Most of the stops are located along Inter-Garrison Road, Second Avenue, and Sixth Avenue. Routes 12, 16, 19, 25, 26, and 74 travel through the campus and provide service to the stops located at the East Campus Housing. Figure 4.13-4 shows the map of the transit services that run through the academic year, and Table 4.13-1 presents weekday bus route information and route access from CSUMB to major points of interest throughout the region.

---

As indicated in the introduction to Section 4.13.1.2, Environment Setting, information in this section reflects pre-COVID-19 Pandemic existing conditions. During the first full academic year of the COVID-19 Pandemic (Fall 2020 - Spring 2021), the CSUMB campus was depopulated and learning was performed remotely, which meant suspension of contracted transit services with MST. Access to MST services renewed with the repopulation of campus in Fall 2021. In Spring 2022, on-campus shuttle service provided by MST (Line 26) was replaced and frequencies increased by a new vendor, MST late night weekend service to Monterey (Line 19) was discontinued, and Otter ID card access to the MST network remained in place. CSUMB will coordinate with MST with the objective to maintain convenient access for all CSUMB students to the MST bus network, as indicated in Chapter 3, Project Description.
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Routes 12, 16, 18, and 74 run vehicles with a capacity between 46 to 59 passengers, and Routes 19, 25, and 26 run vehicles with a capacity of 21 passengers. None of these routes are at or near capacity. Students make up more than 50 percent of the ridership on an average day for Routes 16, 19, 25, and 26. Students make up a small percentage of the passengers of Route 74. See Appendix H, Tables 4 and 5 for additional information about existing transit services.

**Table 4.13-1**
Existing Weekday MST Transit Service Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>From</th>
<th>To</th>
<th>Hours of Operation</th>
<th>Average Weekday Headway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Dunes - NPS</td>
<td>CSUMB Alumni &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>Naval Postgraduate School</td>
<td>6:45 AM to 5:40 PM</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Marina – The Dunes</td>
<td>CSUMB Alumni &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>Marina Transit Exchange</td>
<td>5:35 AM to 10:30 PM</td>
<td>Every 60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Monterey – The Dunes</td>
<td>CSUMB Alumni &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>Monterey Transit Plaza</td>
<td>6:00 AM to 10:40 PM</td>
<td>Every 60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Del Monte Center – CSUMB East Campus</td>
<td>CSUMB Alumni &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>Del Monte Center</td>
<td>Fridays &amp; Saturdays: 1:00 PM to 2:55 AM; Sundays: 6:00 PM to 11:50 PM</td>
<td>Every 60 Minutes before 7:00 PM; Every 120 minutes after 7:00 PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>CSUMB – Salinas</td>
<td>CSUMB Alumni &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>Salinas Transit Center</td>
<td>6:20 AM to 10:35 PM</td>
<td>Every 60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>CSUMB – East Campus Express</td>
<td>CSUMB Alumni &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>East Campus</td>
<td>6:30 AM to 12:25 AM</td>
<td>Every 20 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Presidio – Marina</td>
<td>Otter Sports Center</td>
<td>Reservation &amp; Beach</td>
<td>Fridays: 2:15 PM to 10:10 PM; Weekends: 10:15 AM to 10:10 PM</td>
<td>Every 120 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>Presidio – Toro Park</td>
<td>CSUMB Alumni &amp; Visitor Center</td>
<td>Portola and Anza</td>
<td>6:30 AM to 6:00 PM</td>
<td>Limited</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Table 4

Students, faculty, and staff with physical disabilities have access to the MST para-transit program, RIDES. This service operates on a point-to-point basis with no restrictions on purpose of the trip and appointments are required to guarantee service. The para-transit service accommodates travel to and from locations that are up to three-quarters of a mile from any of MST’s regular bus routes and the service is available during the hours of operation of MST’s regular fixed-route bus service. CSUMB also offers a wheelchair accessible cart that is available for University Departments/Group tours, campus-wide orientations, and major events such as Commencement.
Note: Transit Routes shown for Academic Year, 2017

SOURCE: CSUMB 2017, Fehr & Peers 2019
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FIGURE 4.13-4

Existing Transit Services to CSUMB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Headways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 min</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 min</td>
<td>16, 18, 19, 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 min</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>12, 74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
Existing Campus Parking

The campus parking facilities are designated as academic parking or residential parking. Academic parking serves students (students residing on- and off-campus), staff, employees, and visitors, and is not restricted to on-campus residents as is residential parking, described below. Academic parking also includes handicapped, electric vehicle, and motorcycle parking that serves all the populations. Residential parking is parking reserved for on-campus residents only. Residential parking includes handicapped, electric vehicle, and motorcycle parking that is reserved for on-campus residents.

To assess the existing level of parking occupancy on-campus and the related available inventory, a parking occupancy survey was conducted over a 3-day period for the academic and residential parking areas located within the Main Campus on typical non-holiday days. This parking occupancy survey also provided a parking inventory of the existing parking lots on the campus. The details of the survey results are provided in Appendix H.

The campus currently has 40 parking lots with a total of 4,721 academic and residential spaces (3,730 academic spaces and 991 residential spaces). Academic and residential parking occupancy percentages depict the amount of existing parking utilized compared to the amount of existing parking available on the campus. Peak occupancy for the academic parking spaces is approximately 65 percent and occurs between approximately 10:00 AM and 3:00 PM. For the residential spaces, peak occupancy is approximately 55 percent and occurs at approximately 7:00 AM.

In terms of direct observations, the peak observed academic parking demand for the entire campus was 2,396 vehicles, or 64 percent occupied, at 11:00 AM. The peak observed residential parking demand for the entire campus was 525 vehicles, or 53 percent occupied, at 7:00 AM. The overall academic and residential demand of 2,921 vehicles is lower than existing parking supply of 4,721 parking spaces and represents an overall occupancy rate of approximately 62 percent.

Existing Vehicle Miles Traveled

VMT is a metric that accounts for the number of vehicle trips generated plus the length or travel distance of those trips. As indicated in Section 4.13.2.2, Senate Bill (SB) 743 changed the way transportation impacts are identified under CEQA. Based on revisions to the CEQA Guidelines that resulted from SB 743, the metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts has changed from LOS to VMT; thus, as previously indicated, an assessment of traffic congestion based on the LOS metric is no longer the basis upon which significant impacts are identified under CEQA.

To determine existing daily total VMT for the CSUMB campus and Monterey County, and boundary VMT for Monterey County, the transportation engineers Fehr & Peers utilized the AMBAG regional
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travel forecasting model. As shown in Table 4.13-2, under existing conditions, the CSUMB campus total VMT per service population is 22.31; the Monterey County total VMT per service population is 28.12; and the Monterey County boundary VMT per service population is 13.23. See Appendix H for additional information about how the VMT information was determined.

### Table 4.13-2

**VMT under Existing Conditions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Campus/County Total VMT</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSUMB Campus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT (A)(^1)</td>
<td>178,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population (B)(^2)</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Service Population (A/B =C)</td>
<td>22.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT(A)(^1)</td>
<td>19,158,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population (B)(^2)</td>
<td>681,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Service Population (A/B =C)</td>
<td>28.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT (A)(^1)</td>
<td>9,011,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population (B)(^2)</td>
<td>681,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Service Population (A/B =C)</td>
<td>13.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Tables 10, 11 and 17

Notes:
1. Rounded service population and VMT to nearest 100.
2. Service population is defined as the sum of all employees, residents and students (Kindergarten through University).

**Existing Mode Share**

CSUMB conducted a person travel survey to gather data on existing travel mode shares and to better understand the travel choices of CSUMB students, faculty and staff (see Appendix H for details). The results of the survey showed that under existing conditions, the combined drive-alone and shared ride mode share for travel to and from campus is 62.5 percent for all CSUMB students, faculty and staff (e.g., Main Campus, East Campus Housing, and off-campus), and 85.0 percent for CSUMB East Campus Housing and off-campus residents, as shown in Table 4.13-3.

---

\(^2\) The transportation analysis presented in this section of the EIR uses total VMT and boundary VMT metrics for specific geographic areas. Total VMT per service population is used to evaluate the CSUMB campus VMT rate due to the Project (i.e., the direct impacts). Boundary VMT is used to evaluate the Project’s effect on VMT on the entire roadway system, which is evaluated as part of the cumulative analysis.
The remaining 37.5% and 15% of students, faculty, and staff, respectively, travel by transit, walking, and bicycling.

Table 4.13-3
Existing AM Peak Period Inbound Person Mode Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>All CSUMB Students, Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>CSUMB East Campus and Off-Campus Residents Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone¹</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ride²</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drive Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Tables 24 and 25
Notes:
¹ Drive alone includes motorcycles
² Shared ride includes carpooling, vanpooling, drop-off, Transportation Network Companies like Uber and Lyft, and taxis.

Existing Transportation Demand Management Program

The existing CSUMB TDM program complements the on-campus housing of students, faculty, and staff and enhances the quality of pedestrian, bicycle, and transit facilities on campus. Housing and high-quality transportation infrastructure helps to promote walking, bicycling, and transit use, which reduces vehicle trips to/from the campus.

The following existing TDM strategies provide resident and off-campus students, faculty, and staff with transportation options that reduce vehicle trip generation under existing conditions:

- Otter Cycle Center – on-campus bicycle repair shop that also offers bicycle rentals and other services to facilitate bicycle ridership.
- Bicycle Storage and Amenities – several hundred bicycle racks have been installed on campus outside of residence halls and popular academic, recreation and administrative buildings. Additionally, a secure bicycle bunker storage room has been installed, as well as two ‘fix-it’ stations that provide 24/7 access to bicycle repair tools and air pumps. Bicycle registration is also available through the University Police Department to simplify that process. Skateboard storage racks also have been installed in the popular destinations on campus.
- Paid Parking – to discourage CSUMB and non-CSUMB related vehicle trips the campus manages parking on campus via a parking permit fee structure presently based upon campus, community or vehicle type and parking timeframes. The fees have increased
several times over the last two decades to more accurately match the true cost of providing managed parking.

- Monterey Salinas Transit (MST) – the campus has entered into an agreement with MST that is annually renewed and provides universal access on the MST bus network for all active CSUMB ID card holders, three supplemental campus-serving and subsidized bus routes, and funding for a shared transit marketing student intern.

- Emergency Ride Home Program – campus community members can sign up for a program run by TAMC that reimburses taxi or ridesharing trips home in emergency situations for commuters who use alternative means of transportation.

- Carsharing and Ridesharing – CSUMB hosts four cars for carsharing. These are cars stationed on the campus available for use by carshare members on the campus. Additionally, CSUMB students, faculty and staff can use Go831, a regional rideshare program.

- Transportation Services Website – information for most of the available TDM strategies is included on a campus website to facilitate information dissemination.

- Delivery Vehicle Limitations – to discourage delivery vehicle trips, drivers providing frequent delivery services to campus, such as office supply deliveries, have been instructed to limit their deliveries to campus to no more than three days per week.

- Bicyclist/Pedestrian Malls – to encourage pedestrian and bicycle use, a section of Divarty Street and a section of Sixth Avenue are closed to regular vehicular traffic to better accommodate pedestrians and bicyclists.

- Traffic Calming – to discourage automobile use and provide increased safety, speed humps and flashing beacon crosswalk devices have been installed on several campus roadways to reduce vehicle speeds, particularly near high traffic pedestrian crosswalks.

4.13.1.3 Site Conditions for Near-Term Development Components

The existing transportation setting for the near-term development component sites is generally as described above. Additional information specific to each site is provided below. Chapter 3, Project Description, provides additional information about the location of each development site.

**Student Housing Phase III**

The approximately 6.4-acre Student Housing Phase III site is located on an existing parking lot that does not contain housing or any other buildings. Existing driveway access to the parking lot is provided from General Jim Moore Boulevard, just north of the intersection with Inter-Garrison Road. As illustrated in Figures 4.13-2 and 4.13-3, pedestrian and bicycle facilities are available near this site; however, as indicated previously, some sidewalk gaps exist on the Main Campus in
proximity to this site. Additionally, this site is in close proximity to MST bus service, as is most of the Main Campus (see Figure 4.13-4).

**Academic IV**

The approximately 4.0-acre Academic IV site contains an academic building, parking lots, and landscaping. Existing driveway access to the parking lots is provided on A Street and Sixth Avenue. As illustrated in Figures 4.13-2 and 4.13-3, pedestrian and bicycle facilities are available near this site. Additionally, this site is near MST bus service (see Figure 4.13-4).

**Student Recreation Center Phases I and II**

The approximately 8.5-acre Student Recreation Center site is located south of the Main Quad and contains two buildings and portions of two parking lots, as well as undeveloped land. Existing driveway access to the parking lots is provided from Divarty Street and Engineer Lane. As illustrated in Figures 4.13-2 and 4.13-3, pedestrian and bicycle facilities are available near this site. Additionally, this site is near MST bus service (see Figure 4.13-4).

**Student Housing Phase IIB**

The approximately 7.2-acre Student Housing Phase III site is located on a vacant paved lot south of the Promontory. Existing driveway access to the parking lot is provided from Eighth Street, just north of the intersection with Sixth Avenue. As illustrated in Figures 4.13-2 and 4.13-3, pedestrian and bicycle facilities are available near this site. Additionally, this site is near MST bus service (see Figure 4.13-4).

**Academic V**

The approximately 2.7-acre Academic V site is located in the Main Quad and is developed with administration and academic buildings, a parking lot, and landscaping. Existing driveway access to the parking lot is provided from Divarty Street. As illustrated in Figures 4.13-2 and 4.13-3, pedestrian and bicycle facilities are available near this site. Additionally, this site is near MST bus service (see Figure 4.13-4).

### 4.13.2 Regulatory Framework

The following is an overview of federal, state and regional plans, policies and ordinances relevant to the transportation analysis presented here.
4.13 – TRANSPORTATION

4.13.2.1 Federal

There are no federal plans, policies, regulations, or laws related to transportation that would affect the Project.

4.13.2.2 State

California Department of Transportation

Caltrans is the public agency responsible for designing, building, operating, and maintaining California’s State highway system, which consists of freeways, highways, expressways, toll roads, and the area between the roadways and property lines. Caltrans is also responsible for permitting and regulating the use of State roadways. Caltrans’ construction practices require temporary traffic control planning during any activities that interfere with the normal function of a roadway.

Senate Bill 743

As previously noted, Senate Bill (SB) 743 changed how transportation impacts are analyzed under CEQA. SB 743 removed the use of automobile delay or traffic congestion as measured by LOS for determining transportation impacts in environmental review. Instead, the CEQA Guidelines now specify that vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, is the appropriate metric to evaluate transportation impacts. In short, SB 743 changes the focus of transportation impact analysis in CEQA from measuring impacts to drivers, to measuring the impact of driving.

SB 743, which is codified in Public Resources Code (Cal. Pub. Resources § 21099), required changes to the guidelines implementing CEQA (CEQA Guidelines) regarding the analysis of transportation impacts and the metric upon which to assess those impacts. Pursuant to § 21099, the criteria for determining the significance of transportation impacts must “promote the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions, the development of multimodal transportation networks, and a diversity of land uses.” Section 21099 also provides that following the certification of the CEQA Guidelines implemented pursuant to SB 743, “automobile delay, as described solely by level of service or similar measures of vehicular capacity or traffic congestion shall not be considered a significant impact on the environment” pursuant to CEQA.

The legislation directed the State of California’s Office of Planning and Research (OPR) to look at different metrics for identifying transportation impacts and make corresponding revisions to the CEQA Guidelines. Following several years of draft proposals and related public comments, OPR settled upon VMT as the preferred metric for assessing passenger vehicle-related impacts and issued revised CEQA Guidelines in December 2018, along with a Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA (OPR Technical Advisory) (OPR 2018) to assist practitioners in implementing the CEQA Guidelines revisions to use VMT as the new metric.
further information below). Under the revised Guidelines, vehicle LOS is no longer to be used as a determinant of significant environmental impacts, and an analysis of a project’s impacts relative to VMT is the new metric against which significant impacts are to be assessed. As explained below, in the Spring of 2019, CSU issued its 2019 California State University Transportation Impact Study Manual, which provides a methodology, including significance thresholds, for assessing a project’s impacts in terms of VMT.

**Office of Planning and Research Technical Advisory**

The OPR Technical Advisory, identified previously, is one in a series of advisories provided by OPR as a service to professional planners, land use officials, and CEQA practitioners. This advisory contains technical recommendations regarding the assessment of VMT-related impacts, thresholds of significance, and mitigation measures. OPR issues technical assistance on issues that broadly affect the practice of land use planning and CEQA (Pub. Resources Code, § 21000 et seq.). (Ca. Gov. Code, § 65040, subds. (g), (l), (m).) The purpose of the OPR Technical Advisory document is to provide advice and recommendations, which lead agencies and other entities may use at their discretion. The document does not alter lead agency discretion in preparing environmental documents subject to CEQA and the document should not be construed as legal advice.

**California State University Transportation Impact Study Manual**

As previously noted, in response to the methodological change in required transportation analysis initiated by SB 743, the CSU Office of the Chancellor issued the 2019 California State University Transportation Impact Study Manual (2019 CSU TISM), which supersedes the 2012 CSU TISM. The 2019 CSU TISM provides guidance for the preparation of CEQA-compliant transportation impact analysis pursuant to SB 743 and is the operative TISM for the analysis presented here. See Section 4.13.3.2 for additional information about the methods used in the VMT analysis contained in this section, based on the TISM.

**Integrated California State University Administrative Manual**

The Integrated California State University Administrative Manual (ICSUAM) guidelines require that individual CSU building projects be reviewed by the California State Fire Marshall involving a plan review and approval followed by periodic filed inspections concluding with issuance of a certificate of occupancy to provide for adequate emergency access and building safety features.

**Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act**

The Fort Ord Reuse Authority Act was implemented to facilitate the transfer and reuse of the Fort Ord military base, and established the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) as the entity responsible for planning, financing, and carrying out the transfer and reuse of the base in a
cooperative, coordinated, balanced, and decisive manner (Cal. Gov. Code § 67650 et seq.). Founded in 1994, FORA was responsible for oversight of the Monterey Bay area economic recovery following the closure and reuse planning of the former Fort Ord military base. Pursuant to the Act, FORA’s legislatively defined mission was complete as of June 30, 2020 and FORA has been dissolved per the FORA Resolution No. 18-11.

The FORA Resolution No. 18-11 approved a Transition Plan that was submitted to the Monterey County Local Agency Formation Commission and that assigns assets and liabilities, designates responsible successor agencies and provides a schedule of remaining obligations (FORA 2018). The Transition Plan calls for the cities of Marina, Seaside, Monterey and Del Rey Oaks and the County of Monterey to follow the Reuse Plan policies and programs and states that “…the implementation of the on-site Fort Ord transportation network and transit policies and programs are essential to the long-term success of the economic recovery of the reuse.” The Resolution further states that after FORA’s ultimate dissolution, any changes to the policies and programs of the Reuse Plan or any part thereof will be made by the respective land use jurisdictions only after full compliance with all applicable laws, including but not limited to CEQA.

After the official closure of Fort Ord in 1994, FORA adopted the Fort Ord Reuse Plan (Reuse Plan) in 1997 (FORA 1997). The Reuse Plan provided a framework for the reuse of more than 45 square miles of the former Fort Ord army base. The Reuse Plan identified transportation improvements to create a balanced transportation system, including pedestrian ways, bikeways, transit, and streets to provide for the safe and efficient movement of people. Responsibility for the remaining capital improvements in the Reuse Plan has been transitioned to the local agencies for implementation. The remaining capital improvements enhance regional access alternatives, provide additional local access routes, and enhance the internal circulation system to reduce through trips on facilities in the higher density or otherwise sensitive areas.

The FORA Regional Urban Design Guidelines (RUDG), adopted on June 10, 2016, establish standards for road design, setbacks, building height, landscaping, signage, and other matters of visual importance (FORA 2016). RUDG emphasizes the application and importance of the complete streets and connected street network, as well as providing well designed transit facilities with improvement in rider experience and economic vitality. To realize and support the complete streets concept, the following objectives are identified within the guidelines:

- Encouraging appropriate development scale and pattern to a village environment
- Minimizing street scale to facilitate pedestrian movement while providing adequate circulation and parking opportunities
- Minimizing street width to provide comfortable pedestrian environment
4.13.2.3 Regional

AMBAG Regional Transportation Plan

The AMBAG is the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) for the three-county region (Monterey County, San Benito County, and Santa Cruz County). As the MPO, AMBAG is responsible for preparing the regional transportation plan and sustainable community strategy plan titled *2040 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and Sustainable Communities Strategy (2040 MTP/SCS)* and published in June 2018 (AMBAG 2018). The 2040 MTP/SCS is a 20-year planning document that is updated every 3 years with the following goals and policy objectives:

- Access and Mobility – Provide convenient, accessible, and reliable travel options while maximizing productivity for all people and goods in the region.
- Economic Vitality – Raise the region’s standard of living by enhancing the performance of the transportation system.
- Environment – Promote environmental sustainability and protect the natural environment.
- Healthy Communities – Protect the health of our residents; foster efficient development patterns that optimize travel, housing, and employment choices and encourage active transportation.
- Social Equity – Provide an equitable level of transportation services to all segments of the population.
- System Preservation and Safety – Preserve and ensure a sustainable and safe regional transportation system.

Based on these goals and policies, a financially constrained transportation network (i.e., one recognizing current financial limitations) was prepared by AMBAG to establish the planned improvements that best meet the goals and policy objectives and available funding projections.

4.13.2.4 Local

As a state entity, CSUMB is not subject to local government permitting and planning regulations, policies, or ordinances, such as the general plans and ordinances for the cities of Marina and Seaside and the County of Monterey. While that is the case, local plans relating to transportation are summarized below to provide context for the analysis of potential conflicts with transportation plans, required to address one of the standards of significance presented in Section 4.13.3.1 below.

---

3 This document is also called *Moving Forward Monterey Bay 2040*. 
Seaside General Plan

Seaside General Plan (2004)

The 2004 Seaside General Plan includes goals to provide and maintain the City of Seaside’s transportation network and ensure that its transportation network integrates with the regional transportation system (City of Seaside 2004). The general plan also includes multimodal goals to promote additional transit usage and adequate parking. Key transportation goals and policies from the 2004 Seaside General Plan relevant to the analysis presented here include:

Key Goals:

- **Goal C-1:** Provide and maintain a City circulation system that promotes safety and satisfies the demand created by new development and redevelopment in Seaside.
- **Goal C-2:** Provide a local circulation system that is integrated with the larger regional transportation system to ensure the economic well-being of the community.
- **Goal C-3:** Promote the increased use of multi-modal transportation.
- **Goal C-4:** Ensure adequate parking is provided throughout Seaside.

Key Policies:

- **Policy C-1.1:** Design roadway capacities and ensure transportation facilities that adequately serve planned land uses.
- **Policy C-1.2:** Improve the Seaside circulation system in concert with public and private land development and redevelopment projects to maintain the City standard of Level of Service "C".
- **Policy C-1.3:** Coordinate improvements to and maintenance of the City circulation system with other major transportation and infrastructure improvement programs.
- **Policy C-1.4:** Provide adequate access to the University, golf courses, and other uses in North Seaside.
- **Policy C-1.5:** Use traffic calming methods within residential and mixed-use areas where necessary to create a pedestrian-friendly circulation system.
- **Policy C-1.6:** Apply creative approaches to increase safety and reduce congestion in areas with unique problems, such as: neighborhoods with narrow, one-way streets; areas around schools; neighborhoods with non-essential alleys, businesses with drive-through access; and other special situations.
- **Policy C-1.7:** Reduce impacts on residential neighborhoods from truck traffic and related noise.
- **Policy C-2.1:** Coordinate planning, construction and maintenance of development projects and circulation improvements with adjacent jurisdictions and transportation agencies.
• Policy C-2.2: Support programs that help reduce congestion and encourage alternative modes of transportation.

• Policy C-2.3: Support development that is compatible with increased operations at the Monterey Peninsula Airport.

• Policy C-3.1: Support the provision and expansion of regional transit services and support facilities to serve the City.

• Policy 3.2: Work with MST to provide special transit services to meet community needs.

• Policy C-3.3: Promote mixed use, higher density residential, and employment-generating development in areas where public transit is convenient and desirable.

• Policy C-3.4: Support alternative modes of transportation that encourage physical activity, such as biking and walking.

• Policy C-4.1: Require off-street parking in new development and redevelopment projects.

• Policy C-4.2: Support the development of well-designed and aesthetically pleasing parking facilities in areas where current parking deficiencies exist or where substantial traffic generating uses are planned.

• Policy C-4.3: Ensure well-landscaped parking lots that facilitate pedestrian movement and screen unattractive structures.

Seaside Draft General Plan Update

In addition to the existing general plan approved in 2005, the City of Seaside currently is preparing its next general plan, the 2040 General Plan, Seaside 2040, which includes a vision for a multimodal network of complete streets (City of Seaside 2017). The 2040 General Plan is in draft form and has not yet been adopted by the City Council; therefore, the information contained in the draft plan is advisory only. Goal LUD-23 in the Seaside 2040 Land Use & Community Design section highlights the desire to transform the City’s northern area into a “mixed-use, economically-vibrant Campus Town that serves the student population and leverages its geographic adjacency to CSUMB.” The area is intended to be high-density with a multimodal focus to improve access and connections for all modes to CSUMB.

Additionally, the 2040 General Plan presents different modal priorities than the currently adopted 2005 General Plan. The 2005 General Plan includes a LOS policy that requires the City of Seaside to maintain a LOS C standard during peak hours. Using this LOS C standard requires the construction of larger intersections, which can have a negative effect on pedestrian and bicycle access and comfort. Thus, the draft 2040 General Plan (November 2017) goals include policies that focus on creating accessible, complete streets for all users of the street system and paths. Key transportation goals and policies relevant to the analysis presented here from the 2040 General Plan include:
Key Goals:

- **Goal M-1**: A citywide network of “complete streets” that meets the needs of all users, including bicyclists, children, persons with disabilities, motorists, movers of commercial goods, pedestrians, public transportation, and seniors.
- **Goal M-2**: Mobility options that serve the multi-modal access and travel needs generated by new development in a manner suitable to the local context.
- **Goal M-5**: A citywide bicycle network that connects residential, commercial, educational and recreational uses, and earns Seaside the reputation of a bicycle-friendly city.
- **Goal M-6**: Transit service that is frequent and convenient, and maximizes ridership potential for residents, employees and visitors.
- **Goal M-7**: A safe transportation system that eliminates traffic-related fatalities and reduces non-fatal injury collisions.
- **Goal M-9**: Minimize the impact of motor vehicle parking on residential neighborhoods.
- **Goal M-10**: Environmentally sustainable transportation.
- **Goal M-11**: Integrate Seaside’s circulation system with the larger regional transportation system to ensure the economic well-being of the community.

Key Policies:

- **Planning for all modes and transportation/land use integration**. Design streets holistically, using a complete streets approach, which considers pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, transit users, and other modes together to adequately serve future land uses.
- **Coordination with new development**. Improve the Seaside circulation system in concert with public and private land development and redevelopment projects.
- **Traffic calming**. Consider the implementation of traffic calming measures to reduce speeding and make streets user-friendly for all modes of transportation, including pedestrians and bicyclists.
- **Multi-modal connectivity**. Promote pedestrian and bicycle improvements that improve connectivity between existing and new development.
- **Pedestrian amenities**. Require new development and redevelopment to increase connectivity through direct and safe pedestrian connections to public amenities, neighborhoods, shopping and employment destinations throughout the City.
- **Bikeway network completion**. Strive to complete the citywide bicycle network to create a full network of bicycle facilities throughout Seaside.
- **Transit Priority Corridors**. Provide measures to reduce delay to transit vehicles on priority transit corridors, such as queue-jump lanes and/or bus signal prioritization, where feasible, on transit priority street segments.
Transportation

- **Transit amenities.** Support right-of-way design and amenities consistent with local transit goals to make it easier to get to transit services and improve transit as a viable alternative to driving.

- **Transit stop maintenance is provided.** Work with local and regional transit agencies to ensure that transit stops are maintained in a safe, clean, and attractive condition to encourage transit ridership.

- **Safety Improvements.** Provide safety improvements, and prioritize pedestrian circulation over other travel modes, along high-injury and fatality streets and intersections.

- **Safety and traffic calming.** Use traffic calming methods within residential and mixed-use areas, where necessary, to create a pedestrian-friendly circulation system.

- **Safety for all modes.** Ensure that planned non-transportation capital improvement projects, on or near a roadway, consider safety for all modes of travel during construction and upon completion.

- **Transportation demand management (TDM).** Promote TDM measures for new development. Measures may include subsidized transit passes, car share spaces, unbundled parking, and secured bicycle parking. Allow the City to provide incentives to new projects that provide TDM measures.

- **TAMC and countywide planning efforts.** Continue to support the overall vision, goals, objectives and policies as a partner in TAMC. The City recognizes the regional significance of connecting bicycle and pedestrian facilities, sharing consistent guidelines, needs, and preferences within the City and the greater Monterey County.

- **Regional transit.** Continue to support and encourage development of TAMC’s planned regional transit projects and coordinate service and facilities for new development and redeveloped parts of the City.

**Marina General Plan**

The Marina General Plan was adopted on October 31, 2000 and updated with amendments through August 4, 2010 (City of Marina 2010). The Marina General Plan lays out broad goals and specific policies on land use, community design, circulation, housing, public facilities, open space, recreation, conservation, noise, seismic and safety, and historic preservation. The following are the primary policies of the Marina General Plan from the Transportation Element that are relevant to the analysis presented here:

- **Policy 3.3.2:** Reduce the length and travel time of work trips generated by local residents by maximizing opportunities for residents to work within the community.

- **Policy 3.3.4:** Reduce the number and length of vehicular trips and limit overall traffic congestion by promoting land use patterns which allow for multipurpose trips and trip deferral during peak travel times.
• **Policy 3.3.5:** The City of Marina shall ensure that walking and bicycling routes are integral parts of street design and form a safe and preferred transportation network. Protect existing and future residential areas from through-traffic that creates safety, noise, and pollution problems.

• **Policy 3.3.7:** The City of Marina shall coordinate with surrounding jurisdictions and agencies, such as TAMC, Caltrans, California Department of Parks and Recreation, Monterey Peninsula Regional Parks District, CSUMB, AMBAG, FORA, BLM [Bureau of Land Management], City of Seaside and Monterey County to pursue projects that develop new pedestrian and bicycle routes and that improve and maintain existing pedestrian and bicycle routes. New routes shall be linked to existing routes wherever possible.

• **Policy 3.3.8:** Link existing and future areas of the City with an integrated system of roads, transit, footpaths and bikeways that connects neighborhoods, commercial areas, schools, parks, and other major community-serving destinations.

• **Policy 3.3.9:** Where necessary and feasible, accept some traffic congestion to achieve other community goals, such as encouraging the integrity of neighborhoods and the use of alternative means of travel.

• **Policy 3.3.10:** Make all transportation decisions within a broad policy context that considers visual, environmental, economic and social objectives rather than being solely responsive to existing or projected traffic problems.

**Monterey County General Plan**

The Monterey County General Plan, released on October 26, 2010, presents a long-range vision for the County, looking forward 25 years into the future (County of Monterey 2010). The transportation goals and policies in the Circulation Element relevant to the analysis presented here are listed below:

• **Goal C-1** – Achieve an acceptable level of service by 2030.
  o **Policy C-1.1** – The acceptable level of service of County roads and intersection shall be Level of Service D, except as follows:
    ▪ Acceptable level of service for County roads in Community areas may be reduced below LOS D through the Community Plan process.
    ▪ County roads operating at LOS D or below at the time of adopting this General Plan shall not be allowed to be degraded further except in Community areas where the Lower LOS may be approved through the Community Plan process.
    ▪ Area Plans prepared for County Planning Areas may establish an acceptable level of service for County roads other than LOS D. The benefits which justify less than LOS D shall be identified in the Area Plan. Where an Area Plan does not establish a separate LOS, the standard LOS D shall apply.
• **Goal C-2** – Optimize the use of the County’s transportation facilities.
  o *Policy C-2.4* – A reduction of the number of vehicle miles traveled per person shall be encouraged.
  o *Policy C-2.6* – Bicycle and automobile storage facilities shall be encouraged in conjunction with public transportation facilities.

• **Goal C-3** – Minimize the negative impacts of transportation in the County.
  o *Policy C-3.1* – Transportation modes shall be planned and strategies developed to: protect air quality; reduce noise; reduce the consumption of fossil fuels; and minimize the acquisition of land for roadway construction.

• **Goal C-4** – Provide a public road and highway network for the efficient and safe movements of people and commodities.
  o *Policy C-4.2* – All new roads and interior circulation systems shall be designed, developed, and maintained according to adopted County standards or allowed through specific agreements and plans.
  o *Policy C-4.5* – New public local and collector roads shall be located and designed to minimize disruption of existing development, discourage through auto traffic and provide for bicycle and pedestrian traffic within the right-of-way.
  o *Policy C-4.7* – Where appropriate and sufficient public right-of-way is available, bicycle paths shall be separated from major roads and highways and be provided between adjacent communities.

• **Goal C-5** – Maintain and enhance a system of scenic roads and highways through areas of scenic beauty without imposing undue restrictions on private property or constricting the normal flow of traffic.
  o *Policy C-5.5* – Agencies involved in officially designating State Scenic Highways and/or County Scenic Roads shall coordinate their efforts for the integrated design and implementation of such designations.

• **Goal C-6** – Promote viable transportation options.
  o *Policy C-6.3* – The County shall encourage new development to concentrate along major transportation corridors and near cities to make transit services to these areas more feasible.
  o *Policy C-6.8* – The County shall encourage coordination between all social service transportation providers.

• **Goal C-8** – Encourage a rail system that offers efficient and economical transport of people and commodities.

• **Goal C-9** – Promote a safe, convenient bicycle transportation system integrated as part of the public roadway system.
• Policy C-9.2 – Construction of expansion of roadways within major transportation corridors shall consider improved bike routes.
• Policy C-9.5 – Visitor-serving facilities shall provide adequate bicycle access and secure bicycle parking facilities.

**TAMC Congestion Management Program**

TAMC is the designated Congestion Management Agency for Monterey County. In 1990, the state passed legislation requiring CMAs like TAMC to implement a Congestion Management Program (CMP). The CMP provides level of service and performance standards, trip reduction techniques, development of deficiency programs, transportation system management, and capital improvement programming for the purpose of minimizing regional traffic impacts of development. As a designated CMA, TAMC reviews land use development proposals in order to ensure that traffic impacts of land use development are mitigated. TAMC also undertakes traffic counting regionally, and projects traffic impacts on regional roadways based on adopted general plans and other land use planning documents.

**2018 Monterey County Active Transportation Plan**

The Monterey County Active Transportation Plan 2018 (ATP 2018) is an update of the 2011 Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan, which identified all existing and planned bicycle and pedestrian facilities in Monterey County (TAMC 2018). The Plan identifies remaining gaps in the bicycle and pedestrian network and opportunity areas for innovative bicycle facility design, such as a planned separated bikeway (Class IV) improvement along Inter-Garrison Road. These pedestrian and bicycle planned improvements, including the planned Inter-Garrison Road improvement, are shown on Figure 4.13-2 and Figure 4.13-3. The ATP has added more emphasis on “low-stress networks” that serve people of all ages and abilities, such as separate bike paths, protected bike lanes, bicycle boulevards, and bike protection at intersections. Goals set out in the Plan relevant to the analysis presented here include:

- Increasing the proportion of active transportation trips throughout Monterey County.
- Improve bicycle and pedestrian safety.
- Remove gaps and enhance bicycle and pedestrian network connectivity.
- Provide improved bicycle and pedestrian access to diverse areas and populations in Monterey County.
- Increase awareness of the environmental and public health benefits of bicycling and walking for transportation and recreation.
- Improve the quality of the bike and pedestrian network through innovative design and maintenance of existing facilities.
Monterey-Salinas Transit Designing for Transit

MST developed the Designing for Transit manual in November 2006 to provide guidance to decision-makers, developers, and community members on planning for safe and efficient transit (MST 2020). This includes guidance on considerations and statements other agencies should consider in their general plans and planning. MST advises these policy statements should be considered in General Plans to achieve a multi-modal transportation network:

- Integrate land use and circulation plans to create an urban environment that supports a multi-modal transportation system;
- Prioritize future development and redevelopment projects that are accessible using the existing multi-modal transportation network;
- Direct development to areas with a confluence of transportation facilities (sidewalks, bike paths, park & rides, and transit centers); and
- Limit development in areas accessible by only a single transportation mode

4.13.3 Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section presents the evaluation of potential environmental impacts associated with the Project related to transportation. The section identifies the thresholds of significance used in evaluating the impacts, the methods used in conducting the analysis, and the evaluation of Project impacts and the Project’s contribution to significant cumulative impacts. In the event significant impacts within the meaning of CEQA are identified, appropriate mitigation measures, where feasible, are identified.

4.13.3.1 Thresholds of Significance

The significance thresholds used to evaluate the transportation impacts of the Project are based on Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines and the 2019 CSU TISM (CSU 2019). Based on these two sources, the Project would result in a significant impact related to transportation if:

A. The Project would conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities.
B. The Project would result in a VMT-related impact as described below in Table 4.13-4.
C. The Project would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
D. The Project would result in inadequate emergency access.

For plan conflicts (Threshold A), the programs, plans, ordinances, and policies considered in the analysis presented here are those provided in Section 4.13.2, Regulatory Framework. For VMT impacts (Threshold B), the TISM recommends specific numeric thresholds for project and
cumulative conditions as shown in Table 4.13-4. Based on these recommended thresholds, Table 4.13-4 also provides the numeric thresholds applicable to the analysis of Project and cumulative impacts, as described in detail in Section 4.13.3.2, Analytical Method.

Table 4.13-4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Categories</th>
<th>CSU Significance Thresholds</th>
<th>Calculated Numeric Thresholds for Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Impacts</td>
<td>The threshold to be applied in assessing project-specific impacts is 15% below the existing total VMT per service population rate of Monterey County.</td>
<td>The Project would result in a significant project-specific impact if the CSUMB campus total VMT per service population under existing with Project conditions is greater than 23.91.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Impacts</td>
<td>The threshold to be applied in assessing cumulative impacts is no change in the cumulative conditions (future) boundary VMT per service population for Monterey County.</td>
<td>The Project would result in a significant cumulative impact if it causes the cumulative countywide daily boundary VMT per service population to be greater than 14.07.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSU 2019.

4.13.3.2 Analytical Method

Program- and Project-Level Review

The transportation impact analysis presented in this section includes a program-level analysis of the Project, as described in Chapter 3, Project Description. The analysis presented here also includes a project-level analysis of the 5 near-term development components that would be implemented under the Master Plan. Both construction and operation of the Project are considered in the impact analysis, where relevant. In the event significant environmental impacts would occur even with incorporation of applicable regulations and proposed project design features (PDFs), mitigation measures are identified to reduce impacts to less than significant, where feasible. PDFs from Chapter 3, Project Description, that are applicable to the transportation analysis are described below.

Project Design Features

Project elements that would affect the transportation system include the proposed increase in student enrollment and associated increase in faculty and staff, the added on-campus housing for students, faculty, and staff, and a Main Campus street and parking system that facilitates and prioritizes walking, bicycling, and transit use over vehicle travel. The related Project design features (PDF) are summarized below. See Chapter 3, Project Description for the details of each PDF.
There are a number of PDFs that are incorporated into the quantitative elements of the technical analysis (i.e., the trip generation rates), including:

- **PDF-MO-1 and PDF-MO-2** provide that CSUMB will accommodate at least 60 percent of enrolled students and 65 percent of faculty and staff in on-campus housing. CSUMB will implement these PDFs to ensure that these campus housing goals are met, which will minimize vehicle commute travel to and from the campus. Appendix C, Student Housing and Parking Management Guidelines, and the CSUMB Housing Guidelines (CSUMB 2022) provide additional information about meeting the identified housing goals.

- **PDF-MO-6(c)** provides that CSUMB will implement strategies and measures to reduce parking demand including that parking will be consolidated and relocated to select areas on the periphery of the campus core. While this PDF includes other measures (e.g., maintaining existing parking supply, prohibiting residential Freshmen and Sophomores from purchasing a parking permit, a “park once” policy), such measures are not assumed in the quantitative analysis.

- **PDF-MO-8** establishes restrictions to general vehicle travel through the campus core and locates vehicle circulation and parking on the campus periphery (see Chapter 3, Project Description, Figure 3-9). Specifically, vehicle access will be limited to CSUMB students, faculty, and staff vehicles on General Jim Moore Boulevard between Eighth Street and Fifth Street. Vehicle travel through the campus core will be restricted to shuttles, transit vehicles, service vehicles, and emergency vehicles at: Inter-Garrison Road between General Jim Moore Boulevard and Sixth Avenue, Divarty Street between General Jim Moore Boulevard and Seventh Avenue, Fourth Avenue between Divarty Street and Inter-Garrison Road, Fifth Avenue between Divarty Street and Inter-Garrison, A Street between Divarty Street and Seventh Avenue, Sixth Avenue between B Street and north of Divarty Street, and Butler Street between Sixth Avenue and Seventh Avenue. Additionally, Seventh Avenue between Colonel Durham Street and Butler Street will be converted to one-way for vehicles traveling north from Colonel Durham Street to Inter-Garrison Road.

Other mobility PDFs are considered qualitatively in the technical analysis, thereby resulting in overstating impacts, including:

- **PDF-MO-3 through PDF-MO-5** provide for mixed-use campus development with amenities, a mix of on-campus student housing types and a compact campus core that support and improve campus life, reduce vehicle travel off campus and promote on-campus pedestrian and bicycle access.

- **PDF-MO-6** provides for the implementation, enhancement, and expansion of TDM strategies to reduce single-occupant vehicle trips as part of a formal TDM Plan (PDF-MO-6). The TDM plan will address parking management, transit mobility (PDF-MO-12 through
PDF-MO-16), bicycle and pedestrian mobility (PDF-MO-17 through PDF-MO-18), and program monitoring and administration.

- **PDF-MO-7 and PDF-MO-9** provide for the expansion of the campus multi-modal transportation system infrastructure and programs by establishing two multimodal hubs to provide centralized arrival points on campus from the four campus entries with signs that lead to two key arrival areas including: Divarty Street and General Jim Moore Boulevard on the west side (Peninsula Gateway) and Inter-Garrison Road and Sixth Avenue on the east side (Valley Gateway).

- **PDF-MO-10 and PDF-MO-11** provide for expansion and maintenance of a comprehensive regional wayfinding sign sequence from the primary campus entrances, to campus parking locations, along with universally accessible design throughout campus.

- **PDF-MO-12 through PDF-MO-16** provide for continued free or discounted access to campus, local and regional transit services; maintenance of connections to regional transit from Main Campus and East Campus Housing; improvement of the campus shuttle; expansion of the para-transportation services on campus; and implementation of transit design standards.

- **PDF-MO-17 and PDF-MO-18** establish bicycle mobility as an important travel consideration, prioritized before internal vehicle travel in campus development and programs by implementing a range of measures, including but not limited to establishing at least one form of bicycle route facility on or adjacent to all campus roadways. Pedestrian mobility is established as the primary travel consideration in campus development and programs by expanding accessible pedestrian pathways on campus and linking to adjacent commercial developments along the campus periphery and to surrounding destinations.

- **PDF-MO-19** requires the development and implementation of a construction traffic control plan when construction projects require significant work within existing roadways.

**Technical Methods**

The VMT approach and technical methods were tailored for the Project because of the size of the CSUMB campus, the unique travel behavior of each portion of the CSUMB population, and varied housing locations of the CSUMB population. In establishing conditions tailored for the Project, the Project trip generation is based on observed CSUMB travel characteristics and the assumption that the existing parking management and TDM measures, described in Section 4.13.1.2, Environmental Setting, would remain in place on the CSUMB campus, and those measures continue to be effective in reducing vehicle trip making and encouraging the use of other modes of travel. Rather than calculating the net increase in the Project’s total VMT due to

---

4 Disruptive trends, including but not limited to, transportation network companies (TNCs), autonomous vehicles (AVs), internet shopping, remote-working or remote-learning, and micro-transit may affect the future effectiveness of these strategies.
the net increase in land uses like most projects, total VMT is estimated for the entire campus under both existing conditions and Project conditions to capture the effects of increasing on-campus housing and shifting student housing from East Campus Housing to Main Campus. Specifically, the Project VMT is the net new CSUMB campus total VMT, which is the difference between the total VMT under existing conditions and the total VMT under Project conditions. For the cumulative conditions analysis, the change in the boundary VMT on the roadway system in Monterey County is evaluated without and with the Project. The subsections below review the VMT assessment and estimation methods used in the VMT analysis. Impact TRA-2 describes the analysis scenarios evaluated in the VMT analysis.

VMT Assessment Methods

As discussed below, the VMT analysis presented in this section and in Appendix H considers the Project’s direct impacts, as well as a cumulative analysis that considers the Project’s long-term effect on VMT. The VMT analysis methods and thresholds used for this analysis are consistent with both CEQA and the 2019 CSU TISM and address the unique characteristics of a university campus development project, which are not specifically addressed in the OPR Technical Advisory.

While the OPR Technical Advisory recommends considering a project’s short-term, long-term, and cumulative effects on VMT, it provides limited recommendations on how to prepare a comprehensive VMT analysis for university projects. Accordingly, after careful evaluation of the OPR Technical Advisory relative to a university setting, the CSU Chancellor’s Office prepared the 2019 CSU TISM to provide guidance for CEQA compliant transportation impact analyses pursuant to SB 743 for all CSU campuses.

To implement the SB 743 VMT assessment, certain decisions about methods were made relative to the VMT forecasting model, VMT accounting methods, calculation of the baseline and cumulative regional VMT estimates, and VMT thresholds required for a comprehensive analysis. The necessary tasks and the selected tools used to implement each task are as follows:

- Select a VMT calculation tool
  - Use the AMBAG regional travel forecasting model.
- Select the VMT accounting method(s)
  - Total (Project-Generated)

VMT per service population (for Direct Impacts): The sum of the “VMT from” and “VMT to” and within a specific geographic area divided

For projects requiring a full VMT assessment, the 2019 California State University Transportation Impact Study Manual describes the need to evaluate the project-generated VMT per service population. This analysis uses the total VMT metric. The Project’s VMT is the difference between the CSUMB campus total VMT under existing with Project conditions and existing conditions. This approach of identifying the Project’s total VMT is to capture the effects of increasing on-campus housing and shifting student housing from East Campus Housing to Main Campus.
by the service population, which is the sum of the number of residents, employees, and students in the county.

- Project’s effect on VMT per service population (for Cumulative Impacts): An evaluation of the change in travel between without and with Project conditions on all roadways within Monterey County under cumulative conditions divided by the sum of the number of residents, employees, and students in the county.

- Calculate the baseline and cumulative regional VMT estimates

  - The analysis presented here uses VMT from all trip purposes and vehicle types (i.e., there is no separation of VMT by land use) for Monterey County with a baseline set as existing conditions VMT generated by Monterey County and cumulative set as VMT on all roadways in Monterey County under cumulative without Project conditions. (See VMT Estimation Methods below for more details.)

- Set VMT threshold(s)

  - The threshold to be applied in assessing Project-specific impacts is 15 percent below the existing total VMT per service population rate of Monterey County.\(^6\) (See Table 4.13-4 for additional details about this threshold.)

  - The threshold to be applied in assessing cumulative impacts (Project’s effect on VMT) is no change in the cumulative conditions (future) boundary VMT per service population (without and with Eastside Parkway) for Monterey County. (See Table 4.13-4 for additional details about this threshold.)

As to direct impacts, total VMT per service population is the metric used to evaluate how the CSUMB campus VMT rate changes (increases or decreases) between the “without Project” and “with Project” scenarios, considering both VMT increases due to growth and VMT reductions due to changes in travel behavior. The “with Project” scenario results are divided by the number of full-time equivalent students (FTES) and FTE faculty and staff (the change in service population due to the Project) to normalize the results — that is, to account for the differences in travel behavior among the different campus population types. Total VMT per service population is used to evaluate changes in the VMT rate due to the Project (i.e., the direct impacts); however, it does not evaluate a Project’s effect on VMT on the entire roadway system, which is evaluated as part of the cumulative analysis.

Regarding the cumulative analysis, the CSUMB campus land use changes are relatively small in the context of Monterey County’s residential population and employment; therefore, it is likely that the Project’s effect on VMT (cumulative impact) would be localized, such as shifting some existing

\(^6\) The CSU has selected the 15 percent reduction relative to Monterey County based on the OPR Technical Advisory. (See, e.g., OPR Technical Advisory, page 10, December 2018.)
trips to/from other neighborhoods close to the CSUMB campus. Furthermore, the Project is likely to cause existing pass-through traffic to shift to alternate routes as more CSUMB campus-generated traffic occurs on the local streets within and near the CSUMB campus. Therefore, the Project’s effect on VMT, as evaluated by the cumulative effects of the Project’s land use and transportation changes, compares the changes in boundary VMT per service population between the cumulative and cumulative with Project conditions, including with and without Eastside Parkway conditions.

VMT Estimation Methods

Total VMT per Service Population Estimation Method

The total VMT is the VMT from all vehicle trips for all trip purposes and types caused by the residential population, employment population, and student population in a specified area. It is calculated by summing the “VMT within” the specified geographic area (internal-internal trips), “VMT from” the specified geographic area (internal-external trips), and “VMT to” the geographic area (external-internal trips), as follows:

\[
Total \ VMT = (II + IX) + (II + XI) = 2 * II + IX + XI
\]

- Internal-internal (II): The full length of all trips made entirely within the specified geographic area limits.
- Internal-external (IX): The full length of all trips with an origin within the specified geographic area and a destination outside of the area.
- External-internal (XI): The full length of all trips with an origin outside of the specified geographic area and a destination within the area.

The intra-zonal VMT and VMT between traffic analysis zones, or TAZs, that are in the specified geographic study area causes some double-counting, which is an expected result when summing the trip-end based on VMT. To ensure the VMT rate is expressed properly (i.e., that the numerator and denominator include the generators of both trip ends of the VMT), the total VMT is divided by the service population (residential population, employment population, plus student population), whom are the generators of both trip ends of the VMT. The VMT estimates are also presented on a per service population basis to account for both the effects of population and/or employment growth and the effects of changes in personal travel behavior. For example, population growth may cause an increase in VMT, while travelers changing their behavior by using different travel modes or decreasing their vehicle trip lengths (such as a higher percentage of students living on campus) would cause decreases in VMT.
Project’s Effect on VMT Estimation Method (Using Boundary VMT)

As previously noted, the Project’s effect on VMT, or cumulative impact, generally is evaluated using boundary VMT, which captures all VMT on the roadway network within a specified geographic area, including local trips plus interregional travel that does not have an origin or destination within the region. The boundary VMT method only considers traffic within the physical limits of the selected study area and does not include the impact of vehicles once they travel outside the area limits. Thus, the use of boundary VMT provides a complete evaluation of the potential effects of the Project because it captures the combined effect of new VMT, shifting existing VMT to/from other neighborhoods, and/or shifts in existing traffic to alternate travel routes or modes. As considered here, the boundary VMT also is divided by the service population (sum of residents, employees, and students) to account for the effects of population and/or employment growth, and the effects of changes in personal travel behavior within the specified geographic area.

4.13.3.3 Project Impacts and Mitigation Measures

This section provides a detailed evaluation of transportation impacts associated with the Project.

| Impact TRA-1: Conflict with Program, Plan, Ordinance, or Policy Addressing the Circulation System (Threshold A) | The Project would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities. (Less than Significant) |

Master Plan

As indicated in Draft EIR Chapter 3, upon buildout of the Project, the campus would accommodate an increase in campus enrollment from the existing 6,634 FTES and 1,024 FTE faculty/staff to 12,700 FTES and 1,776 FTE faculty/staff. Achieving this growth would result in an increase of approximately 6,066 FTE students and 752 FTE faculty/staff over existing levels.

The Project would also result in a net increase of approximately 2.6 million gross square feet (GSF) of new academic, administration, student life, athletic recreational, and institutional partnership facilities, and housing. Academic buildings would continue to be concentrated in the campus core to allow for pedestrian travel between buildings in under 10 minutes (PDF-MO-5). On-campus housing would be constructed to continue to accommodate approximately 60 percent of FTES and existing housing would accommodate 65 percent of FTE faculty and staff, with a projected increase of 3,820 student beds and 757 converted residential units for faculty and staff, as indicated in PDF-

---

7 Existing conditions are based on 2016/2017 academic year conditions.
MO-1 and PDF-MO-2. A mixture of uses and amenities in new student housing buildings would be provided to improve campus life and reduce vehicle travel (PDF-MO-3).

The Project would also accommodate redevelopment and growth in outdoor athletics and recreation facilities to serve campus needs, with space set aside for additional athletic fields, tennis courts, and pools, as well as for replacement of the existing stadium, field house, and pool house. Additionally, other key PDFs would be implemented as part of the Project that have transportation implications, including the PDFs summarized in Section 4.13.3.2, Analytical Methods, and further described in the analysis below.

The subsections below evaluate the Project’s potential conflicts with programs, plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle, and pedestrian facilities. The proposed Master Plan and applicable PDFs are considered in the evaluation, where relevant. As a state agency, CSU/CSUMB is not subject to local planning regulations, ordinances, policies or requirements. However, to the extent feasible, CSU endeavors to coordinate with local agencies and, as such, this section includes analysis of the Project’s consistency with such local plans.

Transit Evaluation

Analysis of transit-related impacts encompasses two components: (1) transit capacity, and (2) the Project’s consistency with local transit plans. For transit capacity, a significant impact would occur if the Project creates demand for public transit above existing or planned capacity. To determine the Project’s consistency with local transit plans, an inconsistency would occur if the Project or any part of the Project:

- Disrupts existing transit services or facilities; or
- Conflicts with an existing or planned transit facility; or
- Conflicts with transit policies adopted by the City of Seaside, Monterey County, Fort Ord Reuse Authority, Transportation Agency for Monterey County, or Monterey-Salinas Transit for their respective facilities in the study area.

Transit Capacity

Existing access for regional MST bus routes is provided primarily via Inter-Garrison Road, Imjin Road, and General Jim Moore Boulevard. Currently, regional routes mainly circulate through Inter-Garrison, Divarty Street, East Campus Housing, and General Jim Moore Boulevard.

---

8 When evaluating impacts to multimodal transportation networks, lead agencies generally should not treat the addition of new transit users as an adverse impact (OPR 2018).

9 This includes disruptions caused by the Project relative to transit street operations and transit stops/shelters; or impacts to transit operations from traffic improvements proposed or resulting from the Project.
Figure 4.13-4 shows the existing transit service in and around the campus. It is reasonable to expect that if there is adequate demand, existing transit circulation would be maintained in the future, including through the future restricted access segments of Inter-Garrison Road and Divarty Street, identified in PDF-MO-8 and shown in Figure 3-9 (Chapter 3, Project Description). Since these restricted access segments are primarily designed to preserve bicycle and pedestrian circulation near the core campus, regional transit travel would be limited as much as possible to core routes, and shuttles would primarily travel along the periphery of the Main Campus, as shown in Figure 3-10 (Chapter 3, Project Description).

With PDF-MO-14, additional shuttles are proposed to support the regional transit passing through the campus, as well as residents living in Main Campus and East Campus Housing. Existing shuttles run as MST routes and primarily travel along Inter-Garrison Road, Divarty Street, and East Campus. In the future, these additional shuttles are proposed to circulate in a larger loop serving the East Campus Housing, North Main Campus Housing, the multimodal hubs, and parking areas by traveling along the Fifth Street, Sixth Street, Inter-Garrison Road, Divarty Street, and General Jim Moore Boulevard (see Figure 3-10 in Chapter 3, Project Description).

The Project does not propose changes to the transit system that would impact the 2040 MTP/SCS goals of expanding the role transit plays in meeting the region’s mobility needs such as investments in bus rapid transit, expansion of local services, and planned rail projects. Internal circulation changes within the campus would support core regional transit travel.

Project transit ridership is estimated using the existing mode splits for each population type by housing location. Assuming the public transit service levels and the destinations accessible by transit (e.g., portion of jobs and other land use destinations) remain similar between existing conditions and existing with Project conditions, and assuming no parking management strategies are implemented that would encourage transit ridership, for the reasons explained below, it is reasonable to expect that transit travel behavior (e.g., percent transit mode share for each population type and residential location) would generally remain the same as existing conditions. Therefore, the existing transit mode share by population type was used in calculating the Project transit ridership.

The reason for this determination is because switching from the disaggregated mode share splits for each population type and residential location to the Main Campus transit mode share, the analysis shows there actually would be a decrease in the transit mode share over time as students are moved from East Campus Housing to Main Campus and, therefore, would be less reliant on transit. Based on the CSUMB person trip survey, the transit mode share currently is less than 10 percent of the campus population travel. As more housing is built on campus and students are moved from East Campus Housing to Main Campus, the share of travel by walking and bicycling is expected to increase and the transit mode share is expected to drop to less than 5 percent (see Table 4.13-5).
However, while the transit mode share expressed as a percentage could decrease, the total number of transit riders is likely to increase as CSUMB increases its implementation of effective parking management and TDM strategies, which would result in an increase in the number of transit riders under future conditions. In particular, PDF-MO-6, PDF-MO-7, and PDF-MO-12 through PDF-MO-16 would result in the preparation and implementation of additional and expanded TDM measures to enhance and expand existing TDM strategies being implemented on campus, which would include measures to increase transit use. Relatively, because the provision of transit service is reactive to increased demand for transit ridership, transit service can be increased via increased bus frequency and additional routes if justified, as acknowledged in PDF-MO-6(d).

Table 4.13-5
Existing and Project AM Peak Period Inbound Person Mode Share

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mode</th>
<th>All CSUMB Students, Faculty &amp; Staff</th>
<th>CSUMB East Campus and Off-Campus Residents Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Existing Conditions</td>
<td>Project Conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Alone¹</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ride²</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive Sub-Total</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Tables 24 and 25
Notes:
¹ Drive alone includes motorcycles
² Shared ride includes carpooling, vanpooling, drop-off, Transportation Network Companies like Uber and Lyft, and taxis.

As shown in Table 4.13-6, Main Campus transit ridership is expected to increase as the Project proposes to house more students on the Main Campus. The student population has higher existing transit ridership rates compared to faculty and staff. Since the same travel behaviors are assumed in the future, increasing the student population on the Main Campus would correspondingly increase Project ridership on the Main Campus. In comparison, transit ridership would decrease in the East Campus. The current East Campus Housing faculty and staff transit mode share is 2.9 percent, and the East Campus Housing student transit mode share is 32.8 percent. Relocation of student residents to the Main Campus and increasing the number of faculty and staff residents at East Campus Housing would therefore lower East Campus Housing Project transit ridership overall, because faculty and staff use transit less than students. The transit ridership numbers are based on a condition where there are no additional mobility PDFs being implemented to discourage use of single occupant vehicles, such as the parking management
strategies in PDF-MO-6. As previously noted, future parking management strategies could cause transit ridership to increase, thereby potentially exceeding future projected ridership rates shown in Table 4.13-6. Should this occur it is expected that future transit service would be implemented to serve the future ridership demand, as indicated in PDF-MO-6(d).

Table 4.13-6
Transit Ridership Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Source</th>
<th>Existing Ridership</th>
<th>Project Ridership&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>PM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Main Campus</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Share/Trip Gen Data&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST Data&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>East Campus Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode Share/Trip Gen Data&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MST Data&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Tables 14 and 15
Notes:
1. Peak hour ridership calculated using mode share data from person trip surveys (inbound - AM, outbound - PM), and campus population type by housing location.
3. Peak hour ridership data from Spring 2017 MST data for Route 26, which travels between East Campus and Main Campus.
4. Future ridership conservatively based on current conditions, assuming no increase in on-campus housing, parking policies or additional transit connectivity to encourage ridership.

A bus capacity analysis was conducted for the weekday AM and PM peak hours when the Project's estimated public transit ridership is the highest. This analysis assumes that public transit service levels and the destinations accessible by transit (e.g., portion of jobs and other land use destinations) are similar between existing conditions and existing with Project conditions. Therefore, Project transit riders are estimated to use each route in similar proportions as existing conditions. The estimated Project peak hour boardings per route are presented in Table 4.13-7. The Existing with Project peak hour boardings were then divided by the route’s vehicle capacity to determine if the Project would cause the ridership-to-capacity ratio to exceed 1.0 and therefore create demand for public transit above the capacity that is currently provided.

As shown in Table 4.13-7, for each of the six MST bus routes serving the campus, boardings related to the Project would not result in over capacity conditions on any of the routes. Thus, the Project is not anticipated to create demand for public transit above the existing available capacity and, therefore, the impact of the Project on transit ridership and facilities would be less than significant.
Moreover, the additional shuttles proposed by the Project to circulate within the campus would not affect existing or planned transit facilities and would not reduce existing or planned capacity. These proposed shuttles would add capacity that could serve estimated Project ridership from the Main Campus and East Campus Housing, as described above.

Table 4.13-7
Weekday Peak Hour Bus Route Capacity Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Peak Hour</th>
<th>Peak Hour Capacity [A]</th>
<th>Average Existing Peak Hour Boarding²</th>
<th>Project Peak Hour Boarding³</th>
<th>Total Boarding [B]</th>
<th>Over Capacity? (B/A&gt;1?)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>AM</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PM</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Table 16
Notes:
1. Bus capacity is a product of the average number of buses serving the route during the weekday AM and PM peak hours and sitting and standing capacity. Peak hour capacity was calculated by dividing the peak period capacity by two.
2. Calculations based on Spring 2017 Tuesday through Thursday peak period ridership data provided by MST. Peak hour boardings were calculated by dividing the peak period capacity by two.
3. Plan transit ridership per route estimated based on the proportion of ridership for the route.

Transit Plans and Policies

Consistent with the 2040 MTP/SCS, the existing transit circulation would be maintained in the future, including through the future restricted access segments of Inter-Garrison Road and Divarty Road. The changes to the vehicle circulation system as part of the Project would not interfere with existing transit facilities nor conflict with planned transit facilities and services or conflict with adopted transit plans, guidelines, policies, or standards. Additionally, the Project is supportive of transit use and goals, as indicated in PDF-MO-6, PDF-MO-7, and PDF-MO-12 through PDF-MO-16. Therefore, as the Project would not disrupt existing or planned transit facilities or conflict with transit programs, plans, ordinances, or policies, the impact would be less than significant.
Roadway Evaluation

To determine the Project’s consistency with local roadway plans, the Project would be inconsistent if the Project or any part of the Project would disrupt existing or planned roadway facilities or conflict with a relevant program, plan, ordinance, or policy.

The Project includes modifications to existing campus parking and street facilities to create a more pedestrian and bicycle-oriented campus core (see Chapter 3, Project Description, Figures 3-9, 3-11 and 3-12). These modifications would cause existing and future local and regional traffic to circulate differently on-campus and in some cases divert traffic to adjacent streets. The expected influence on existing and future traffic for each of the key PDFs to be implemented as part of the Project, are listed below:

- Parking will be consolidated and relocated to select areas on the periphery of the campus core (PDF-MO-6[c]):
  - Traffic Volume Change: Less CSUMB vehicle traffic within the campus core. Increased volumes of CSUMB vehicles along the outer streets of the Main Campus.

- Vehicle access will be limited to CSUMB students, faculty, and staff vehicles on General Jim Moore Boulevard between Eighth Street and Fifth Street (PDF-MO-8):
  - Traffic Volume Change: Shifting of non-CSUMB vehicles to parallel streets of Second Avenue and Eighth Street and direct access to new parking lots for CSUMB vehicles along General Jim Moore Boulevard.

- Vehicle travel through the campus core will be restricted to shuttles, transit vehicles, service vehicles, and emergency vehicles by limiting access at Inter-Garrison Road between General Jim Moore Boulevard and Sixth Avenue, Divarty Street between General Jim Moore Boulevard and Seventh Avenue, Fourth Avenue between Divarty Street and Inter-Garrison Road, Fifth Avenue between Divarty Street and Inter-Garrison, A Street between Divarty Street and Seventh Avenue, Sixth Avenue between B Street and north of Divarty Street, and Butler Street between Sixth Avenue and Seventh Avenue. (PDF-MO-8):
  - Traffic Volume Change: Shifting of existing and future vehicle traffic to nearby roadway facilities, including Second Avenue, Eighth Street (future street extension between Third Avenue and Fifth Avenue), Imjin Parkway, Eighth Street, Colonel Durham Street, and Gigling Road.

- Seventh Avenue between Colonel Durham Street and Butler Street will be converted to one-way for vehicles traveling north from Colonel Durham Street to Inter-Garrison Road (PDF-MO-8).
  - Traffic Volume Change: Shifting of outbound traffic to Eighth Avenue. (A complement to limiting vehicle access within the campus core.)
Overall, the Project would not conflict with existing or planned roadway facilities because the proposed roadway changes are limited to on-campus roads. Moreover, while the Project would result in a shift of vehicle traffic from the campus core to nearby roads, the Project also includes a “park once” policy (see PDF-MO-6c) that would limit vehicle circulation on local streets on or near the CSUMB campus during the day. Parallel transportation improvements (such as the Eighth Street extension and Gigling Road to Inter-Garrison Road) would serve the shifts in local and regional traffic that otherwise would travel through the CSUMB campus. The street modifications also would support a more walkable, bikeable and transit-oriented campus core. The Project is not expected to interfere with existing roadway facilities, conflict with planned roadway facilities or conflict with adopted transportation plans, guidelines, policies, or standards. Therefore, as the Project would not result in the disruption of existing or planned roadways, or conflict with a program, plan, ordinance, or policy, the impact would be less than significant.

Bicycle Evaluation

To determine the Project’s consistency with local bicycle plans, a conflict would occur if the Project or any part of the Project would disrupt existing or planned bicycle facilities, or conflict with applicable bicycle plans, guidelines, policies, or standards. The Project is expected to generate demand for bicycle lanes, bicycle routes, and off-street shared use paths between the campus and adjacent land uses, and travel to/from areas within the entire campus. The Project proposes to improve bicycle access along Inter-Garrison Road and Divarty Street by restricting vehicles along segments of these roadways next to the campus core, as show in Figure 3-9 and described in PDF-MO-8 and PDF-MO-17. Inter-Garrison Road has bicycle lanes (Class II) from East Campus Housing to Main Campus. The Project proposes to improve bicycle travel through the Main Campus by:

- Replacing the existing Class II facilities (bike lanes) on Inter-Garrison Road between Fourth Avenue and Sixth Avenue with Class I facilities (bike paths),
- Installing a Class I bicycle path facility in place of the existing Class III bicycle route facility along the future restricted access segment of Divarty Street between General Jim Moore Boulevard to Seventh Avenue, and
- Installing a Class I bicycle path along the segment of General Jim Moore Boulevard that transverses the Main Campus from Lightfighter Road to Divarty Street and that would serve as a main bicycle north-south route.
- Providing a network of Class I trails linking the campus together.

The proposed campus bicycle and pedestrian networks are shown on Figure 3-11 and Figure 3-12, respectively (see Chapter 3, Project Description).
To further facilitate bicycle and pedestrian travel, smaller interior parking lots would be removed, which would allow for increased internal campus facilities, such as campus bicycle and pedestrian paths and trails to aid pedestrian and bicycle circulation. These internal bicycle and pedestrian paths are proposed near housing and other campus buildings that would connect to the proposed bicycle facilities on roadways described above, and existing and planned facilities and trails, including the planned Fort Ord Regional Trail and Greenway (FORTAG) shown on Figure 3-11 (see Chapter 3, Project Description).

The FORTAG is a planned 30-mile network of regional trails that will connect Seaside, Marina, and CSUMB, and will extend to the existing Monterey Bay Sanctuary Scenic Trail that is parallel to SR 1. The FORTAG trail is planned to go through the Main Campus and along Butler Street, Eighth Street, and Divarty Street within the campus. The trail would also intersect with Inter-Garrison Road, General Jim Moore Boulevard, and Second Avenue within and around the Main Campus. The Project’s consolidation of parking to satellite parking areas would not interfere with the FORTAG trail’s alignment and would remove driveways of smaller existing parking lots near the Main Campus reducing the number of conflict points for the trail. The Project would not interfere with the FORTAG trail’s planned route and proposes bicycle facilities that would provide connections to the trail.

Overall, the Project’s bicycle enhancements on the campus core align with the ATP 2018, except for the planned improvement along a portion of Inter-Garrison Road. Under existing conditions, Inter-Garrison Road is a bike route (Class III bikeway) from Second Avenue to Seventh Avenue and has bike lanes (Class II bikeway) from Seventh Avenue to Inter-Garrison Road Connection. Under the ATP 2018, Inter-Garrison Road is planned as a cycle track or separated bikeway (Class IV bikeway) from General Jim Moore Boulevard to Eighth Street/Seventh Avenue (see Figure 4.13-3). As shown on Figures 3-9, 3-11 and 3-12 in Chapter 3, Project Description, the Project proposes to restrict vehicle travel and construct a shared-use path (Class I bikeway) along Inter-Garrison Road between General Jim Moore Boulevard and Sixth Avenue. The specifics of this Project improvement differ somewhat from what is proposed in the ATP 2018; although, the Project’s improvement would provide a path for exclusive use of bicycle and pedestrians and would not preclude the future development of a cycle track on the alignment. Thus, the path would provide bicyclists with a travel lane that is separated from vehicular traffic as would a cycle track and, as a result achieves the same purpose. Therefore, the Project is consistent with the ATP 2018. Moreover, the Project’s improvements would not preclude the future development of a cycle track on the alignment.

The Project improvements of adding new internal bicycle paths, and on-road bicycle facilities connecting to existing and planned bicycle facilities align with the overall goals and policies of the plans described in Section 4.13.2.4, such as the ATP 2018, which are to improve bicycle connectivity by eliminating gaps, improving the quality of the bicycle network, and supporting
complete streets for all users, including bicyclists. The Project improvements would not disrupt or conflict with the intent of planned bicycle facilities consistent with relevant plan goals and policies, and would not conflict with applicable programs, plans, ordinance or policies related to bicycle facilities. Therefore, the bicycle-related impact of the Project would be less than significant.

Pedestrian Evaluation

To determine the Project’s consistency with local pedestrian plans, a conflict would occur if the Project or any part of the Project would fail to provide safe pedestrian connections between campus buildings and adjacent streets and transit facilities, disrupt existing or planned pedestrian facilities, or conflict with applicable plans, guidelines, or policies.

The Project proposes to increase housing within the Main Campus and locate parking areas outside of the campus core. These changes are expected to generate demand for sidewalks and off-street shared use paths. As can be seen on Figure 4.13-2, there are gaps in the existing sidewalks on and around the campus. As shown on Figure 3-12 and described in PDF-MO-18, the Project would expand the pedestrian network on the campus and to adjacent land uses by adding multi-use greenways, pedestrian pathways, and closing existing sidewalk gaps. The Project also proposes to establish additional pedestrian malls such as Divarty Street and Inter-Garrison Road.

The Project site plan was evaluated for internal circulation between the residential housing, academic and recreational uses, and transit stops. As part of the Project, Divarty Street would be further developed as a pedestrian mall with restricted vehicle travel. Along with Divarty Street, Inter-Garrison Road would also be limited to only pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel. The restricted access roadways, identified in Figure 3-9 and described in PDF-MO-8, would allow for improved pedestrian circulation within the campus core of the Main Campus. Along with restricting vehicles from traveling along the campus core, smaller interior parking lots will be removed, and parking would be located mainly on the periphery of the campus to help minimize pedestrian and vehicle conflicts.

Bus stops are mainly concentrated around the campus core along Inter-Garrison Road, Divarty Street, and Sixth Avenue, which would be limited to only pedestrian, bicycle, and transit travel. Pedestrians will continue to have access to the campus core bus stops.

The Project includes expanding the pedestrian network by adding multi-use greenways and pedestrian pathways. These pathways would link the campus core to residential areas in the north end of the Main Campus and the athletics and recreation area in the southern end of the Main Campus.

The pedestrian goals and policies of the plans summarized in Section 4.13.2.4 include increasing trail connections to parks and open space, supporting pedestrian movements, improving pedestrian safety, and removing gaps in the pedestrian network. The Project improvements such
as increased trail connections to existing and planned trails, expanding multi-use greenways and pathways, reducing vehicle circulation through the campus core, and closing gaps in the pedestrian network align with these goals and policies. The Project would not interfere with existing or planned pedestrian facilities nor conflict with applicable non-vehicle transportation plans, guidelines, policies, or standards and, instead, would enhance pedestrian circulation within the campus core and connections to adjacent land uses, which is a beneficial effect on the pedestrian circulation and access. Therefore, as the Project would not conflict with pedestrian-related plans the impact would be less than significant.

Construction Evaluation

Construction activities include those associated with site preparation and building and other infrastructure construction. Site preparation includes all of the activities required to allow construction on the Project site. Major components of site preparation would involve removal of the existing parking lots, excavation and grading of the site, and construction of necessary infrastructure. A variety of equipment would be required for the site preparation stage, including bulldozers, grading machines, cranes, and dump trucks, which would be responsible for the removal and deposition of cut and fill material on the site. Major elements of building construction could include driving piles to support the building foundation, assembling the concrete reinforcing bars as the building frame, pouring concrete, and completing the building accessories such as elevators. Additional infrastructure construction includes streets and parking lots.

To address construction traffic, PDF-MO-19 requires that Project contractors implement construction traffic control plans, to comply with California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) Standard Specifications and to include, among other components, appropriate traffic control devices, such as signage and temporary roadway closures, if necessary. With implementation of the plan, safe access to the pedestrian, bicycle, transit and street facilities would be maintained while construction activities associated with the Project proceed. Therefore, Project construction would not conflict with transportation plans and impacts would be less than significant.

Near-Term Development Components

Transit Evaluation

The five near-term development components would all be located on the Main Campus and include Student Housing IIB, Student Housing III, Academic IV, Academic V, and Student Recreation Center, which are anticipated to be constructed in the first 10 years of Project implementation. The FTE building capacity associated with the academic developments would add capacity such that CSUMB could incrementally increase student enrollment and associated growth in faculty and staff. Additionally, the two student housing developments would increase
the number of on-campus residents. An increase in student enrollment and housing, as well as faculty and staff would increase the demand for transit services. However, given that the near-term development components are a component, or subset, of the building program anticipated under the Project, these near-term developments would not create a demand for public transit exceeding that of the entire Master Plan as shown in Table 4.13-7 above, and, therefore, the impact of the near-term development components on transit ridership and facilities would be less than significant.

Consistent with the 2040 MTP/SCS, the existing transit circulation would also be maintained in the future with the near-term development components. Additionally, these developments would not interfere with existing transit facilities, conflict with planned transit facilities and services, or conflict with adopted transit plans, guidelines, policies, or standards. Therefore, as the Project would not disrupt existing or planned transit facilities or conflict with transit programs, plans, ordinances, or policies, the impact would be less than significant.

Roadway Evaluation

The near-term development components would not impact or disrupt existing or planned roadways, as these developments in and of themselves would not result in any changes or restrictions to on-campus roadways. Modifications to access driveways could be implemented at each site, if necessary, to ensure adequate service and emergency access is provided. Such modifications, however, would not disrupt existing or planned adjacent roadways. Therefore, as the Project would not conflict with roadway programs, plans, ordinances, or policies, the impact would be less than significant.

Bicycle and Pedestrian Evaluation

An increase in student enrollment and student housing on the Main Campus associated with the near-term development components would generate demand for sidewalks and off-street shared use paths on the Main Campus, especially where there are gaps in the existing sidewalks around the campus (see Figure 4.13-2). As PDF-MO-6e provides that bicycle and pedestrian improvements would be implemented as part of capital projects, it is expected that filling in sidewalk gaps and other improvements to facilitate pedestrian and bicycle access would be implemented in conjunction with the near-term development components. As an example of this standard practice, the completion of the Library and the Business and Information Technology Building included completion of the sidewalk on the south side of Divarty Street. The recently completed Academic III building included a sidewalk along its frontage on Divarty Street. The Student Recreation Center, one of the near-term development components, would be expected to complete the sidewalk along the south side of Divarty Street. Given the above, the near-term development components would provide safe pedestrian connections and would not disrupt
existing or planned bicycle or pedestrian facilities or conflict with applicable bicycle or pedestrian plans, guidelines, policies, or standards and therefore impacts would be less than significant.

Construction Evaluation

A traffic control plan would be implemented during construction of all five of the near-term development components, as required by PDF-MO-19. With implementation of the plan, safe access to the pedestrian, bicycle, transit and street facilities would be maintained while construction activities associated with each near-term development proceed. Therefore, construction of near-term development components would not conflict with transportation plans, guidelines, policies, or standards and therefore impacts would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not required because a significant impact relative to circulation system plan conflicts has not been identified.

Impact TRA-2: Vehicle Miles Travelled (Threshold B). The Project would not result in a VMT-related impact. (Less than Significant)

Master Plan

The VMT impact analysis presented in this section considers the Project’s direct impacts relative to CSUMB Campus total VMT per service population under existing with Project conditions, as well as a cumulative analysis, which considers the Project’s long-term effect on VMT using boundary VMT per service population under cumulative conditions. The analysis was conducted by Fehr & Peers and the summary presented here is based on the corresponding technical report, which can be found in Appendix H to this Draft EIR. Refer to Section 4.13.3.1 for the thresholds of significance and Section 4.13.3.2 for additional information about analytical methods related to program- and project-level review, PDFs considered in the analysis, and VMT assessment and estimation methods.

Analysis Scenarios

The total VMT per service population and boundary VMT per service population\(^ 10 \) were evaluated during weekday, 24-hour daily conditions for each of the scenarios listed below:

**Scenario 1:** Existing Conditions – Baseline VMT per service population based on existing land use and transportation network.

\(^{10}\) As indicated previously, service population is the sum of the number of employees, residents, and students within the designated geographic area. Appendix H, Table 13 provides the service populations for the CSUMB campus and Monterey County for each of the analysis scenarios.
Scenario 2: *Existing with Project Conditions* – Scenario 1 with the combined effects of the Project, including increased campus population and modifications to existing campus parking and transportation facilities, on total VMT per service population.

Scenario 3: *Cumulative without Project and without Eastside Parkway Conditions* – Future boundary VMT per service population based on forecasts from the AMBAG regional travel model without Eastside Parkway extension.\(^1\)

Scenario 4: *Cumulative with Project and without Eastside Parkway Conditions* – Scenario 3 boundary VMT per service population plus effects of the Project, including increased campus population and modifications to existing campus parking and transportation facilities.

Scenario 5: *Cumulative without Project and with Eastside Parkway Conditions* – Future boundary VMT per service population based on forecasts from the AMBAG regional travel model with Eastside Parkway extension.

Scenario 6: *Cumulative with Project and with Eastside Parkway Conditions* – Scenario 5 boundary VMT per service population plus effects of the Project, including increased campus population and modifications to existing campus parking and transportation facilities.

Given the uncertainty of the Eastside Parkway project as of this writing, two cumulative scenarios relating to Eastside Parkway are provided as noted above (cumulative with Project and without Eastside Parkway conditions, and cumulative with Project and with Eastside Parkway conditions [Scenarios 4 and 6, respectively]).

**Total VMT (Project Analysis)**

As shown in Table 4.13-8, the CSUMB campus total VMT would increase *in absolute terms* between existing conditions (178,500) and existing with Project conditions (295,500), which is expected due to the planned campus population increase and the associated increase in related vehicle travel.

However, on a *per service population* basis, which is the relevant metric used in assessing significant impacts in this case, VMT would decrease by approximately 10 percent between existing conditions (22.31) and existing with Project conditions (20.24). This decrease in VMT would result due to the planned increase in on-campus housing and, to a lesser extent, due to modifications to the campus street and parking system, each of which is a component of the proposed Project. Other VMT-reducing components of the Project include student life buildings, indoor recreation buildings and facilities, outdoor athletics and recreation support buildings, as shown in Table 3-3 in Chapter 3

\(^1\) As of this writing, although various planning documents depict a future Eastside Parkway, because the Eastside Parkway project does not have an identified funding source, nor has a final alignment been determined, analyses both with and without the Eastside Parkway are provided here. See Figure 4.13-1 for the alignment studied.
Project Description, which also would contribute to reducing or eliminating the need for students to drive off-campus. Notwithstanding, due to the complexities of accurately assessing the additional VMT reduction that would result from implementation of these latter referenced Project components, such reductions were not considered as part of the analysis and, as such, the analysis overstates total VMT associated with the Project. Nonetheless, as shown in Table 4.13-8, the total VMT per service population associated with the Project would be 20.24. As this number is less than the applicable significance threshold of 23.91, impacts related to total VMT per service population would be less than significant.

### Table 4.13-8
Total VMT for SB 743 VMT Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VMT Characteristics</th>
<th>Existing Conditions</th>
<th>Existing with Project Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSUMB Campus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Vehicle Miles Traveled (A)¹</td>
<td>178,500</td>
<td>295,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population (B)¹²</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>14,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total VMT per Service Population (A/B = C)</td>
<td>22.31</td>
<td><strong>20.24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Service Population Threshold</td>
<td>23.91</td>
<td>(Less Than Significant)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Table 17
Notes:
1. Service population and VMT rounded to nearest 100.
2. Service population is defined as the sum of all employees, residents, and students (Kindergarten through University). See Appendix H, Table 13 for additional information about service populations used in this table.

Project’s Effect on VMT (Cumulative Analysis)

As to cumulative impacts, the results of the analysis addressing the Project’s effect on VMT under cumulative with Project and without Eastside Parkway conditions are presented in Table 4.13-9. As shown on Table 4.13-9, the Monterey County boundary VMT per service population would be 13.98 under cumulative with Project and without Eastside Parkway conditions. As this number is less than the applicable threshold of 14.07, the impact of the Project’s effect on VMT under cumulative without Eastside Parkway conditions (i.e., cumulative impacts) would be less than significant.

Assuming construction of the Eastside Parkway, the results of the analysis addressing the Project’s effect on VMT under cumulative with Project and with Eastside Parkway conditions are also presented in Table 4.13-9. As shown on Table 4.13-9, the Monterey County boundary VMT per service population would be 13.96 under cumulative with Project and with Eastside Parkway conditions. As this number also is less than the applicable threshold of 14.07, the impact of the Project’s effect on
VMT under cumulative with Project and with Eastside Parkway conditions (i.e., cumulative impacts) would also be less than significant.

**Table 4.13-9**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cumulative without Project and without Eastside Parkway Conditions</th>
<th>Cumulative with Project and without Eastside Parkway Conditions</th>
<th>Cumulative with Project and with Eastside Parkway Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monterey County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle Miles Traveled (D)¹</td>
<td>11,268,400</td>
<td>11,372,800</td>
<td>11,353,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Population (E)¹²</td>
<td>800,900</td>
<td>813,500</td>
<td>813,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Service Population (D/E = F)</td>
<td>14.07</td>
<td>13.98</td>
<td>13.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VMT per Service Population Threshold (14.07) (see Table 4.13-4) (Impact Conclusion)</td>
<td>14.07 (Less Than Significant)</td>
<td>14.07 (Less Than Significant)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix H, Table 18

Notes:
1. Service population and VMT rounded to nearest 100.
2. Service population is defined as the sum of all employees, residents and students. See Appendix H, Table 13 for additional information about service populations used in this table.

**Near-Term Development Components**

As presented above, the total VMT per service population rate (Project Impact) and the Project’s effect on VMT (Cumulative Impact) would not exceed the identified thresholds and, therefore, the Project’s impacts relative to VMT would be less than significant. This is largely due to the proposed increase in on-campus housing and modifications to the campus street and parking system, which would create a more pedestrian- and bicycle-oriented campus core, which, in turn, would reduce VMT and offset any potential increases in VMT that would result from other components of the Project such as the increase in student enrollment.

To be distinguished from the overall project buildout, the five near-term development components (Student Housing IIB, Student Housing III, Academic IV, Academic V and Student Recreation Center) would be constructed in the first 10 years of Project implementation. Each is being pursued collectively over this initial time frame to provide student housing and student recreational services to support new academic space and associated student enrollment and faculty and staff growth that would result from the two new academic buildings, Academic IV and V. Thus, additional student housing would be provided as new academic buildings to accommodate student enrollment increases are constructed, thereby providing additional on-campus housing for the increased enrollment along with the related VMT-reducing benefits. Given that these near-term development components are planned for implementation collectively in the first 10 years of Project implementation, the VMT-reducing student housing and student
recreation buildings generally would offset any potential increases in VMT that might result from the increased enrollment and related academic buildings. Therefore, the VMT-related impacts of the near-term development components would also be less than significant.

**Mitigation Measures**

Mitigation measures are not required because a significant impact relative to VMT has not been identified.

**Impact TRA-3: Geometric Design Hazards (Threshold C).** The Project would not substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment). (Less than Significant)

**Master Plan**

The Project would have a significant impact regarding hazards if the Project would substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).

The Project includes modifications to existing campus parking and transportation facilities to create a more pedestrian and bicycle-oriented campus core. These modifications would change the design of parking lots and local streets and intersections, but they would not create hazards such as sharp curves or include otherwise dangerous transportation-facility design features as they would be designed and constructed consistent and in conformance with all applicable standards. Therefore, the Project impact related to hazards would be less than significant.

**Near-Term Development Components**

The five near-term development components (Student Housing IIB, Student Housing III, Academic IV, Academic V, and Student Recreation Center) would result in new buildings on individual development sites. While several of the developments would result in the removal of parking lots and each of the developments could result in modifications to driveway access points to provide for adequate access, none of these developments would result in modifications to local streets or intersections and each would be designed and constructed consistent and in conformance with all applicable standards. Therefore, the near-term development components would not create hazards such as sharp curves or include otherwise dangerous transportation-facility design features and the impacts would be less than significant.
Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not required because a significant impact related to transportation design hazards has not been identified.

Impact TRA-4: Emergency Access (Threshold D). The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access. (Less than Significant)

Master Plan

Ease of access and travel time are critical for first responders when traveling in emergency vehicles. Obstructions in the roadway, detours, and excessive delays due to congestion are among the factors that can affect emergency response time. A significant impact would occur if the Project would result in inadequate emergency access.

While most vehicle traffic under the Project would have limited access to the campus core, emergency vehicles would have unlimited access to campus streets otherwise restricted to pedestrians, bicyclists, transit vehicles, and service vehicles. Additionally, future parking facilities and streets would be designed to accommodate emergency vehicles. As such, emergency and service vehicles would continue to have unlimited access to the campus, and access would be improved by the design of future parking facilities and streets. Additionally, as indicated in Section 4.13.2, Regulatory Framework, the ICSUAM guidelines require that individual CSU building projects be reviewed by the California State Fire Marshall involving a plan review and approval followed by periodic field inspections concluding with issuance of a certificate of occupancy to provide for adequate emergency access and building safety features. Therefore, the Project impact related to emergency access would be less than significant.

Near-Term Development Components

The five near-term development components (Student Housing IIB, Student Housing III, Academic IV, Academic V, and Student Recreation Center) would result in new buildings on individual development sites. New or modified access driveways and access routes for each building would be designed to provide for adequate emergency access and the State Fire Marshall review process required by the ICSUAM would provide for adequate emergency access and building safety features. Therefore, the impact of the near-term development components related to emergency access would be less than significant.

Mitigation Measures

Mitigation measures are not required because a significant impact related to emergency access has not been identified.
4.13.3.4 **Cumulative Impacts**

This section provides an evaluation of transportation impacts associated with the Project, including near-term development components, when considered together with other planned growth in the study area, based both on the 2018 AMBAG Regional Growth Forecast and based on other reasonably foreseeable cumulative development, as identified in Table 4.0-1 in Section 4.0, Introduction to Analysis, and as relevant to the particular transportation issue evaluated. The geographic area considered in the cumulative analysis for this topic is described in the impact analysis below.

As indicated in Impact TRA-3, while the Project would result in modifications to existing campus parking and transportation facilities to create a more pedestrian and bicycle-oriented campus core, it would not create hazards such as sharp curves or include otherwise dangerous transportation-facility design features (Threshold C). As such, hazards would not be created and the Project would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to such hazards; accordingly, this topic is not evaluated below.

**Impact TRA-5: Cumulative Transportation Impacts (Thresholds A, B and D).**

The Project’s incremental effect would not be cumulatively considerable and would not contribute to or result in a significant cumulative impact related to transportation impacts. *(Less than Significant)*

**Plan Conflicts**

As explained in Impact TRA-1 above, the Project would not conflict with programs, plans, ordinances or policies addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadways, bicycle and pedestrian facilities and therefore would not contribute to cumulative impacts related to plan conflicts that could result from the implementation of other cumulative projects. Additionally, the increased transit ridership attributable to the Project would be limited and not cumulatively considerable when considered along with other cumulative projects.

As to potential cumulative transit impacts, the Project plus other cumulative development could contribute transit ridership above current weekday peak hour bus route capacity for the bus routes that serve the campus (Routes 12, 16, 18, 25, 26 and 74). Table 4.13-7 in Impact TRA-1 illustrates that the Project alone would not exceed the capacities of these bus routes, but it is possible that with other cumulative development near the campus the bus route capacities on one or more of the routes could be exceeded. Should this occur in the future, it is expected that additional transit service would be implemented to serve the future ridership demand. As previously explained in Impact TRA-1, because the provision of transit service is reactive to increased demand for transit ridership, transit service can be increased via increased bus frequency and additional routes if justified, as provided for in PDF-MO-6(d). Therefore, the
impact of the Project in combination with other cumulative development on transit ridership and facilities would be less than significant.

**VMT**

Impact TRA-2 provides the cumulative VMT analysis, which is briefly summarized herein in this cumulative impact discussion. As indicated in Impact TRA-2, the geographic area for the cumulative VMT analysis is Monterey County because the Project effects likely would be limited within Monterey County.

The results of the analysis addressing the Project’s effect on VMT under the cumulative scenarios are presented in Table 4.13-9. As shown on Table 4.13-9, the Monterey County boundary VMT per service population of 13.98 under cumulative with Project and without Eastside Parkway conditions and 13.96 under cumulative with Project and with Eastside Parkway conditions are less than the applicable threshold of 14.07. Therefore, the impact of the Project’s effect on VMT under both cumulative scenarios would be less than significant.

**Emergency Access**

The Project, in combination with cumulative projects in the vicinity of the campus, has the potential to impact emergency access in and surrounding the Project site. However, as explained in Impact TRA-4, the ICSUAM guidelines require that individual CSUMB building projects be reviewed by the California State Fire Marshall involving a plan review and approval, followed by periodic field inspections, and concluding with issuance of a certificate of occupancy to provide for adequate emergency access and building safety features. Similarly, design and construction documents for cumulative projects would need to be reviewed and approved for adequate emergency access by the local agency building and fire departments. Therefore, with the implementation of CSU and local agency approval processes, individual building projects on campus and in the vicinity of the campus would provide adequate emergency access, such that cumulative impacts related to emergency access would be less than significant.
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