



California State University, Fullerton Master Plan Update

Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations
State Clearinghouse No. 2019080575

prepared for

California State University, Fullerton
800 North State College Boulevard
Fullerton, California 92831

prepared with the assistance of

Rincon Consultants, Inc.
250 East 1st Street, Suite 1400
Los Angeles, California 90012

JULY 2020

rincon

RINCON CONSULTANTS, INC.

Environmental Scientists | Planners | Engineers

rinconconsultants.com

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	i
1 Findings of Fact	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 CEQA Findings of Independent Judgement	7
1.3 Findings Regarding Alternatives	32
1.4 General CEQA Findings	37
1.5 Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report	41
2 Statement of Overriding Considerations	42

1 Findings of Fact

1.1 Introduction

1.1.1 Purpose

This statement of Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations (Findings) addresses the environmental effects associated with the California State University, Fullerton (CSUF) Physical Campus Master Plan (Campus Master Plan). These Findings are made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code and Sections 15091 and 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, Title 14, Cal. Code Regs. 15000, et seq (CEQA Guidelines). The potentially significant impacts were identified in both the Draft Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and the Final EIR, as well as additional facts found in the complete record of proceedings.

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

- a) No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant environmental effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The possible findings are:
 - 1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the final EIR.
 - 2) Such changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and not the agency making the finding. Such changes have been adopted by such other agency or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
 - 3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the final EIR.

In accordance with Public Resource Code 21081 and Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, whenever significant impacts cannot be mitigated to below a level of significance, the decision-making agency is required to balance, as applicable, the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse effects may be considered "acceptable." In that case, the decision-making agency may prepare and adopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations, pursuant to the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines state that:

- a) CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, the adverse environmental effects may be considered "acceptable."
- b) When the lead agency approves a project which will result in the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the final EIR but are not avoided or substantially lessened, the agency shall state in writing the specific reasons to support its action based on the final EIR and/or other information in the record. The statement of overriding considerations shall be supported by substantial evidence in the record.
- c) If an agency makes a statement of overriding considerations, the statement should be included in the record of the project approval and should be mentioned in the notice of determination. This statement does not substitute for, and shall be in addition to, findings required pursuant to Section 15091.

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

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the CSU Board of Trustees adopts these Findings as part of its certification of the Final EIR for the Campus Master Plan. Pursuant to Section 21082.1(c)(3) of the Public Resources Code, the CSU Board of Trustees also finds that the Final EIR reflects the Board's independent judgment as the lead agency for the project. As required by CEQA, the CSU Board of Trustees, in adopting these Findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program (MMRP) for the Campus Master Plan. The CSU Board of Trustees finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these Findings, meets the requirements of Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

1.1.2 Organization and Format of CEQA Findings of Fact

Section 1.1 contains a summary description of the Campus Master Plan and background facts relative to the environmental review process.

Section 1.2 discusses the CEQA findings of independent judgment. Section 1.2.1 identifies the project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant and, therefore, do not require mitigation measures. Section 1.2.2 describes the environmental effects determined not to be significant during the Notice of Preparation (NOP) scoping process and therefore were not discussed in the EIR. Section 1.2.3 identifies the potentially significant effects of the project that

would be mitigated to a less than significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. Section 1.2.4 of these Findings identifies the significant impacts of the project that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level, even though all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project.

Section 1.3 identifies the feasibility of the project Alternatives that were studied in the EIR.

Section 1.4 discusses findings with respect to mitigation of significant adverse impacts, and adoption of the MMRP.

Section 1.5 describes the certification of the Final EIR.

Section 2.0 contains the Statement of Overriding Considerations providing the Board of Trustees' views on the balance between the project's significant environmental effects and the merits and objectives of the Campus Master Plan.

1.1.3 Summary of Project Description

The CSUF campus is located at 800 North State College Boulevard in the City of Fullerton, Orange County, California. The campus is located in the northern portion of Orange County and in the eastern area of the City of Fullerton, about 1,000 feet west of the Placentia city limit, two miles northeast of downtown Fullerton, 3.25 miles northeast of downtown Anaheim. The campus encompasses approximately 240 acres. The main campus is bounded by Yorba Linda Boulevard to the north, Nutwood Avenue to the south, State Route 57 (SR 57) (the Orange Freeway) to the east, and North State College Boulevard to the west. Three smaller areas are also part of the campus, including a block which lies on the southern side of Nutwood Avenue, bounded by Langsdorf Drive to the east, College Place to the south, and North Commonwealth Avenue to the west. Additional campus areas are located on the west side of North State College Boulevard, south of Dorothy Lane, north and east of La Vista High School, and north of Yorba Linda Boulevard, east of North State College Boulevard and Almira Avenue.

The original CSUF campus was founded in 1957 and officially became part of the California State University (CSU) system in June 1972 (CSUF 2017). Today, CSUF is the second largest university in the CSU system (CSU 2019) with expected total full-time equivalency students (FTES) increasing from 25,000 to 32,000 by 2039 (at a rate of one percent annually). The footprint of the campus has expanded over time to accommodate an exponential increase in student enrollment, with several facilities developed in the last decade. The 2003 Master Plan, currently in effect, is now outdated and inadequate for CSUF's growing student enrollment. The Campus Master Plan provides a framework for managing future campus growth and needs, as well as the CSUF's relationship with the City of Fullerton.

Many of the current facilities on campus are overdue for renovations and improvements to fit the needs of the growing population. The Campus Master Plan will provide a guideline for improving existing facilities and guiding new construction through 2039, including the improvement of recreational facilities and academic buildings, the addition of on campus housing, and improvement of multi-modal circulation. Through gradual phased development, the goal of the Campus Master Plan is to create an enjoyable experience for students, staff, and visitors. The Campus Master Plan also contains goals and policies to realize a more environmentally sustainable and resilient future.

Development under the Campus Master Plan would include approximately 3,000 new student beds and 350 residential units for faculty/staff. Approximately 600 of the proposed 3,000 student housing beds were evaluated under the 2003 Master Plan and are the subject of separate environmental review. These beds have not yet been constructed and are a part of the projected 3,000 additional student beds accommodated under the Campus Master Plan. This equates to approximately 803,880 gross square feet (gsf) of new residential housing and 539,000 gsf of faculty/staff housing to be accommodated under the Campus Master Plan. In addition, the Campus Master Plan would add approximately 881,526 gsf of academic administrative and support space, 40,000 gsf of non-academic support space, two additional parking structures totaling approximately 1,677,374 gsf, and a 6,000-seat event center.

The Campus Master Plan focuses on CSUF's commitment to student success while guiding the physical growth on campus needed to accommodate an expanding and thriving campus population. CSUF's commitment to its students is underlined in the Campus Master Plan through the inclusion of the following overarching goals:

- Serve the future of society by providing a robust and relevant education.
- Improve graduation rates.
- Support problem-based learning.
- Promote research as learning and basic research as vital components of this knowledge-based community.
- Promote cross discipline collaboration.
- Increase quality student/professional interaction.
- Build community connection and support.

1.1.4 Project Objectives

To accomplish the aforementioned goals, the Campus Master Plan presents strategies that balance programmatic and behavioral needs with the physical identify for the campus and its built environment, to educate a future student enrollment of 32,000 FTES. The following project objectives have been established in support of the larger goals:

- Enable the university to accommodate incremental planned enrollment growth in the future as required by the CSU.
- Construct new academic facilities that can house programs to fulfill the pedagogic needs of the future and contribute to meeting demand created by planned enrollment growth.
- Improve the connectivity and cohesion of physical spaces on campus and with improved linkages to Downtown Fullerton and public transit.
- Enable the campus to function as a 24-hour hub for student life through increased building density with amenities and access to goods and services in the campus core, the addition of student beds, informal and after-hours work spaces for students, and improved nighttime security.
- Restore the Green Loop that circumnavigates the campus to better function as an organizing feature for academic facilities and open space.
- Increase the density of academic facilities in the campus core to support program growth and change and enable cross-disciplinary collaboration in a space-efficient manner.

- Develop an Innovation Hub that allows students to experiment with processes and prototypes for the future, to serve all sectors of society.
- Establish an event center on campus for daily use by the entire campus community.
- As the campus resumes primary responsibility for management of the Arboretum, balance preservation of its natural and historic resources, protection of its function as a place of solitude and reflection for campus and community members, and enhancement of its use for academic purposes.
- Provide an additional 3,000 student beds¹ and a range of residential options and associated amenities on campus, to support improved rates of retention and graduation for freshman and other students.
- Provide 350 units of faculty housing.
- Improve alternative, multimodal access to campus and reduce reliance on personal vehicle use and parking demand.
- Replace and improve storm management infrastructure to reduce the incidence of flooding.
- Incorporate resilience into the Campus Master Plan through emergency management planning and established locations for emergency operation centers and material storage.

1.1.5 Environmental Review Process

Notice of Preparation

In accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21092) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Section 15082), CSUF issued a NOP on August 30, 2019. CSUF circulated the NOP to responsible and trustee agencies, organizations, and interested individuals to solicit comments on the proposed project. CSUF followed required procedures with regard to distribution of the appropriate notices and environmental documents to the State Clearinghouse. The NOP was received by the State Clearinghouse (State Clearinghouse No. 2019080575) and a 30-day public review period ended on October 3, 2019. One public scoping meeting was conducted by CSUF on September 19, 2019.

Draft EIR

In accordance with CEQA (Public Resources Code Sections 21000-21177) and the CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR Sections 15000-15387), CSUF prepared a Draft EIR (which is the subject of these Findings) to address the potentially significant environmental effects associated with the Campus Master Plan. The Draft EIR addresses the following potentially significant environmental issues:

¹ Approximately 600 of the proposed 3,000 student housing beds were evaluated under the 2003 Master Plan and are the subject of separate environmental review. These beds have not yet been constructed and are a part of the projected 3,000 additional student beds accommodated under the Campus Master Plan.

- Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Energy
- Greenhouse Gas Emissions
- Geology and Soils
- Noise
- Population and Housing
- Public Services
- Recreation
- Transportation
- Utilities and Service Systems

CSUF published the Draft EIR for public and agency review on May 6, 2020 for a 45-day public review period that ended on June 19, 2020. During the public review period, the Draft EIR was accessible online at <https://masterplan.fullerton.edu/>, and of flash drives containing the Draft EIR and hardcopies of Volume I of the Draft EIR were made available for mailing. Due to current circumstances associated with COVID-19, the CSUF campus and local public libraries were not accessible to the public for review of hard copies of the Draft EIR. In lieu of a public meeting, an online presentation video was made available on the CSUF website for the duration of the Draft EIR public review period.

During the Draft EIR public review period, CSUF received 1 letter from a state agency, four letters from local/regional agencies and organizations, and three letters from individuals. All comment letters received in response to the Draft EIR were reviewed and included in the Final EIR, and responses to these comments relevant to CEQA were addressed in the Final EIR in compliance with the CEQA Guidelines (Sections 15088, 15132).

Final EIR

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

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

In accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15132, the Final EIR for the proposed project consists of: (i) the Draft EIR and subsequent revisions; (ii) comments received on the Draft EIR; (iii) a list of the persons, organizations, and public agencies commenting on the Draft EIR; (iv) written responses to significant environmental issues raised during the public review and comment period and related supporting materials; and, (v) other information contained in the EIR, including EIR appendices.

The Final EIR was released on July 10, 2020 and was made available for review by commenting agencies in accordance with CEQA requirements. The Final EIR was also made available to the public online at <https://masterplan.fullerton.edu/>.

1.2 CEQA Findings of Independent Judgement

1.2.1 Effects Determined Not to Be Significant

Section 15128 of the CEQA Guidelines requires an EIR to contain a statement briefly indicating the reasons that various possible significant effects of a project were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. Based on the discussion in Section 4.13, Effects Found Not to be Significant, implementation of the Campus Master Plan was determined to result in no potentially significant impacts related to the following issues, which were therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR:

Agriculture and Forestry Resources

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use;
- Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use or a Williamson Act contract;
- Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code Section 12220(g)); timberland (as defined by Public Resources Code Section 4526); or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined by Government Code Section 51104(g));
- Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use;
- Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use.

Biological Resources

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Potential to have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Potential to have a substantial adverse effect on state or federally protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means; or
- Potential to interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.
- Potential to conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance.

Geology and Soils

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following threshold of significance:

- Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials;
- Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment.
- Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school.
- Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.
- For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area.
- Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires.

Hydrology and Water Quality

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or groundwater quality.
- Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin.
- Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or through the addition of impervious surfaces, in a manner which would:
 - Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site;
 - Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site;

- Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff; or,
 - Impede or redirect flood flows.
- In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation.
- Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control or sustainable groundwater management plan.

Land Use and Planning

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Physically divide an established community.
- Cause a significant environmental impact due to a conflict with any land use plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect.

Mineral Resources

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

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

Noise

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following threshold of significance:

- Expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels for a project located within the vicinity of a private airstrip or an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport.

Wildfire

The Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.
- Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks and thereby expose project occupants to pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire.
- Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment.
- Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslopes or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes.

1.2.2 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, including information in the Final EIR, the following impacts have been determined be less than significant and no mitigation is required pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a):

AESTHETICS, LIGHT, AND GLARE

Scenic Vistas (Impact AES-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.1-20 to -21)

New development proposed under the Campus Master Plan would mainly be within the existing CSUF campus footprint. The existing views of distant mountains or foothills accessible on campus would not be impacted by Campus Master Plan, as they are limited to the athletic fields and other open spaces. The Campus Master Plan would not substantially impact views of campus from areas of scenic enjoyment, since development under the Campus Master Plan would not include buildings or structures taller than existing buildings. Impacts to scenic views would be less than significant.

Scenic Highways (Impact AES-2, Draft EIR p. 4.1-21)

There are no officially designated scenic resources on or near the CSUF campus, and there are no State Scenic Highways in the vicinity of the campus. Currently, motorists looking west on State Route (SR) 57 near CSUF have a view consisting mostly of surface parking lots along the east side of campus. No distant and scenic views are available from this location. Therefore, development under the Campus Master Plan would not substantially damage scenic resources within a State Scenic Highway, and there would be no impact.

Visual Character and Public Views (Impact AES-3, Draft EIR pp. 4.1-22 to -24)

The majority of the construction work would be centralized to the campus interior. Additionally, while construction staging could be unsightly, it would be short in duration, phased over time, and not expected to pose a significant impact on sensitive viewers. New development and redevelopment of existing facilities would primarily impact the visual character of the CSUF campus from on-campus viewpoints, namely in the academic core and student housing areas on the eastern and western edges of campus. New development would densify the campus due to increased building massing and height but would be consistent with the style of existing buildings, and the Campus Master Plan directs new building material and color choices to harmonize with exiting campus palettes. Overall, the Campus Master Plan would strengthen the visual connections from the main campus to the surrounding streets, enhance entranceways and landscaping, and improve visual resources and overall quality of views from sensitive viewers both on and off campus. New buildings would have similar massing, scale, and materials as existing modern buildings, and visual character of the campus would be maintained or improved. Construction impacts would be temporary and not substantially impact sensitive viewers. Therefore, the Campus Master Plan would have less than significant impacts on visual character and public views.

Light and Glare (Impact AES-4, Draft EIR pp. 4.1-25 to -26)

Existing CSU policies and guidelines included in the Campus Master Plan would reduce excessive light on campus and impacts on the surrounding community from light associated with existing

development and new development under the Campus Master Plan. Therefore, impacts of the Campus Master Plan related to light and glare would be less than significant.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista.
- Substantially damage scenic resources, including but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a State Scenic Highway.
- In nonurbanized areas, substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of public views of the site and its surroundings? (Public views are those that are experienced from publicly accessible vantage point). If the project is in an urbanized area, would the project conflict with applicable zoning and other regulations governing scenic quality.
- Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect daytime or nighttime views in the area.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not result in potential significant impacts associated with adverse effects on a scenic vista, degradation of existing visual character, and creation of a new source of light or glare, and no mitigation measures are required.

AIR QUALITY

Expose Sensitive Receptors to Substantial Pollutant Concentrations (Impact AQ-3, Draft EIR pp. 4.2-22 to -24)

Construction-related activities would result in short-term, project-generated emissions of diesel particulate matter (DPM) exhaust emissions from off-road, heavy-duty diesel equipment for site preparation (e.g., excavation, grading, and clearing), building construction, and other miscellaneous activities. DPM was identified as a toxic air contaminant (TAC) by CARB in 1998. The potential cancer risk from the inhalation of DPM, as discussed below, outweighs the potential non-cancer health impacts. DPM generated by construction of projects under the Campus Master Plan is not expected to create conditions where the Maximum Incremental Cancer Risk probability is greater than 10 in 1 million for the Maximally Exposed Individual or to generate ground-level concentrations of noncarcinogenic TACs that exceed a Hazard Index greater than 1 for the Maximally Exposed Individual. The proposed project would not produce the volume of traffic required to generate a carbon monoxide (CO) “hot spot” based on representative South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) CO threshold considerations. Therefore, the project would not expose sensitive receptors to significant criteria pollutant emissions during construction or operation, and impacts would be less than significant.

The nearest monitoring stations to the project have shown the area to have relatively clean air, as over the past three years of monitoring data the worst year there was only 11 violations (in 2017). In addition, the project would implement the residential indoor air quality requirements in the 2019 Title 24 Building Energy Efficiency Standards which require Minimum Efficiency Reporting Value (MERV) 13 (or equivalent) filters for heating/cooling systems and ventilation systems in residences

(Section 150.0[m]), or would implement future standards that would be anticipated to be more stringent than 2019 standards. The siting of the residences near SR 57 would not be anticipated to expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations, and impacts would be less than significant.

Odors (Impact AQ-4, Draft EIR pp. 4.2-24 to -25)

Construction activities would be temporary and transitory and associated odors would cease upon construction completion. Common sources of operational odor complaints include sewage treatment plants, landfills, recycling facilities, and agricultural uses. The Campus Master Plan would not include any of these uses. Accordingly, the Campus Master Plan would not create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people during construction, and short-term impacts would be less than significant.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations.
- Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations or result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people, and no mitigation measures are required.

ENERGY

Wasteful, Inefficient or Unnecessary Consumption of Energy (Impact E-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.4-11 to -16)

The Campus Master Plan would consume electricity, natural gas, and fuel during construction and operation. However, the Campus Master Plan would not place significant additional demand on Southern California Edison or Southern California Gas and would comply with applicable conservation standards. Energy consumption associated with project construction would be temporary and typical of similar projects. Construction equipment would be maintained to applicable standards, and construction activity and associated fuel consumption and energy use would be temporary and typical for construction sites.

The Campus Master Plan would contain several energy efficiency design features that would enable CSUF to achieve its target of reaching zero net energy consumption for new or renovated state buildings starting design after 2025. Energy consumption by the cumulative projects under the Campus Master Plan would be regulated by Energy Efficiency Standards embodied in Title 24 of the California Building Code, which apply to new construction buildings, and indirect energy reduction measures from GHG reduction policies.

Furthermore, the project would further reduce its use of nonrenewable energy resources as the electricity generated by renewable resources provided by SCE continues to increase to comply with state requirements through Senate Bill 100, which requires electricity providers to increase procurement from eligible renewable energy resources to 33 percent of total retail sales by 2020, 60 percent by 2030, and 100 percent by 2045. Therefore, the Campus Master Plan would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy.

Conflict with or Obstruct a State or Local Plan for Renewable Energy or Energy Efficiency (Impact E-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.4-16 to -17)

The projects developed under the Campus Master Plan would eventually be powered by renewable energy mandated by Senate Bill (SB) 100 and would not conflict with this statewide plan. Additionally, the buildings would also be subject to the latest energy efficiency standards pursuant to Title 24 requirements. Although the CSU system acts as an autonomous governing body and is not required to comply with the City's Climate Action Plan (CAP), CSUF would be compliant with local policies and incorporate local strategies in an effort to reduce overall energy consumption. Therefore, the Campus Master Plan would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. Impacts would be less than significant.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Result in a potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation.
- Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation; and would not conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency. No mitigation measures are required.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Unstable or Expansive Soils (Impact GEO-3, Draft EIR p. 4.6-12)

Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would include the construction of new facilities as well as replacement of existing facilities within the Campus Master Plan area, which could potentially occur within areas that consist of expansive soils. However, development associated with the Campus Master Plan would be constructed on existing developed land and would not be subject to changes in soil type than what is already existing on the campus. Additionally, all structures proposed to be constructed or redeveloped under the Campus Master Plan would be required to comply with the CSU Seismic Requirements and the latest California Building Code (CBC), to ensure structural design of all new and modified buildings would not result in adverse effects such on- or off-site landslides, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse. Therefore, impacts associated with expansive or unstable soils would be less than significant.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse.
- Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not result in potentially significant environmental impacts due to unstable or expansive soils that may result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse, or substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property. No mitigation measures are required.

POPULATION AND HOUSING

Induce Population Growth (Impact PH-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.8-11 to -13)

The Campus Master Plan would result in a gradual increase of approximately 7,000 students and 1,000 faculty/staff. The population increase associated with the Campus Master Plan would be part of SCAG's population forecasts and would account for less than one percent of the total area population by 2040 and would not represent substantial unplanned growth.

Displace People or Housing (Impact PH-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.8-13 to -14)

The Campus Master Plan would include the construction of 2,400 student beds and 350 faculty beds to accommodate projected future growth in student enrollment and employees. An additional 600 student beds have been approved and analyzed under the 2003 Master Plan and are included in this analysis as they would serve future students accommodated under the Campus Master Plan. The Campus Master Plan directs the construction of new and on-campus housing and the renovation of existing on-campus housing. Non-campus housing to serve projected students, faculty, and staff would represent less than one percent of the new households forecasted in the region by 2040. Renovations would not displace existing students. The Campus Master Plan would not require the demolition of housing.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Induce substantial unplanned population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure).
- Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not result substantial unplanned population growth or displacement of substantial numbers of existing people or housing, and no mitigation measures are required.

PUBLIC SERVICES

New or Altered Fire Protection Facilities (Impact PS-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.9-12 to -13)

Development of the Campus Master Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered fire protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered fire protection facilities. All site and building improvements carried out under the Campus Master Plan would be required to comply with the 2016 Fire and Building Code requirements for construction, access, water mains, fire flows, and hydrants, and would be subject to review and approval by the Fullerton Fire Department prior to building permit and certificate of occupancy issuance. Implementation would result in the continuation of existing academic programs, extra-curricular activities, and similar housing and instructional facilities and would not fundamentally change the nature of campus operations.

New or Altered Police Protection Facilities (Impact PS-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.9-14 to -15)

The Campus Master Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered police protection facilities, or the need for new or physically altered police protection facilities. Construction would not cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would incrementally increase the service population of the Fullerton Police Department. The University Police Department (UPD), which has primary jurisdiction on campus, would reduce demand for FPD services. Facility space for the UPD is included in the Campus Master Plan.

New or Altered School Facilities (Impact PS-3, Draft EIR pp. 4.9-16 to -17)

The Campus Master Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered schools, or the need for new or physically altered schools. Construction would not cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios or other performance objectives. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would incrementally increase the enrollment of students in local schools. However, enrollment would not cause schools to exceed capacity.

New or Altered Public Facilities (Impact PS-4, Draft EIR pp. 4.9-17 to -19)

The Campus Master Plan would include renovations and additions to facility space, including potential space for library and medical services, to meet demand from the incremental increase in student and faculty/staff population. The Campus Master Plan would incrementally increase the demand for library and medical services in the City of Fullerton and neighboring cities. However, the Campus Master Plan would increase capacity for on campus medical services reducing the impact to off campus medical facilities.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain

acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

- a) Fire protection
- b) Police protection
- c) Schools
- d) Other public facilities (Libraries and Medical Facilities)

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, or the need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts. No mitigation measures are required.

RECREATION

Physical Deterioration of Existing Parks and Recreational Facilities, and New or Altered Parks or Recreational Facilities (Impact REC-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.10-8 to -12)

The Campus Master Plan would incrementally develop or sustain new recreation facilities, including 100,000 sf of new facility space in the Fullerton Arboretum, event center, and recreation areas, that would adequately serve the increase in campus population. Additionally, the Campus Master Plan would not result in significant deterioration of off-campus facilities. Under the conservative assumption that all new residents, both residing on and off-campus, visited park space in the City of Fullerton, the impact from the Campus Master Plan would change the city's park-to-population ratio to 5.7 acres per 1,000 residents, a decrease of 0.3 acre per 1,000 residents but still above its park-to-population goal.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.
- Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not result in substantial deterioration of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment. No mitigation measures are required.

TRANSPORTATION AND TRAFFIC

Conflict with a Program, Plan, Ordinance or Policy Addressing the Circulation System (Impact T-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.11-16 to -18)

Development under the Campus Master Plan would be consistent with applicable CSU programs, plans, and policies. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not result in major changes to the design, location, or access to existing transit, campus circulation, or bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Conflict with or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b) (Impact T-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.11-19 to -20)

Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) per service population under the Camps Master Plan would be below the CSU Transportation Impact Study Manual (TISM) threshold of 15 percent below citywide VMT per service population. Therefore, the project would have a less than significant impact on VMT per service population under the Existing Plus Project scenario.

Create Hazards due to Design Features of Incompatible Uses (Impact T-3, Draft EIR pp. 4.11-20 to -20)

The Campus Master Plan 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). Development under the Campus Master Plan would be constructed in such a way that changes would remain consistent to surrounding geometric design features and any redesign or construction of on-campus circulation paths would be designed and constructed to meet applicable City and Campus Master Plan design standards.

Result in Inadequate Emergency Access (Impact T-4, Draft EIR pp. 4.11-21 to -22)

Development of the Campus Master Plan would not result in inadequate emergency access. Development under the Campus Master Plan would not include major changes to existing access points or on-campus circulation paths. All projects under the Campus Master Plan would adhere to CSU policy and undergo review and approval by the State Fire Marshal prior to implementation and use.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities.
- Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3 that would result in a VMT impact as described in Table 14.6.2; subdivision (b).
- Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment).
- Result in inadequate emergency access.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not conflict with a program, plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature or incompatible uses, or result in inadequate emergency access. No mitigation measures are required.

UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Water Infrastructure (Impact U-1, Draft EIR p. 4.12-9)

Development of the Campus Master Plan would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, or telecommunications facilities. Construction of which could cause significant environmental effects. The Campus Master Plan may require installation of additional water main lines, lateral connections, and hydrants within the plan area to serve planned facilities. Such facilities would be installed during individual project construction and within the disturbance area of such projects or previously disturbed roadways.

Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Wastewater Infrastructure (Impact U-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.12-9 to -11)

The Campus Master Plan may require installation of additional sewer lines and lateral connections within the plan area to serve planned facilities. As with water facilities, any sewer line extensions necessary to serve the future facilities would generally be installed within the already disturbed right of way (ROW) of existing roads or within the disturbance footprint of proposed buildings.

Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Stormwater Infrastructure (Impact U-3, Draft EIR p. 4.12-11)

All individual projects constructed under the Campus Master Plan would constitute regulated projects under the Phase II MS4 Permit and, therefore, would be required to demonstrate compliance with the stormwater capture requirements described in the permit. As with water and wastewater facilities, proposed storm drain infrastructure would be constructed within the disturbance area of individual projects or previously disturbed roadways and would not result in substantial additional impacts.

Relocation or Construction of New or Expanded Telecommunication Infrastructure (Impact U-4, Draft EIR p. 4.12-12)

No major telecommunications improvements are proposed as part of the Campus Master Plan. Individual projects occurring under the Campus Master Plan may require minor telecommunications improvements, such as undergrounding of telephone lines or rewiring of buildings during renovation. Such improvements would be minor in nature and would generally occur within the disturbance area of individual projects.

Sufficient Water Supplies (Impact U-5, Draft EIR pp. 4.12-12 to -15)

The Campus Master Plan would have sufficient water supplies available during normal, dry and multiple dry years. Construction and operation of the Campus Master Plan would result in a net increase in water demand of approximately 1,198 acre-feet per year of water. This increase in demand through 2040 is accounted for in the City of Fullerton's 2015 Urban Water Management Plan.

Exceed Wastewater Capacity (Impact U-6, Draft EIR p. 4.12-16)

The Campus Master Plan would not result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project in addition to the provider's existing commitments. Wastewater generated by development under the Campus Master Plan would be treated at the Orange County Sanitation District's Treatment Plant Number 2 facility in Huntington Beach. The plant would have adequate capacity to serve the Campus Master Plan's anticipated wastewater generation in addition to its existing wastewater treatment commitments.

Exceed Solid Waste Capacity and Compliance with Statutes and Regulations (Impact U-7, Draft EIR pp. 4.12-16 to -18)

The Campus Master Plan would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals. The Campus Master Plan would not generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, including the Frank R. Bowerman Landfill. The Campus Master Plan would not impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals and would comply with federal, state, and applicable local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

As such, the Draft EIR determined that the Campus Master Plan would not result in impacts to the following thresholds of significance:

- Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects.
- Not have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple-dry years.
- Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it does not have adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments.
- Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals.
- Not comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

Finding

The Board of Trustees finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the Campus Master Plan would not require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or stormwater drainage, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects; that there would be sufficient water supplies,

wastewater capacity, and solid waste capacity to serve the project; and would comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste. No mitigation measures are required.

1.2.3 Potentially Significant Impacts That Can Be Mitigated Below A Level of Significance

Pursuant to Section 21081(a) of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091(a)(1) of the CEQA Guidelines, the CSU Board of Trustees finds that, for each of the following significant effects identified in the Final EIR, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the proposed project which mitigate or avoid the identified significant effects on the environment to less than significant levels. These findings are explained below and are supported by substantial evidence in the record of proceedings.

CULTURAL RESOURCES

Historic Resources (Impact CUL-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.3-42 to -45)

Several historic resources are present on the CSUF campus and shall remain with implementation of the Campus Master Plan. Implementation and build-out of the Campus Master Plan could result in substantial adverse changes in the significance of historical resources as there is the potential for new development to adversely affect buildings, structures, or other resources that are known to be or could be historically significant. Campus Master Plan projects could also cause damage to or destruction of historical resources or potential historical resources that have not yet been evaluated. With implementation of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 through CUL-4, the Campus Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts.

Archaeological Resources and Human Remains (Impact CUL-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.3-46 to -47)

No known archaeological resources or human remains are present on the campus. However, construction of the Campus Master Plan would involve ground-disturbing activities, such as grading and surface excavation, with the potential to unearth or adversely impact previously unidentified archaeological resources or human remains. Mitigation Measures CUL-5 and CUL-6 would ensure procedures are in place to properly identify, document, and manage archaeological resources and human remains that may be discovered during ground-disturbing activities under the Campus Master Plan. Therefore, the Campus Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts with mitigations incorporated.

Mitigation Measures

CUL-1 Complete Historic Resources Evaluation and Project-Specific Surveys Prior to Design Phase to Identify Historical Resources

Before altering or otherwise affecting a building, structure, or designed landscape feature that is 45 years old or older, CSUF shall retain a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to assess and document the significance of the resource according to the criteria of the National Register of Historic Places

(NRHP), California Register of Historical Resources (CRHR) and California Historical Landmarks program.

The qualified historian or architectural historian shall prepare an intensive-level historic resources evaluation. Evaluations shall consider buildings, structures, objects, sites, historic districts, and potential cultural landscapes and shall identify the character-defining features of such resources and other required information on the appropriate Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) 523 Record Forms, which shall be appended to the evaluation.

The level of documentation for each evaluation shall comply with Public Resources Code Section 5024 and 5024.5 with respect to state-owned historical resources. For resources determined through this evaluation process to meet National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)/ California Register of Historic Places (CRHR) and/or California Historical Landmark criteria, mitigation measures CUL-2 and CUL-3 shall be required as early as possible in the project planning and design phase.

If the resource was the subject of a historic resources evaluation meeting the standards of Public Resources Code Section 5024 and 5024.5 within the last five (5) years, Mitigation Measure CUL-1 shall not be required.

For buildings, structures, objects, sites, historic districts, cultural landscapes, and other resources determined through this evaluation process not to meet NRHP/CRHR and/or California Historical Landmark criteria, no further mitigation is required.

CUL-2 Conduct Secretary's Standards Project Review and Analyze Impacts to Historical Resources

For projects that would demolish or alter resources eligible for listing in the NRHP, CRHR, or as a California Historical Landmark, CSUF shall retain a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to review and comment upon project plans for conformance with the Secretary's Standards and applicable mitigation measures and/or alternatives.

The architectural historian or preservation architect shall provide input to CSUF and the project design team as early as possible to facilitate project compliance with the Secretary's Standards, if prudent and feasible. Preservation input will identify project options capable of complying with the Secretary's Standards and avoiding, lessening, or mitigating significant adverse impacts to historical resources.

Secretary's Standards project review shall include all project components that would result in a physical change to character-defining features, insofar as these project details are available. If project details remain conceptual at the time of project review, the memorandum shall include design recommendations drawn from the Secretary's Standards that would facilitate compliance with the Standards and avoid, lessen, or mitigate significant adverse impacts to historical resources.

In addition, the Secretary's Standards project review shall include a section assessing the potential direct and indirect impacts of the proposed project on the historical resource, whether an individual resource or historic district/cultural landscape.

For projects that do not comply with the Secretary's Standards and would result in a significant adverse impact to a historical resource, Mitigation Measure CUL-4 shall be required.

CUL-3 PRC-Required SHPO Consultation

For state-owned historical resources, PRC Section 5024 and 5024.5 require State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPO) consultation for proposed projects that might impact historical resources eligible for the NRHP, CRHR or as a California Historical Landmarks. These sections of the PRC are designed to give SHPO the opportunity to review and comment on historical resource determinations and proposed projects that might affect such historical resources.

CSUF shall consult with SHPO regarding the potential alteration or demolition of any buildings, structures, objects, sites, historic districts, cultural landscapes, or other campus features that appear eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, the California Register of Historical Resources or as California Historical Landmarks, as documented through CUL-1 or through survey or evaluation. Such consultation shall be completed pursuant to California Public Resources Code Sections 5024 and 5024.5 and related guidance published by SHPO.

Following the completion of Mitigation Measures CUL-1 and/or CUL-2 and as early as possible in the project planning phase, CSUF shall retain an architectural historian or historian meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards in either architectural history or historic architecture in order to assist in SHPO consultation and compile the required documentation and consultation materials in compliance with Public Resources Code Sections 5024 and 5024.5 and related guidance published by SHPO.

This shall include a formal request for consultation, the intensive-level historic resources evaluation establishing the historic resource status of the property, DPR 523 Record Forms, the appropriate historical background documentation, and a project-specific impacts analysis prepared by the qualified historian or architectural historian.

CUL-4 HABS-Like Documentation

For projects that do not comply with the Secretary's Standards and would result in a significant adverse impact to a historical resource, mitigation measure CUL-4 shall be required. Prior to the commencement of construction activities, CSUF shall retain a historian or architectural historian who meets the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards to prepare HABS-like documentation for the subject historical resources. The evaluation process shall include the development of appropriate historical background research as context for the assessment of the significance of the structure in the history of the CSU system, CSUF, and the region. The HABS-like package will document in photographs and descriptive and historic narrative the historical resources slated for modification/demolition. Documentation prepared for the package will draw upon primary- and secondary-source research and available studies previously prepared for the project.

The specifications for the HABS-like package follow:

- Photographs: Photographic documentation will focus on the historical resources/features slated for demolition, with overview and context photographs for the campus and adjacent setting. Photographs will be taken of the building using a professional-quality single lens reflex (SLR)

digital camera with a minimum resolution of 10 megapixels. Photographs will include context views, elevations/exteriors, architectural details, overall interiors, and interior details (if warranted). Digital photographs will be provided in electronic format.

- **Descriptive and Historic Narrative:** The historian or architectural historian will prepare descriptive and historic narrative of the historical resources/features slated for demolition. Physical descriptions will detail each resource, elevation by elevation, with accompanying photographs, and information on how the resource fits within the broader campus during its period of significance. The historic narrative will include available information on the campus design, history, architect/contractor/designer as appropriate, area history, and historic context. In addition, the narrative will include a methodology section specifying the name of researcher, date of research, and sources/archives visited, as well as a bibliography. Within the written history, statements shall be footnoted as to their sources, where appropriate.
- **Historic Documentation Package Submittal:** The electronic package will be assembled by the historian or architectural historian and submitted to CSUF for review and comment. In addition, an electronic version of the HABS package will be provided to the State Office of Historic Preservation for review and comment.
- Upon approval by CSUF, one hard-copy version of the historic documentation package will be prepared and deposited with the University archives, Pollak Library Special Collections.

CUL-5 Unanticipated Discovery of Cultural and Tribal Cultural Resources

In the event that cultural resources of Native American origin are identified during construction, all earth-disturbing work in the vicinity of the find shall be temporarily suspended or redirected until an archaeologist meeting the Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualifications Standards (NPS 1983) has evaluated the nature and significance of the find and an appropriate Native American representative, based on the nature of the find, is consulted. If CSUF determines that the resource is a tribal cultural resource and thus significant under CEQA, a mitigation plan shall be prepared and implemented in accordance with state guidelines and in consultation with Native American groups. The plan shall include avoidance of the resource or, if avoidance of the resource is infeasible, the plan shall outline the appropriate treatment and data recovery plan in coordination with the archeologist and the appropriate Native American tribal representative. The Native American monitor and consulting tribe(s) will be provided an opportunity to participate in the documentation and evaluation of the find. If a data recovery plan and treatment of the unanticipated discovery is required, then the consulting tribe(s) will be provided an opportunity to review and provide input on the plan and treatment.

CUL-6 Discovery of Unknown Human Remains.

The discovery of human remains is always a possibility during ground disturbing activities. If human remains are found, the State of California Health and Safety Code Section 7050.5 states that no further disturbance shall occur until the County coroner has made a determination of origin and disposition pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 5097.98. In the event of an unanticipated discovery of human remains, the County coroner must be notified immediately. If the human remains are determined to be prehistoric, the coroner shall notify the NAHC, which will determine and notify a MLD. The MLD shall complete the inspection of the site within 48 hours of being

granted site access and may recommend scientific removal, and nondestructive analysis of human remains and items associated with Native American burials, pursuant to Mitigation Measure CUL-2.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential cultural resource-related impacts of the project to less-than-significant levels, and are adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees. Accordingly, the CSU Board of Trustees finds, that pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1), and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Rationale

Mitigation measures would ensure adherence to applicable measures of the Secretary's Standards and CSUF Design Guidelines for projects pertaining to the preservation, rehabilitation, and/or maintenance of historic properties on the CSUF campus to record, evaluate, avoid, or otherwise treat the historic resource appropriately. In some circumstances, documentation of a historical resource shall not mitigate the effects of demolition of that resource to a less-than-significant level because the historic resources would no longer exist. Mitigation measures would also ensure construction and ground-disturbing activities would halt in the event previously unknown cultural resources or human remains are unearthed, and such resources would be properly identified, documented, and managed.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Seismic Fault Rupture and Ground Shaking (Impact GEO-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.6-10 to -11)

The campus is not located in an Alquist-Priolo fault zone and no fault lines traverse directly under the site. There is potential for both earthquakes and ground shaking in the campus area. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Soil Erosion or the Loss of Topsoil (Impact GEO-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.6-11 to -12)

The campus would be subject to potential erosion of topsoil due to temporary construction activities. All construction would be subject to follow State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB's) Construction Requirements and would be required to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Additionally, CSUF is located on built-out, flat topography. Substantial soil erosion of topsoil would not occur given the above considerations. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures

GEO-1 Perform Site Specific Geotechnical Investigation

A site-specific geotechnical investigation shall be performed for each future development or redevelopment project proposed under the Campus Master Plan. Appropriate stabilization and site design recommendations, or low impact development features determined necessary to support proposed development shall be incorporated in the project design and implemented as part of

project construction. Examples of stabilization and erosion control recommendations may include. But are not limited to:

- Installation of earthen buttress(es);
- Excavation of landslide mass/material;
- Slope stabilization through excavation into bench and/or keyways and other methods;
- Deep soil mixing;
- Installation of retaining walls;
- Use of tie-back anchors, micropiles or shear pins; or
- A combination of any of these methods

GEO-2 Retain a Qualified Paleontologist

Prior to the commencement of ground-disturbing activities, a qualified professional paleontologist shall be retained to review all project plans where ground disturbance is expected to extend to or below eight feet below ground surface (bgs) within areas mapped as Holocene alluvial deposits (Qa) to determine if underlying paleontologically sensitive units (i.e., Pleistocene age deposits or the La Habra Formation) could be impacted. If potentially significant impacts are identified, the qualified professional paleontologist shall prepare and implement a Paleontological Resources Mitigation Plan (PRMP). A Qualified Paleontologist is an individual who meets the education and professional experience standards as set forth by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology (SVP) (2010), which recommends the paleontologist shall have at least a Master's Degree or equivalent work experience in paleontology, shall have knowledge of the local paleontology, and shall be familiar with paleontological procedures and techniques. The PRMP shall describe mitigation recommendations in detail, including paleontological monitoring procedures; communication protocols to be followed in the event that an unanticipated fossil discovery is made during project development; and preparation, curation, and reporting requirements.

GEO-3 Paleontological Worker Environmental Awareness Program (WEAP)

Prior to the start of construction, the Qualified Paleontologist or his or her designee shall conduct training for construction personnel regarding the appearance of fossils and the procedures for notifying paleontological staff should fossils be discovered by construction staff. The WEAP shall be fulfilled at the time of a preconstruction meeting. In the event a fossil is discovered by construction personnel anywhere in the campus, all work in the immediate vicinity of the find shall cease and a qualified paleontologist shall be contacted to evaluate the find before re-starting work in the area. If it is determined that the fossil(s) is (are) scientifically significant, the qualified paleontologist shall complete the mitigation outlined below to mitigate impacts to significant fossil resources.

GEO-4 Paleontological Monitoring

Initially, full-time monitoring shall be conducted during ground construction activities (i.e., grading, trenching, foundation work, and other excavations) in areas where ground disturbance would occur at or below eight feet bgs within intact Holocene deposits. Monitoring shall be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor, who is defined as an individual who meets the minimum qualifications per standards set forth by the SVP (2010), which includes a B.S. or B.A. degree in geology or paleontology with one year of monitoring experience and knowledge of collection and

salvage of paleontological resources. The duration and timing of the monitoring shall be determined by the Qualified Paleontologist and the location and extent of proposed ground disturbance. If the Qualified Paleontologist determines that full-time monitoring is no longer warranted, based on the specific geologic conditions at the surface or at depth, the Qualified Paleontologist may recommend that monitoring be reduced to periodic spot-checking or cease entirely.

GEO-5 Fossil Discovery, Preparation, and Curation

If a paleontological resource is discovered, the monitor shall have the authority to temporarily divert the construction equipment around the find until it is assessed for scientific significance and collected. Typically, fossils can be safely salvaged quickly by a single paleontologist and not disrupt construction activity. In some cases, larger fossils (such as complete skeletons or large mammals) require more extensive excavation and longer salvage periods. In this case, the paleontologist should have the authority to temporarily direct, divert or halt construction activity to ensure that the fossil(s) can be removed in a safe and timely manner.

Once salvaged, significant fossils shall be identified to the lowest possible taxonomic level, prepared to a curation-ready condition and curated in a scientific institution with a permanent paleontological collection (such as the Natural History Museum of LA County along with all pertinent field notes, photos, data, and maps.

GEO-6 Final Paleontological Mitigation Report

At the conclusion of laboratory work and museum curation, a final report shall be prepared describing the results of the paleontological mitigation monitoring efforts associated with the project. The report shall include a summary of the field and laboratory methods, an overview of the project geology and paleontology, a list of taxa recovered (if any), an analysis of fossils recovered (if any) and their scientific significance, and recommendations. The final report shall be submitted to the CSUF. If the monitoring efforts produced fossils, then a copy of the report shall also be submitted to the designated museum repository.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential impacts of the project related to geology and soils to less-than-significant levels, and are adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees. Accordingly, the CSU Board of Trustees finds, that pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1), and the CEQA Guidelines Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Rationale

Mitigation measures would ensure appropriate stabilization and erosion control during design and construction activities associated with individual projects under the Campus Master Plan, and that construction and ground-disturbing activities would halt in the event previously unknown paleontological resources are unearthed, and such resources would be properly identified, documented, and managed.

NOISE

Increase in Ambient Noise in Exceeding Standards (Impact N-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.7-18 to -20)

Construction and operation of the Campus Master Plan would result in noise level increases that would exceed applicable construction and operation noise standards at nearby noise sensitive receivers. Pile driving during construction within 260 feet of noise-sensitive campus buildings or off-site residences would exceed noise thresholds. HVAC units at the closest Campus Master Plan buildings to noise-sensitive uses would exceed the City of Fullerton's interior noise standards for noise-sensitive uses of 45 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Ground-borne Noise and Vibration (Impact N-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.7-26 to -28)

If an impact pile driver is used during construction within 160 feet of the nearest building, impacts from vibration would be potentially significant. Impacts would be less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures

N-1 Pile Driver Noise and Vibration Reduction Measures

If pile driving is to be used within 260 feet of any occupiable structure on- or off- campus during Campus Master Plan project construction, one of the following measures shall be implemented:

- Use of a pile driver shall not occur within 260 feet of a structure; or
- A Campus Master Plan-specific noise and vibration impact analysis shall be conducted that shall consider the type of pile driver used and potential noise and vibration levels at structures within 260 feet. If, after consideration of the type of pile driver used and other factors of the environment, noise levels do not exceed 80 dBA (8-hour) and vibration levels do not exceed the distinctly perceptible impact for humans of 0.24 in/sec PPV and the structural damage impact to residential structures of 0.2 in/sec PPV, construction may proceed without additional measures. If, after consideration of the type of pile driver used and other factors of the environment, noise levels exceed 80 dBA (8-hour) or vibration levels exceed the distinctly perceptible impact for humans of 0.24 in/sec PPV or the structural damage impact to residential structures of 0.2 in/sec PPV, additional measures shall be implemented to reduce noise and vibration levels below threshold. These measures may include, but not be limited too, use of temporary noise barriers or performing pile driving at a further distance from the noise-sensitive land use.

N-2 HVAC Noise Reduction Measures

Concurrent with design review and prior to the approval of building permits, CSUF shall require a Campus Master Plan-specific design plan for projects demonstrating that the noise level from operation of HVAC units shall not cumulatively exceed the following noise level limits at receiving noise-sensitive land uses as specified in Fullerton Municipal Code Chapter 15.9045:

- For exterior locations, 55 dBA from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 50 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

- For interior locations, 55 dBA from 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. and 45 dBA from 10:00 p.m. to 7:00 a.m.

Noise control measures shall include, but are not limited to, the selection of quiet equipment, equipment setbacks, silencers, and/or acoustical louvers.

Finding

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

Rationale

The mitigation measures would reduce impacts related to construction noise and vibration levels (due to pile driving within 260 feet of a sensitive use or occupied building) by requiring the contractor to locate equipment further than 260 feet of a structure or conduct a noise analysis to refine appropriate setback distances and identify other measures to reduce noise and vibration. Additionally, mitigation measures would require a Campus Master Plan-specific design plan for projects demonstrating that the noise level from operation of HVAC units would not cumulatively exceed the following noise level limits at receiving noise-sensitive land uses.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES

Tribal Cultural Resources (Impact TCR-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.3-49 to -50)

No known significant tribal cultural resources are located on the project site based on the findings of the Cultural Resources Assessment prepared for the project site. However, grading and ground-disturbing activities during project construction could impact currently unknown subsurface cultural resources of tribal or Native American importance. In the event of the discovery of previously unknown cultural resources of tribal or Native American importance during construction activities, appropriate mitigation measures would be followed. Mitigation Measures CUL-5 and CUL-6 would ensure procedures are in place to properly identify, document, and manage archaeological resources and human remains that may be discovered during ground-disturbing activities under the Campus Master Plan. Therefore, potential project impacts to previously unknown archaeological resources and human remains, if encountered, would be reduced to less than significant with mitigation incorporated.

Mitigation Measures

See Mitigation Measures CUL-5 and CUL-6 above.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential tribal cultural resource-related impacts of the project to less-than-significant levels, and are adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees. Accordingly, the CSU Board of Trustees finds, that pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(a)(1), and the CEQA Guidelines

Section 15091(a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which avoid or substantially lessen the significant environmental effect as identified in the Final EIR.

Rationale

Mitigation measures would ensure that construction and ground-disturbing activities would halt in the event previously unknown cultural resources or human remains are unearthed, and such resources would be properly identified, documented, and managed. In the event that tribal cultural resources are discovered, project under the Campus Master Plan would be required to comply with the applicable regulatory requirements and the consultation requirements of AB 52 to determine and mitigate any potential impacts to tribal cultural resources.

1.2.4 Potentially Significant Impacts That Cannot Be Mitigated Below a Level of Significance

This section identifies the significant unavoidable impacts that require a statement of overriding considerations to be issued by the CSU Board of Trustees, pursuant to Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, if the project is approved. Based on the analysis contained in the Final EIR, the following impacts have been determined to be significant and unavoidable:

AIR QUALITY

Conflict with Air Quality Plan (Impact AQ-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.2-12 to -13)

The Campus Master Plan would exceed SCAQMD thresholds for ozone precursors (reactive organic gasses [ROG] and nitrogen oxides [NO_x]) during operation of the project. Therefore, the project could result in an increase in frequency or severity of existing air quality violations or contribute to new violations and conflict with the air quality management plan (AQMP). Implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1 would not reduce ROG or NO_x emissions below SCAQMD thresholds. Therefore, the Draft EIR found that the proposed project would result in significant and unavoidable air quality impacts associated with operational ROG and NO_x emissions from mobile sources.

Exceed SCAQMD Thresholds for Criteria Pollutants (Impact AQ-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.2-14 to -22)

Campus Master Plan operational-source emissions would exceed the applicable SCAQMD regional threshold for ROG and NO_x. With implementation of Mitigation Measure AQ-1, the Campus Master Plan would still exceed SCAQMD thresholds for these pollutants. Therefore, impacts are significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

AQ-1 Green Cleaning Production Education Program

CSUF shall develop a Green Cleaning Product education program to be made available at housing offices, educational areas, and/or on websites. The education program is intended for students and institutional consumers and consists of: (1) provision of educational materials in housing offices, educational areas, and/or on websites, about low ROG/volatile organic chemical (VOC) consumer products for planned housing and academic uses, (2) educational materials addressing the use of detergents; cleaning compounds; polishes; floor finishes; cosmetics; personal care products; home,

lawn and garden products; disinfectants; sanitizers; aerosol paints; automotive specialty products; low ROG/VOC paints and architectural coatings; and low emission landscape equipment, and (3) educational materials on the importance of recycling and purchasing recycled material.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees finds that implementation of the identified mitigation measure would provide educational information to students and staff of the campus to decrease their use of consumer products to benefit the air quality of the basin. The amount of reductions created by the educational material as directed in Mitigation Measure AQ-1 is not quantifiable at this stage of planning, as the reductions would ultimately depend on future individual consumer behavior. Therefore, it is conservatively assumed that the Campus Master Plan would still result in operational ROG emissions that exceed SCAQMD regional thresholds. In addition, as described above, at this stage of planning, project design features and mitigation are not available that would feasibly reduce impacts from operational NO_x mobile emissions to a less than significant level. Therefore, impacts from operational emissions would be significant and unavoidable.

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

Generate GHG Emissions (Impact GHG-1, Draft EIR pp. 4.5-16 to -19)

The Campus Master Plan would generate GHG emissions during construction and operation that would exceed the GHG emission threshold. Mitigation Measure GHG-1 would reduce GHG emissions through creation and implementation of a GHG Reduction Plan. However, it is unknown if the measure would be able to reduce emissions to below the applicable thresholds, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Conflict with a GHG Reduction Plan (Impact GHG-2, Draft EIR pp. 4.5-19 to -20)

Due to GHG emissions during construction and operation that would exceed the threshold, the Campus Master Plan would conflict with the goals of the 2018 Scoping Plan, EO B-55-18, and American College & University Presidents' Climate Commitment. With Mitigation Measure GHG-1, this impact would still exceed the project-specific threshold, and impacts would be significant and unavoidable.

Mitigation Measures

GHG-1 GHG Emissions Reduction Plan

CSUF shall prepare and implement a plan to reduce operational GHG emissions through implementation of one or more of the following measures:

- a. Prior to the construction of Campus Master Plan projects analyzed in this analysis,² CSUF shall develop a Greenhouse Gas Reduction Program (GGRP) that reduces annual GHG emissions from the Campus Master Plan by a minimum of the million tones carbon dioxide (MTCO₂e) per year that the project exceeds for that year and each subsequent year, which is estimated to be 8,281 MTCO₂e in 2039 (1.15 MTCO₂e per person per year in 2039) over the operational life of the project, or by an amount determined through further analysis of project GHG emissions at the time of GGRP preparation. The plan may include, but not be limited to, the following components:
1. Installation of renewable energy facilities (e.g., solar photovoltaics)
 2. Purchase of renewable energy in lieu of fossil-fuel grid sources
 3. Construction of residences that achieve energy and water efficiencies beyond those specified in the California Code of Regulations, Title 24 requirements
 4. Implementation of energy efficient building design exceeding California Building Code requirements
 5. Installation of energy-efficient equipment and appliances exceeding California Green Building Code standards
 6. Construction of all-electric buildings
 7. Installation of outdoor water conservation and recycling features, such as smart irrigation controllers and reclaimed water usage
 8. Installation of low-flow bathroom and kitchen fixtures and fittings
 9. Provision of incentives and outreach for future residents to promote alternative transportation and transit use
 10. Promotion of alternative fuel vehicles
 11. Increased provision of electric vehicle (EV) charging parking spaces beyond required
 12. Implementation of carbon sequestration measures

CSUF shall monitor and verify implementation of measures included in the GGRP to ensure implementation of mitigation measures included in the plan.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees finds that implementation of the identified mitigation measure would reduce GHG emissions through creation and implementation of a GHG Reduction Plan. At this stage of planning, it is unknown what exact measures would be implemented as part of the plan and therefore reductions are not quantifiable. In addition, it is unknown if the measures would be able to reduce emissions to below the applicable thresholds due to the majority of the emissions coming from mobile emissions. Although project design features include transportation demand management implementation that would have the effect of reducing mobile trips that was not

² The analysis did not include projects in the Campus Master Plan considered “immediate” or part of the five-year capital plan.

included in modeling (e.g., mobility hubs that support transit, bikeshare, scootershare, carshare, on-demand rideshare, microtransit, EVs, and rideables), ultimately vehicle emissions depend on individual transportation choices that CSUF would not have full control over. Therefore, impacts from GHG emissions would be significant and unavoidable.

1.3 Findings Regarding Alternatives

Section 15126.6(a) of the CEQA Guidelines requires the discussion of “a reasonable range of alternatives to a project, or the location of a project, which would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project and evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives.” The Final EIR identified and considered the following reasonable range of feasible alternatives to the proposed project which would be capable, to varying degrees, of reducing identified impacts:

- Alternative 1: No Project-No Development Alternative
- Alternative 2: Reduced Enrollment and Academic Space Alternative
- Alternative 3: Increased Student Housing Alternative

These alternatives are evaluated for their ability to avoid or substantially lessen the impacts of the proposed project identified in the Final EIR, as well as consideration of their ability to meet the basic objectives of the proposed project as described in the Final EIR.

1.3.1 No Project-No Development Alternative

Description

CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6(e)(1) requires that the “no project” alternative be described and analyzed “to allow decision makers to compare the impacts of approving the project with the impacts of not approving the project.” The no project analysis is required to discuss “the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published...as well as what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126.6[e][2]). “If the project is...a development project on identifiable property, the no project alternative is the circumstance under which the project does not proceed. Here the discussion would compare the environmental effects of the property remaining in its existing state against environmental effects which would occur if the project is approved. If disapproval of the project under consideration would result in predictable actions by others, such as the proposal of some other project, this ‘no project’ consequence should be discussed. In certain instances, the no project alternative means ‘no build’ wherein the existing environmental setting is maintained. However, where failure to proceed with the project will not result in preservation of existing environmental conditions, the analysis should identify the practical result of the project’s non-approval and not create and analyze a set of artificial assumptions that would be required to preserve the existing physical environment” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15126[e][3][B]).

Under the No Project-No Development Alternative, future campus development would generally be limited to projects already approved under the adopted 2003 Master Plan, which includes a very limited number of academic facilities, some support facilities, a single student residence, and a parking structure. Student enrollment, which reached its approved cap of 25,000 FTES during the

2016-2017 academic year, would remain officially capped at that level, despite ongoing increases in demand. Any additional development would be required to undergo separate environmental review; campuses are limited to one major master plan revision per year by the CSU State University Administrative Manual “when warranted by emergency or when donor-sponsored capital projects require earlier consideration.”

Under this Alternative, the Campus Master Plan would not be adopted; rather, development of the campus would proceed in accordance with the 2003 Master Plan. Campus improvements proposed under the 2003 Master Plan but not yet constructed would still be implemented within campus boundaries (including the main campus as well as portions of the campus north of Yorba Linda Boulevard, south of East Nutwood Avenue, and west of North State College Boulevard. There are several facilities that were either already under construction at the time that the 2003 Master Plan was being prepared or were constructed between 2004 and 2019. These include the Mihaylo Colleges of Business and Economics, the Student Recreation Center, the University Police and Emergency Operations Center, and three new parking structures. With completion of these facilities, most of the facilities and improvements approved under the 2003 Master Plan will have been implemented.

Under the No Project Alternative, it is assumed that remaining facilities approved under the 2003 Master Plan that have not yet been constructed would be implemented as shown in the Campus Master Plan. Major facilities not yet constructed include the Ruby Gerontology expansion, the bookstore expansion, additional student housing, retail service office, the retail/office development on Nutwood Avenue, and the staff/ faculty housing complex and parking structure south of Nutwood Avenue.

Implementation of this alternative would reduce all identified significant impacts of the Campus Master Plan except transportation and traffic impacts, as the VMT impacts under the No Project Alternative, which would presumably be close to those of the existing campus, would be greater than VMT impacts of the Campus Master Plan. Significant and unavoidable impacts under the Campus Master Plan, including air quality and greenhouse gas impacts, would be avoided.

As discussed in the Draft EIR, 10 properties within the campus were found to be eligible for listing as historical resources. Impacts to these 13 buildings were determined to be significant and unavoidable under the Campus Master Plan. Therefore, impacts associated with the No Project Alternative would be less than those of the Campus Master Plan.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees rejects the No Project-No Development Alternative as undesirable as it would not achieve the underlying purpose of the Campus Master Plan, which is to support the CSUF Academic Master Plan and the CSU’s Graduation 2025 Initiative by guiding physical campus development through the year 2039 in ways that support anticipated enrollment growth and changes in pedagogy, academic and support programs, energy supplies and use, utility infrastructure, and transportation. It would also prevent achievement of any of the project objectives.

Rationale

Although the No Project-No Development Alternative would result in an overall decrease in environmental impacts, it would not achieve any of the objectives of the Campus Master Plan. It would not provide the guidance for the physical development of the campus as needed to enable

CSUF to accommodate incremental planned enrollment growth in the future as required by the CSU and provide additional on-campus housing to support improved rates of retention and graduation for freshman and other students. Therefore, this alternative would not support the primary objectives of the Campus Master Plan, which are to support CSUF Academic Master Plan and the CSU's Graduation 2025 Initiative. Further, it would not result in the development of on-campus faculty housing, an innovation hub, event center, increase the density of academic facilities in the campus core, enhance and preserve the Fullerton Arboretum, construct new academic facilities, or restore the Green Loop. Therefore, it would limit the ability for CSUF to enhance academic quality and student success, promote cross-discipline collaboration, increase quality student/professional interaction, or build community connection and support.

1.3.2 Reduced Enrollment and Academic Space Alternative

Description

Under the Reduced Enrollment and Academic Space Alternative, most aspects of the Campus Master Plan would still be implemented. The buildings proposed for renovation, such as McCarthy Hall, Langsdorf Hall, the Pollak Library, the Visual Arts complex, and the Humanities Social Sciences building, would still be renovated as under the Campus Master Plan. The new event center, mobility hubs, parking structures, new innovation center, and the four new student/faculty housing clusters would be implemented. However, academic space would be reduced, since academic space entitlement is driven by FTES enrollment, the FTES growth goal of 32,000 would also be reduced, as would and associated demand for student support space would also be reduced. Under this alternative, buildings A1 and A5 would not be constructed, which would reduce academic and student support space. The removal of these two buildings equates to the removal of 235,000 sf of academic space and 130,000 sf of student life space, for a total reduction of 365,000 sf, compared to the Campus Master Plan.

Construction and operation-related air quality impacts would still be significant and unavoidable but reduced compared to the Campus Master Plan. Because this alternative would result in lower FTES as compared to the Campus Master Plan, overall traffic and VMT would be reduced and would be less than significant. Additionally, the reduction in square footage of academic facilities would result in fewer short-term construction GHG emissions. Similarly, due to the reduced intensity of academic square footage, long-term operational GHG emissions would be lower than under the Campus Master Plan. However, impacts would be significant and unavoidable under this alternative, as is the case for the Campus Master Plan, since the calculated annual emissions of MT CO_{2e} would still exceed the 2039 threshold of 1.15 per service person.

Impacts to historic resources would be comparable under this alternative, as the reduction in square footage would not reduce the potential for alterations to historic buildings compared to the Campus Master Plan, and impacts would therefore remain significant and unavoidable. All other impacts would be reduced compared to the Campus Master Plan.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees rejects the Reduced Enrollment and Academic Space Alternative as undesirable as it would only partially achieve the underlying purpose of the Campus Master Plan, which is to support the CSUF Academic Master Plan and the CSU's Graduation 2025 Initiative by guiding physical campus development through the year 2039 in ways that support anticipated

enrollment growth and changes in pedagogy, academic and support programs, energy supplies and use, utility infrastructure, and transportation.

Rationale

Although the Reduced Enrollment and Academic Space Alternative would result in an overall decrease in environmental impacts, it would not achieve any of the objectives of the Campus Master Plan. This alternative would fully achieve the following nine project objectives, which would be unaffected by the reduction in enrollment growth and academic square footage:

- Restore the Green Loop that circumnavigates the campus to better function as an organizing feature for academic facilities and open space.
- Develop an Innovation Hub that allows students to experiment with processes and prototypes for the future, to serve all sectors of society.
- Establish an event center on campus for daily use by the entire campus community.
- As the campus resumes primary responsibility for management of the Arboretum, balance preservation of its natural and historic resources, protection of its function as a place of solitude and reflection for campus and community members, and enhancement of its use for academic purposes.
- Provide 350 units of faculty housing.
- Improve alternative, multimodal access to campus and reduce reliance on personal vehicle use and parking demand.
- Replace and improve storm management infrastructure to reduce the incidence of flooding.
- Incorporate resilience into the Campus Master Plan through emergency management planning and established locations for emergency operation centers and material storage.

The Reduced Enrollment and Academic Space Alternative would only partially achieve the following five project objectives, since the reduction in enrollment would result in the corresponding reduction in academic square footage on the campus, and an accompanying loss of capacity for future students:

- Enable the university to accommodate incremental planned enrollment growth in the future as required by the CSU.
- Construct new academic facilities that can house programs to fulfill the pedagogic needs of the future and contribute to meeting demand created by planned enrollment growth.
- Improve the connectivity and cohesion of physical spaces on campus and with improved linkages to Downtown Fullerton and public transit.
- Enable the campus to function as a 24-hour hub for student life through increased building density with amenities and access to goods and services in the campus core, the addition of student beds, informal and after-hours work spaces for students, and improved nighttime security.
- Increase the density of academic facilities in the campus core to support program growth and change and enable cross-disciplinary collaboration in a space-efficient manner.

Therefore, this alternative would not support most of the primary objectives of the Campus Master Plan or support University's Academic Master Plan and the CSU's Graduation 2025 Initiative. It would limit the ability for CSUF to enhance academic quality and student success, promote cross-

discipline collaboration, increase quality student/professional interaction, or build community connection and support.

1.3.3 Increased Student Housing

Description

The Increased Student Housing Alternative would be similar to the Campus Master Plan in all respects except that the number of new student beds would increase from 3,000 to 6,000, in new student residential buildings. The additional 3,600 beds would be provided in three new housing clusters in the same area of campus, on the east side, as existing and other new student housing proposed under the Campus Master Plan, in buildings similar in height to those (i.e., no more than 75 feet tall). The additional student housing proposed under this alternative would be located here for reasons of collocation with other existing and proposed student housing and support services and to avoid encroaching on the defined Academic Core proposed under the Campus Master Plan or athletic and open space. Because of the presence of SR 57 to the west, it is conceivable that additional student housing in this part of campus could result in the elimination of the parking facility to the south or encroachment into the Arboretum to the north and west. The building cluster intended for staff and faculty housing would not change compared to the Campus Master Plan.

CSUF has a high percentage of students that commute to classes as opposed to living on campus (less than 10 percent). The increase in housing would increase the percentage of students living on campus from approximately 8 percent to 25 percent, even accounting for an increase in the FTES from 25,000 to 32,000.

The Increased Student Housing Alternative would result in similar or greater impacts to all impact areas except population and housing, public services, recreation, and transportation, as it would result in fewer students residing off campus. Construction-related noise would be greater under this alternative, but operation-related noise would be less than the Campus Master Plan.

Impacts on historic resources would be significant and unavoidable, comparable to those of the Campus Master Plan. Archaeological resource impacts under the Increased Student Housing Alternative would be slightly greater than under the Campus Master Plan, because a larger area of campus would be subject to disturbance, and impacts would remain significant but mitigable.

Air quality impacts under this alternative would be similar to the Campus Master Plan and significant and unavoidable. However, air quality impacts associated with vehicular emissions would be reduced as compared to the Campus Master Plan due to VMT efficiencies associated with fewer students who commute to campus.

The additional housing contemplated under this alternative would result in slightly increased operational GHG emissions relative to energy and water use and the production of solid waste; however, this would be partially or entirely offset by the Campus Master Plan's proposed sustainability measures. Moreover, this alternative would result in a slight reduction in GHG emissions compared to the Campus Master Plan due to the VMT efficiencies. However, both construction and operational GHG emissions under this alternative would be significant and unavoidable.

Finding

The CSU Board of Trustees rejects the Increased Student Housing Alternative as undesirable as it is infeasible for reasons of space constraints on campus, cost, or lack of demand, depending on market conditions within Fullerton and surrounding cities. Additionally, the Reduced Enrollment and Academic Space Alternative has the potential to enable only partial achievement of the following project objective related to the Arboretum, since the additional student housing complexes could conceivably require encroachment on Arboretum land because of other physical constraints to the east, west and south:

- As the campus resumes primary responsibility for management of the Arboretum, balance preservation of its natural and historic resources, protection of its function as a place of solitude and reflection for campus and community members, and enhancement of its use for academic purposes.

Rationale

The Increased Student Housing Alternative would result in the same amount of development as the Campus Master Plan but would construct an additional 3,600 beds in three new housing clusters in the same area of campus, on the east side. It would implement all other aspects of the Campus Master Plan. For this reason, the Increased Student Housing Alternative would achieve most of the project objectives and support the CSUF Academic Master Plan and the CSU's Graduation 2025 Initiative. It would limit the ability for CSUF to enhance academic quality and student success, promote cross-discipline collaboration, increase quality student/professional interaction, or build community connection and support. However, this alternative would allow encroachment of housing-related development in the Fullerton Arboretum, and therefore would have potential to enable only partial achievement of the following project objective related to the Arboretum.

1.4 General CEQA Findings

1.4.1 Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program

Based on the entire record before the CSU Board of Trustees and having considered the unavoidable significant impacts of the project, the CSU Board of Trustees hereby determines that all feasible mitigation within the responsibility and jurisdiction of CSUF has been adopted to reduce or avoid the potentially significant impacts identified in the Final EIR, and that no additional feasible mitigation is available to further reduce significant impacts. The feasible mitigation measures are discussed in Sections 2.3 and 2.4, above, and are set forth in the MMRP.

Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code requires the CSU Board of Trustees to adopt a monitoring or compliance program regarding the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed to lessen or avoid significant effects on the environment. The MMRP for the Campus Master Plan is hereby adopted by the CSU Board of Trustees because it fulfills the CEQA mitigation monitoring requirements:

The MMRP is designed to ensure compliance with the changes in the project and mitigation measures imposed on the project during project implementation; and

Measures to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment are fully enforceable through conditions of approval, permit conditions, agreements or other measures.

1.4.2 CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15092 Findings

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, the CSU Board of Trustees has made one or more of the following findings with respect to each of the significant effects of the project:

1. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
2. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and such changes have been adopted by such other agency, or can and should be adopted by such other agency.
3. Specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly-trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the Final EIR.

Based on the foregoing findings and the information contained in the administrative record, and as conditioned by the foregoing:

1. All significant effects on the environment due to the project have been eliminated or substantially lessened where feasible.
2. Any remaining significant effects that have been found to be unavoidable are acceptable due to the overriding considerations set forth herein.

1.4.3 CSU Board of Trustees Independent Judgement

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

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

1.4.4 Nature of Findings

Any findings made by the CSU Board of Trustees shall be deemed made, regardless of where it appears in this document. All of the language included in this document constitutes findings by the CSU Board of Trustees, whether or not any particular sentence or clause includes a statement to that effect. The CSU Board of Trustees intends that these findings be considered as an integrated whole and, whether or not any part of these findings fail to cross-reference or incorporate by reference any other part of these findings, that any finding required or committed to be made by the CSU Board of Trustees with respect to any particular subject matter of the Final EIR, shall be deemed to be made if it appears in any portion of these findings.

1.4.5 Reliance on Record

Each and all of the findings and determinations contained herein are based on substantial evidence, both oral and written, contained in the administrative record relating to the project.

Record of Proceedings

In accordance with Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e), the record of proceedings for the CSU Board of Trustees' decision on the project includes the following documents:

- The NOP for the project and all other public notices issued in conjunction with the project;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the NOP;
- The Draft EIR for the project and all appendices;
- All comments submitted by agencies or members of the public during the comment period on the Draft EIR;
- The Final EIR for the project, including comments received on the Draft EIR, responses to those comments, and appendices;
- Documents cited or referenced in the Draft EIR and Final EIR;
- The MMRP for the project;
- All findings and resolutions adopted by the Trustees in connection with the project and all documents cited or referred to therein;
- All reports, studies, memoranda, maps, staff reports, or other planning documents relating to the project prepared in compliance with the requirements of CEQA and with respect to the Trustees' action on the project;
- All documents submitted by other public agencies or members of the public in connection with the project, up through the close of the final public hearing;
- Any minutes and/or verbatim transcripts of all information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings held in connection with the project;
- Any documentary or other evidence submitted at such information sessions, public meetings, and public hearings;
- Any and all resolutions adopted by the CSU regarding the project, and all staff reports, analyses, and summaries related to the adoption of those resolutions;
- Matters of common knowledge, including, but not limited to federal, state, and local laws and regulations;
- Any documents expressly cited in these findings and any documents incorporated by reference, in addition to those cited above;
- Any other written materials relevant to the CSU Board of Trustees' compliance with CEQA or its decision on the merits of the project, including any documents or portions thereof, that were released for public review, relied upon in the environmental documents prepared for the project, or included in the CSU Board of Trustees non-privileged retained files for the EIR or project;

- Any other materials required for the record of proceedings by Public Resources Code Section 21167.6(e); and
- The Notice of Determination.

The CSU Board of Trustees intends that only those documents relating to the project and its compliance with CEQA and prepared, owned, used, or retained by the CSU Board of Trustees and listed above shall comprise the administrative record for the project. Only that evidence was presented to, considered by, and ultimately before the CSU Board of Trustees prior to reviewing and reaching its decision on the EIR and project.

Custodian of Records

The custodian of the documents or other material that constitute the record of proceedings upon which the CSU Board of Trustees' decision is based is identified as follows:

California State University, Fullerton
800 North State College Boulevard
Fullerton, CA 92831

Recirculation Not Required

CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5 provides the criteria that a lead agency is to consider when deciding whether it is required to recirculate an EIR. Recirculation is required when "significant new information" is added to the EIR after public notice of the availability of the Draft EIR is given, but before certification. (CEQA Guidelines, Section 15088.5(a).) "Significant new information," as defined in CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a), means information added to an EIR that changes the EIR so as to deprive the public of a meaningful opportunity to comment on a "substantial adverse environmental effect" or a "feasible way to mitigate or avoid such an effect (including a feasible project alternative) that the project's proponents have declined to implement."

An example of significant new information provided by the CEQA Guidelines is a disclosure showing that a "new significant environmental impact would result from the project or from a new mitigation measure proposed to be implemented;" that a "substantial increase in the severity of an environmental impact would result unless mitigation measures are adopted to reduce the impact to a level of insignificance;" or that a "feasible project alternative or mitigation measure considerably different from others previously analyzed would clearly lessen the significant environmental impacts of the project, but the project's proponents decline to adopt it" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(a)(1)-(3)).

Recirculation is not required where "the new information added to the EIR merely clarifies or amplifies or makes insignificant modifications in an adequate EIR" (CEQA Guidelines Section 15088.5(b)). Recirculation also is not required simply because new information is added to the EIR — indeed, new information is oftentimes added given CEQA's public/agency comment and response process and CEQA's post-Draft EIR circulation requirement of proposed responses to comments submitted by public agencies. In short, recirculation is "intended to be an exception rather than the general rule" (Laurel Heights Improvement Assn. v. Regents of University of California (1993) 6 Cal.4th 1112, 1132).

In this legal context, the CSU Board of Trustees finds that recirculation of the Draft EIR prior to certification is not required. In addition to providing responses to comments, the Final EIR includes revisions to expand upon information presented in the Draft EIR; explain or enhance the evidentiary

basis for the Draft EIR's findings; update information; and to make clarifications, amplifications, updates, or helpful revisions to the Draft EIR. The Final EIR's revisions, clarifications and/or updates do not result in any new significant impacts or increase the severity of a previously identified significant impact.

In sum, the Final EIR demonstrates that the project will not result in any new significant impacts or increase the severity of a significant impact, as compared to the analysis presented in the Draft EIR. The changes reflected in the Final EIR also do not indicate that meaningful public review of the Draft EIR was precluded in the first instance. Accordingly, recirculation of the EIR is not required as revisions to the EIR are not significant as defined in Section 15088.5 of the CEQA Guidelines.

1.5 Certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report

The CSU Board of Trustees certifies that the Final EIR, dated June 2020, has been completed in compliance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, that the EIR was presented to the CSU Board of Trustees, and that the Board reviewed and considered the information contained therein before approving the proposed Campus Master Plan, and that the EIR reflects the independent judgment and analysis of the Board (CEQA Guidelines Section 15090).

2 Statement of Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21081(b) and CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a) and (b), the CSU Board of Trustees is required to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, of a proposed project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve the project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological or other benefits of the project, including region-wide or statewide environmental benefits, outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable” (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093 (a)). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b)).

Courts have upheld overriding considerations that were based on a variety of policy considerations including, but not limited to, new jobs, stronger tax base, and implementation of an agency’s economic development goals, growth management policies, redevelopment plans, the need for housing and employment, conformity to community plan, and provision of construction jobs (see *Towards Responsibility in Planning v. City Council* (1988) 200 Cal App. 3d 671; *Dusek v. Redevelopment Agency* (1985) 173 Cal App. 3d 1029; *City of Poway v City of San Diego* (1984) 155 Cal App. 3d 1037; *Markley v. City Council* (1982) 131 Cal App.3d 656).

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the CSU Board of Trustees finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the MMRP, when implemented, will avoid or substantially lessen many of the significant effects identified in the Final EIR for the proposed CSUF Physical Campus Master Plan (hereinafter, Campus Master Plan). However, certain significant impacts of the Campus Master Plan are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are to air quality, GHG emissions, and historic resources. The Final EIR provides detailed information regarding these impacts (see Section 2.4, Potentially Significant Impacts that Cannot Be Mitigated Below A Level of Significance, of this document).

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

1. The Campus Master Plan will enable CSUF to accommodate incremental planned enrollment growth in the future as required by the CSU.
2. The Campus Master Plan will construct new academic facilities that can house programs to fulfill the pedagogic needs of the future and contribute to meeting demand created by planned enrollment growth.
3. The Campus Master Plan will improve the connectivity and cohesion of physical spaces on campus and with improved linkages to Downtown Fullerton and public transit.
4. The Campus Master Plan will enable the campus to function as a 24-hour hub for student life through increased building density with amenities and access to goods and services in the

campus core, the addition of student beds, informal and after-hours work spaces for students, and improved nighttime security.

5. The Campus Master Plan will restore the Green Loop that circumnavigates the campus to better function as an organizing feature for academic facilities and open space.
6. The Campus Master Plan will increase the density of academic facilities in the campus core to support program growth and change and enable cross-disciplinary collaboration in a space-efficient manner.
7. The Campus Master Plan will develop an Innovation Hub that allows students to experiment with processes and prototypes for the future, to serve all sectors of society.
8. The Campus Master Plan will establish an event center on campus for daily use by the entire campus community.
9. The Campus Master Plan will balance preservation of natural and historic resources in the Fullerton Arboretum, protection of its function as a place of solitude and reflection for campus and community members, and enhancement of its use for academic purposes.
10. The Campus Master Plan will provide an additional 2,400 student beds and a range of residential options and associated amenities on campus, to support improved rates of retention and graduation for freshman and other students.
11. The Campus Master Plan will provide 350 units of faculty housing.
12. The Campus Master Plan will improve alternative, multimodal access to campus and reduce reliance on personal vehicle use and parking demand.
13. The Campus Master Plan will replace and improve storm management infrastructure to reduce the incidence of flooding.
14. The Campus Master Plan will incorporate resilience into the Campus Master Plan through emergency management planning and established locations for emergency operation centers and material storage.

Considering all the factors, the CSU Board of Trustees finds that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations associated with the project that serve to override and outweigh the project's significant unavoidable effects and, thus, the adverse effects are considered acceptable. Therefore, the CSU Board of Trustees hereby adopts this Statement of Overriding Considerations.