

6.0 OTHER CEQA CONSIDERATIONS

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Sections 15126 and 15128 of the 2008 California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Statutes and Guidelines

MP Impact CULT-2: Implementation of the proposed Master Plan could cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical building or structure, as a result of alteration, removal, or demolition of the building, or alteration of the site associated with project development.

MP Impact TRANS-1: Full buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan, with and without the Third Entrance, will contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at eight study intersections, in either the AM peak hour or PM peak hour, or both peak hours.

MP Impact TRANS-5: Campus development under the proposed Master Plan will substantially increase volumes on several segments of the CMP or MTS networks.

6.2 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Section 15126.2(c) of the State CEQA Guidelines states that an EIR must include a discussion of any significant irreversible environmental changes that would be caused d 3(.)-497(r)3(e)-6(m)-2(o(o)-8(ul)-10(da)-6(n)46(m)-

procedures related to hazardous materials, which reduces the likelihood and severity of accidents that could result in irreversible environmental damage. In the history of the campus, there have been no accidents resulting in irreversible environmental damage, indicating that current practices with respect to hazardous materials handling are adequate, and thus the potential for the proposed Master Plan to cause irreversible environmental damage from an accident or upset of hazardous materials, is considered low.

6.3 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

This section evaluates the potential for growth inducement as a result of implementation of the proposed Master Plan. Section 15126.2(d) of the State CEQA Guidelines requires that an EIR include a discussion of the potential for a proposed project to foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment.

The State CEQA Guidelines do not provide specific criteria for evaluating growth inducement and state that it must not be assumed that growth in an area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment. Growth inducement is generally not quantified, but is instead evaluated as either occurring, or not occurring, with implementation of a project. The identification of growth-inducing impacts is generally informational, and mitigation of growth inducement is not required by CEQA. It should be noted that the State CEQA Guidelines

Master Plan, based on Table 4.10-3 (in Section 4.10, Population and Housing), practically no new students would be added to the population of the City of Hayward or other Bay Area communities. Of the additional faculty and staff, approximately 220 employee households would live on campus and about 134 employee households would be added to Hayward. Overall, the indirect population increase in the City of Hayward would be about 402 persons (134 employees plus their dependents). In the rest of Alameda County, the proposed Master Plan would increase the population by about 1,209 persons.

The remainder of the CSUEB Hayward-related population that will live outside of Alameda County would likely be distributed among a large number of communities, and therefore would not be expected to substantially affect those communities.

The proposed Master Plan would be considered growth inducing for a number of reasons.

- It would directly increase the study area population by providing facilities so that campus student population would increase from approximately 8,758 Full Time Equivalent students (FTES) in 2007 to approximately 18,000 FTES by 2030. In terms of headcount, the increase would be of approximately 12,910 students. It would also cause employment on the campus to increase from about 1,585 to about 3,258 (headcount) by 2030.
- The proposed Master Plan would also indirectly increase employment and population in the region through the expenditures made by the campus and by students, faculty, and staff which could create or support additional jobs.

6.3.2 Direct Population and Employment Growth

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the total CSUEB Hayward campus population (not including dependents of new students, faculty, and staff) from a total of 13,809 in 2007 to an estimated 28,392 by 2030. This increase of about 14,583 persons would consist of about 12,910 students and 1,673 faculty and staff.

Historically, the majority of new CSUEB Hayward students already lived in the Bay Area region at the time of their enrollment at CSUEB Hayward. Therefore, this Draft EIR assumes that about 16.5 percent of all the additional students (or about 2,130 students) would relocate in order to attend CSUEB Hayward and would therefore be “new” to the study area. This Draft EIR also assumes that all of the faculty would be new to the study area, as the majority of faculty is likely to be recruited from outside the area. Although staff positions are typically filled by persons already living in the Bay Area, conservatively this Draft EIR assumes that 30 percent of additional staff will also be “new” to the study area. Based on these assumptions, approximately 3,177 CSUEB Hayward affiliates would be “new” to the study area and therefore would seek housing in the study area.

As discussed in Section 4.10, Population and Housing, because more than adequate on-campus housing is proposed under the Master Plan to adequately handle the increase in student population, the additional students at the campus would not result in a demand for off-campus housing. With respect to housing needed for the new faculty and staff, the housing demand in Hayward and Alameda County associated with new CSUEB Hayward affiliates is expected to be within the projected supply. Similarly, housing demand in the Bay Area region associated with new CSUEB Hayward affiliates would also be well within the projected supply. Therefore, there would be no substantial shift in demand to more distant communities outside the Bay Area region, nor would the project stimulate additional new housing beyond what is already projected.

To minimize the environmental effects of new housing construction and other urban development, the General Plans of the affected jurisdictions contain policies to control urban encroachment, especially on agricultural lands and sensitive habitats. Furthermore, the environmental review process of each affected jurisdiction is designed to avoid, minimize, or mitigate environmental effects of specific development projects as they are proposed. However some significant and unavoidable impacts, especially related to traffic and habitat conversion, would be expected. By contributing to the regional demand for new housing and urban amenities, the Hayward campus would also contribute to these environmental impacts, as they are created by overall growth in regional housing and other urban amenities. However, the contribution by the Hayward campus would not be considerable.

In addition to impacts from the development of new housing, new Hayward campus affiliates that would reside off campus would place a demand on utilities and services such as water, sewer, and parks in these affected communities. Because the CSUEB Hayward-related population would comprise a very small fraction of the total population in each of the affected communities, its contribution to cumulative impacts on utilities and services in those communities would not be considerable.

6.3.3 Indirect Employment Growth

Employment growth resulting from new or expanded businesses in the area in response to the increased demand for goods and services would also contribute to regional changes in population. Therefore, apart from the direct jobs on the campus, the operation of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would result in the creation of new indirect and induced jobs. Indirect jobs are those that are created or supported when the campus purchases goods and services from businesses in the region, and induced jobs are created or supported when wage incomes of those employed in direct and indirect jobs or students are spent on the purchase of goods and services in the region.

any substantial loss of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region or state because the campus area is not available for extraction of mineral resources. Further development of the campus would not result in the additional loss of important mineral resource recovery. Therefore, no impact would occur.

6.5 REFERENCES

California State University, Fresno. 2006. *The Economic Impact of California State University, Fresno on the San Joaquin Valley's Economy*. Prepared by Department of Economics, California State University, Fresno.

California State University, Long Beach. 2005. *CSULB Economic Impact Report 2005*. http://csulb.edu/colleges/cba/alumni_development/economic_impact.htm

California State University, Sacramento. 2003. *Impacts of California State University, Sacramento on the Sacramento Region*. Prepared by Sacramento Regional Research Institute.

San Francisco State University. 2007. *SFSU Campus Master Plan EIR*. Prepared by URS Corporation.