

4. OTHER CEQA TOPICS

This chapter provides an overview of the environmental effects of the proposed project, including and evaluation of the proposed project’s consistency with the certified 2008 EIR, significant unavoidable adverse impacts, significant irreversible environmental changes, and growth-inducing impacts. Cross references are made throughout this chapter to other chapters of the Supplemental EIR where more detailed discussion of the impacts of the proposed project can be found.

4.1 PROJECT CONSISTENCY WITH 2008 CAMPUS MASTER PLAN EIR

The 2008 EIR was prepared pursuant to the State CEQA Guidelines, Article 7, Sections 15086-15087; and the California Public Resources Code Section 21153 that were current at the time. Since then, Appendix G, the Environmental Checklist Form, was updated to address the analysis and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions (March 18, 2010) and include questions related to impacts to tribal cultural resources (September 27, 2016). In addition, on December 28, 2018, a comprehensive update to the State CEQA Guidelines became effective, which addressed legislative changes to the CEQA, clarified certain portions of the existing CEQA Guidelines, and updated the CEQA Guidelines to be consistent with recent court decisions. As such, the thresholds and analyses contained in this Supplemental EIR reflect the latest CEQA Guidelines.

The evaluation contained in Table 4-1 discusses the consistency of the proposed project with the 2008 EIR. The table reflects the current thresholds in Appendix G of the CEQA Guidelines, lists the significance determination for each resource area based on the analysis in the 2008 EIR, and determines whether the analysis from the 2008 EIR is sufficient, or if further analysis is required. Based on the consistency table prepared for the proposed project and supporting documentation, it was determined that four topics be carried forward for further analysis in this Supplemental EIR, as discussed in Chapter 1, Introduction, Section 1.4, Purpose, Scope, and Legal Authority. The four topics carried forward in this Supplemental EIR are analyzed in Chapter 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation and include Cultural Resources, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Energy, and Tribal Cultural Resources.

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
AESTHETICS. Would the project:			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality the site and its surroundings?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
<p>Findings: Section 3.8, Aesthetics, Light, and Glare, of the 2008 EIR determined that the 2008 Campus Master Plan would have a beneficial impact to campus aesthetics with adherence to the plan’s architectural guidelines. The proposed project would replace an outdated facility with a one-story building and a two-story building in its place. Consistent with the 2008 EIR, the proposed project would maintain and enhance campus character and the quality of the physical environment; and the proposed buildings would be designed to adhere with the plan’s architectural guidelines. The central courtyard would activate the space between the new buildings as well as provide space for socialization, which is an important element in CSULB’s campus character. Lighting would be installed as a part of the proposed project to maximize safety while minimizing spillover to surrounding areas. Consistent with the determination in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR, the proposed project would not result in any impacts to scenic highways. Therefore, similar to the findings of the 2008 EIR, the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to aesthetics.</p>			
<p>AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY RESOURCES. In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state’s inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board. Would the project:</p>			
<p>a. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?</p>	No Impact	☒	☐
<p>b. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson act contract?</p>	No Impact	☒	☐
<p>c. 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))?</p>	No Impact	☒	☐
<p>d. Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?</p>	No Impact	☒	☐
<p>e. Involve other changes in the existing environment that, 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?</p>	No Impact	☒	☐
<p>Findings: The Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined that there are no designated farmland or agricultural uses within the campus. No agricultural zoning or Williamson Act contracts exist within the campus or vicinity. The proposed project would replace an outdated facility with two connected buildings in its place. Therefore, consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impacts related to agricultural or forestry resources.</p>			

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
AIR QUALITY. Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management district or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations. Would the project:			
a. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality?	Significant and Unavoidable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in other emissions (such as those leading to odors) adversely affecting a substantial number of people?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Findings: The 2008 EIR assessed long-term, operational air quality emissions in Section 3.2, Air Quality, and short-term construction emissions in Section 3.9, Construction Effects. The operational analysis found that regional emissions, primarily from passenger vehicles, would exceed the South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) significance thresholds for reactive organic gases, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), carbon monoxide (CO), and particulate matter ten microns or less in diameter (PM₁₀). The following mitigation measure was included in the project approval:

- The University will exceed Title 24 energy saving requirements on campus by 15% or more on all new or renovation projects by applying a range of techniques and measures that may include planting trees to provide shade and shadow to buildings; use of energy-efficient lighting in buildings and parking lots; use of light-colored roofing materials; installing energy-efficient appliances; installing automatic lighting on/off controls; use of insulation and double-paned glass windows; connecting buildings to central air and water heating and cooling systems, and/or other measures.

As discussed on page 4 in the Preface to the Final Supplemental EIR chapter of this EIR, the California State University Sustainability Policy was revised on February 5, 2020 requiring that all new construction, remodeling, renovation, and repair projects be designed to exceed Title 24, Part 6 energy codes by ten percent. The proposed project would be consistent with the revised California State University Sustainability Policy.

Regarding operations, the proposed project would not change the operational emissions analysis and associated conclusions presented in the 2008 EIR. The proposed project would accommodate the existing student population and would provide associated campus support services to support additional residents on campus. The proposed project would not generate new significant vehicle trips, and would likely reduce regional vehicles miles travels and associated air quality emissions by providing on-campus housing. Additionally, the building envelope would be designed to achieve NZE and would meet LEED Platinum certification criteria. No significant stationary or area sources of long-term, operational emissions have been identified as part of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in new or more severe air quality long-term, operational impacts than identified in the 2008 EIR.

Regarding construction activities, a detailed emissions analysis was completed to assess the potential for the proposed project to change the conclusions presented in the 2008 EIR. Construction of the proposed project has the potential to create air quality impacts through the use of heavy-duty construction equipment and through vehicle trips generated by construction workers and haul trucks traveling to and from the

**Table 4-1
Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------

project site. Fugitive dust emissions would primarily result from site preparation (e.g., demolition and grading) activities. NO_x emissions would predominantly result from the use of construction equipment and haul truck trips. The assessment of construction air quality impacts considers all of these emissions sources. Construction emissions can vary substantially from day to day, depending on the level of activity, the specific type of operation and, for dust, the prevailing weather conditions.

The construction analysis found that the emissions would exceed SCAQMD regional significance thresholds for NO_x and PM₁₀. The following mitigation measures were included in the project approval:

- Exposed surfaces are watered as needed
- Soils stabilizers are applied to disturbed inactive areas as needed.
- Ground cover is replaced quickly in inactive areas.
- All stockpiles are covered with tarps or plastic sheeting.
- All unpaved haul roads are watered daily and all access points used by haul trucks are kept clean during the site grading.
- Speed on unpaved roads is reduced to below 15 miles per hour.
- Trucks carrying contents subject to airborne dispersal are covered.
- Grading and other high-dust activities cease during high wind conditions (wind speeds exceeding a sustained rate of 25 miles an hour).
- Diesel particulate filters are installed on diesel equipment and trucks.
- All construction equipment will be properly tuned.
- To reduce emissions from idling, the contractor shall ensure that all equipment and vehicles not in use for more than 5 minutes are turned off, whenever feasible.
- Low VOC-content paint, stucco, or other architectural coatings materials will be utilized to the extent possible.
- Low VOC-content asphalt and concrete will be utilized to the extent possible.
- The University will continue to comply with SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Renovation/Demolition Activities) and other pertinent regulations when working on structures containing asbestos, lead, or other toxic materials.
- As appropriate, outdoor activities at the campus will be limited during high-dust and other heavy construction activities, including painting.
- If construction activities occur adjacent to classrooms, student dormitories, health facilities and other sensitive receptors the University will either:
 - Make findings and notify each sensitive receptor that construction activity will not affect such receptor, or
 - Install and maintain filters on interior ventilation system to reduce intake of pollutants until construction activity ceases.

It is mandatory for all construction projects in the South Coast Air Basin to comply with SCAQMD Rule 403 for Fugitive Dust. Rule 403 control requirements include measures to prevent the generation of visible dust plumes. Measures include, but are not limited to, applying soil binders to uncovered areas, re-establishing ground cover as quickly as possible, utilizing a wheel washing system or other control measures to remove bulk material from tires and vehicle undercarriages before vehicles exit the project site, and maintaining effective cover over exposed areas. Compliance with Rule 403 would reduce fugitive dust emissions associated with construction activities by approximately 61 percent. In addition, the proposed project would be required to comply with the California Air Resources Board Airborne Toxics Control Measure, which restricts heavy-duty diesel vehicle idling time to 5 minutes.

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------

The air quality analysis conducted for the proposed project is consistent with the methods described in the SCAQMD CEQA Air Quality Handbook (1993 edition), as well as the updates to the CEQA Air Quality Handbook provided on the SCAQMD website. The SCAQMD recommends the use of the California Emissions Estimator Model (CalEEMod, version 2016.3.2) as a tool for quantifying emissions of air pollutants that will be generated by constructing and operating development projects. Project-specific information was provided describing the schedule of construction activities and the equipment inventory required.

Table 4-1.1 shows maximum daily regional emissions during construction presented in the 2008 EIR in addition to project-specific emissions. Project-related emissions would not result in a previously undisclosed impact. It is reasonable to state the 2008 EIR air quality analysis, which included all Master Plan projects, accounted for a project similar to the proposed project. Regional emissions would be within the emissions inventory envelope included in the 2008 EIR. The proposed project would still not result in a new impact if maximum daily project-specific emissions are considered in combination the maximum daily emissions in the 2008 EIR. Regarding previously disclosed impacts, particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM_{2.5}) emissions would increase by 2.9 percent, which is not considered a more severe impact than that disclosed in the 2008 EIR. Maximum daily NO_x emissions would increase by 10 percent for a brief period of intense construction activities. This would not exacerbate the previously discussed significant impact due to the short-term duration of haul activity. The revised project would not result in new or more severe air quality impacts.

**Table 4-1.1
 Estimated Peak Day Regional Construction Emissions**

Phase	Daily Emissions (Pounds Per Day)				
	VOC	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
2008 EIR Emissions					
Maximum Regional Daily Emissions	32	298	136	182	48
Regional Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	55
Exceed Regional Threshold?	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Proposed Project Emissions					
Building Construction					
Demolition	2.1	16	17	2.2	1.1
Site Preparation	3.1	29	19	5.2	3.0
Building Construction	1.9	11	15	2.8	1.1
Architectural Coating	21	1.7	3.2	0.5	0.2
Roadway Construction					
Demolition	0.9	7.3	8.2	0.6	0.4
Site Preparation	1.0	9.9	7.7	0.9	0.5
Paving	1.5	9.9	11	0.7	0.5
Maximum Regional Daily Emissions	21	29	19	5.2	3.0
Regional Significance Threshold	75	100	550	150	55

Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No	No
-------------------	----	----	----	----	----

Note: Emissions modeling files can be found in Appendix C.
Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc., 2019.

The 2008 EIR did not include a detailed analysis of localized exposure to pollutant concentrations. Localized exposure has been assessed for the proposed project in accordance with the SCAQMD Localized Significance Threshold (LST) methodology. The Basin is divided into 38 Source Receptor Areas, each with its own set of maximum allowable LST values for on-site emissions sources during construction and operations based on locally monitored air quality. Maximum on-site emissions resulting from construction activities were quantified and assessed against the applicable LST values for SRA South Coastal LA County 4. LSTs have been established for 1, 2, and 5-acre construction sites and for 25, 50, 100, and 500 meter receptor distances. The LST analysis is based on a 2-acre project site for building construction and a 1-acre project site for roadway construction. The receptor distance was 25 meters for both scenarios. Table 4-1.2 shows that localized pollutant emissions would not exceed the LSTs developed by the SCAQMD. Therefore, the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact related to substantial pollutant concentrations.

**Table 4-1.2
Estimated Peak Day Localized Construction Emissions**

Phase	Daily Emissions (Pounds Per Day)			
	NO _x	CO	PM ₁₀	PM _{2.5}
Building Construction				
Demolition	16	14	1.0	0.8
Site Preparation	29	16	4.1	2.7
Building Construction	10	7.3	0.5	0.5
Architectural Coating	1.6	3.2	0.5	0.2
Maximum Localized Daily Emissions	29	16	4.1	2.7
Localized Significance Threshold	82	842	7	5
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No
Roadway Construction				
Demolition	7.3	7.6	0.4	0.4
Site Preparation	9.7	6.3	0.4	0.4
Paving	9.2	10	0.5	0.4
Maximum Localized Daily Emissions	9.7	10	0.5	0.4
Localized Significance Threshold	57	585	4	3
Exceed Threshold?	No	No	No	No

Note: Emissions modeling files can be found in the Appendix C.
Source: Terry A. Hayes Associates Inc., 2019.

The 2008 EIR concluded that the Master Plan would result in a cumulative air quality impact due to potential overlap with related projects. The South Coast Air Basin is designated as nonattainment of the California Air Quality Standards and the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for ozone and particulate matter. Therefore, there is an ongoing regional cumulative impact associated with these air pollutants. Considering the existing environmental conditions, the SCAQMD propagated guidance that an individual project can emit allowable quantities of these pollutants on a regional scale without significantly contributing to the cumulative impacts. As discussed above, air pollutant emissions associated with construction of the proposed project would not exceed any applicable SCAQMD air quality thresholds of significance. The SCAQMD does not consider individual project emissions of lesser magnitude than the mass daily thresholds to be cumulatively considerable. The proposed project would not result in a new

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
cumulatively considerable impact. In addition, in accordance with SCAQMD guidance, the proposed project would not exacerbate the existing cumulatively considerable impact as project-specific emissions would not be significant.			
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Findings: The proposed project would replace an outdated facility with two connected buildings in its place. As described in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR, the campus is surrounded by and consists of urban development. No suitable habitat within the campus exists for native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, and no sensitive species are known to live, visit, or forage on campus. There are no wildlife corridors, riparian habitats, sensitive natural communities, or wetlands within campus. The campus is not subject to any habitat conservation plan or local policies regarding biological resources. Up to 55 landscape trees would be removed with the project to allow for construction. The proposed project would comply with CSULB's "Campus Forest" initiative aims to replace trees on at least a one-for-one basis either within the project site or elsewhere on campus. Therefore, consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impacts related to biological resources.			
CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project:			
a. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	No Impact	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

**Table 4-1
Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
b. Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5?	Less than Significant with Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
c. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?	Less than Significant with Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings: At the time the 2008 Campus Master Plan was prepared, the existing Hillside Office/Commons building was not of historic age. As such, the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined that impacts related to historic resources would not occur. As part of this project, the existing Hillside Office/Commons building, which is proposed to be demolished, is now of an age that qualifies it as a potentially historic resource. The existing Hillside Office/Commons building was recently evaluated in terms of historical significance in the Historical Resources Assessment prepared for this project (Appendix A). The Hillside College residence hall complex (excluding Los Cerritos Hall, Los Alamitos Hall, and the International House) was found eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and California Register of Historical Resources, and therefore is considered a potentially historic resource. Therefore, this Supplemental EIR addresses the proposed project’s potential impacts associated with demolition of the existing building in Section 3.1, Cultural Resources.

The 2008 EIR determined that construction of new and replacement facilities may potentially disturb unknown archaeological resources or human remains and mitigation would be required to reduce impacts to a less than significant level. Mitigation measures include archaeological and Native American monitoring during earth-moving construction activities; construction crew training; stop work if an inadvertent discovery of archaeological resource occurs; Phase III data recovery, if required; and stop work and notification of the Los Angeles County Coroner’s Office if any human skeletal remains are found. These mitigation measures would also be applicable to the proposed project. Nonetheless, this Supplemental EIR evaluates impacts related to archaeological resources located in the vicinity of the proposed project and human remains in Section 3.1, Cultural Resources.

ENERGY. Would the project:

a. Result in potentially significant environmental impact due to wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy resources, during project construction or operation?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with or obstruct a state or local plan for renewable energy or energy efficiency?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings: At the time the 2008 Campus Master Plan was prepared, specific details related to energy use were not available and environmental impacts were evaluated in the 2008 EIR to the extent possible given the level of project information available at the time. The Campus Master Plan’s potential impacts related to energy were not previously analyzed in detail in the Program EIR. Therefore, this Supplemental EIR analysis addresses the projected energy consumption associated with construction and operation of the proposed project in Section 3.2, Energy.

GEOLOGY AND SOILS. Would the project:

a. Directly or indirectly cause potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Landslides?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Result in substantial soil erosion, loss of topsoil, or changes in topography or unstable soil conditions from excavation, grading, or fill?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on-or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial direct or indirect risks to life or property?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. 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?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature?	Less than Significant with Mitigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Findings: The Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined that compliance with all applicable regulations and standard university procedures designed for geotechnical and seismic safety would ensure that impacts related to seismicity, liquefaction, erosion, and soils would be less than significant level. In addition, the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined no impacts related to landslides, unstable soils, or alternative wastewater disposal systems would occur. The proposed project would comply with all applicable regulations and standard university procedures for geotechnical and seismic safety. Consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to geology and soils.

Paleontological resources were previously evaluated in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR under Cultural Resources. It was determined that no paleontological resources are known to be located on campus or in the vicinity. As discussed in Section 3.7, Archaeological Resources, of the 2008 EIR, if fossilized shells, plants, or bones are discovered during construction of an individual project, work shall be suspended in the immediate vicinity of the finds, and the potential significance of the resources shall be evaluated by a qualified specialist. This mitigation measure would also be applicable to the proposed project to ensure impacts would be less than significant. No new or more severe impacts related to paleontological resources would occur as a result of the proposed project.

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:			
a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict with an applicable plan, policy or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Findings: The 2008 EIR did not address potential impacts to greenhouse gas emissions because it was prepared prior to the 2010 amendment to the State CEQA Guidelines requiring analysis and mitigation of greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, this Supplemental EIR analysis addresses potential impacts related to greenhouse gas emissions in Section 3.3, Greenhouse Gas Emissions.			
HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS. Would the project:			
a. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Be located on a site that 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?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard or excessive noise for people residing or working in the project area?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
f. Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
g. Expose people or structures, either directly or indirectly, to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Findings: The handling, movement, storage, and disposal of hazardous materials would be monitored by the University's environmental health and safety staff. Consistent with the analysis in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR, the proposed buildings would not involve the routine use, transport, or disposal of hazardous materials. On-site hazardous materials would be limited to small amounts of everyday cleaning and common chemicals used for landscaping and maintenance. Additionally, the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined that no impact would occur related to a public use airport or private airstrip, emergency			

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
response or evacuation plan, or wildland fires. Consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to hazardous materials.			
HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY. Would the project:			
a. Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements or otherwise substantially degrade surface or ground water quality?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially decrease groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that the project may impede sustainable groundwater management of the basin?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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 that would:			
i) Result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or offsite?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) 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?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. In flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche zones, risk release of pollutants due to project inundation?	Not previously evaluated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of a water quality control plan or sustainable groundwater management plan?	Not previously evaluated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Findings: Sections 3.6, Water Supply and Quality, and 3.9, Construction Effects, of the 2008 EIR discuss long-term and construction-related impacts to water quality, respectively. The 2008 EIR determined that impacts related to water quality would be less than significant with compliance to applicable regulations for stormwater runoff, including preparation and implementation of Standard Urban Water Mitigation Plans, adherence to existing National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System requirements, and implementation of best management practices, such as implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan. As discussed in the 2008 EIR, standard requirements would be incorporated into the final site plan for each individual facility on campus, including for the proposed project. Consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts related to water quality and would not conflict with any water quality control plan.

Drainage is discussed in Section 3.5, Utilities and Service Systems, of the 2008 EIR. The 2008 EIR determined that impacts associated with the minor improvements to existing drainage would be less than significant. As discussed above, compliance with applicable regulations for stormwater runoff would ensure that impacts related to water quality, erosion, siltation, and surface runoff resulting in flooding would be less than significant. The proposed project may increase the area of impermeable surfaces due to the larger footprint of the proposed commons and HRL buildings than the existing Hillside Office/Commons, as

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------

well as proposed pathways; however, the impact to existing drainage pattern would be minimal as the natural conditions and open space of the project site would be maintained. Therefore, the proposed project would not result in an exceedance in the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff. Consistent with findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to the existing drainage pattern of the site.

The 2008 EIR determined that groundwater pumping is expected to remain similar to current levels through 2030 as supplies of recycled water would supplement any additional water use from implementation of the Campus Master Plan. Implementation of mitigation measures, including use of reclaimed water for irrigation, installation of low-use water fixtures, and coordination with the Long Beach Water Department, would ensure that proper water conservation is pursued. As described in Section 2.6, Project Components, of the Supplemental EIR, the proposed project would include sustainable design features, such as use of purple pipe (recycled water pipelines), which would save 4,300 gallons of potable water a day, or approximately 1.6 million gallons annually. In addition, the proposed project would install bioswales so that 100 percent of the site's stormwater would be managed on site via capture and/or infiltration with groundwater recharge. As such, impacts related to groundwater supplies, groundwater recharge, or conflict with a sustainable groundwater management plan would not occur. Implementation of the proposed project would result in a less than significant impact, and no new or more severe impacts would occur as a result of the proposed project.

The proposed project would construct new structures within the existing campus. Consistent with findings of the 2008 EIR, no substantial change in exposure to flood hazards would occur. The project site is located in an area of minimal flood hazard, as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (Federal Emergency Management Agency n.d.). Additionally, as discussed in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR, no waterbodies are located uphill from campus, and therefore, the campus is not exposed to seiche. The campus is located at a distance of approximately 3 miles from the ocean and is not susceptible to damage from tsunami. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact related to risk of release to pollutants due to project inundation from flood hazard, tsunami, or seiche.

LAND USE AND PLANNING. Would the project:

a. Physically divide an established community?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. 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?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Findings: The proposed project is included in the 2008 Campus Master Plan, which guides development of the campus. The proposed project would replace an outdated facility with two connected buildings in its place. As such, the proposed project would not divide any established community. The proposed project would not impact any off-campus uses and would conflict with any land use plans, policies, or regulations. Consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact to land use and planning.

MINERAL RESOURCES. Would the project:

a. Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	-----------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
b. Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Findings: The Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined that the campus is not known to contain any important mineral resources. As such, loss of any such resources would not occur with implementation of the proposed project. Consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impact to mineral resources.</p>			
<p>NOISE. Would the project result in:</p>			
a. Generation of a substantial temporary or permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the project in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies?	Significant and Unavoidable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?	Significant and Unavoidable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. 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, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Findings: The 2008 EIR determined that implementation of the 2008 Campus Master Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts related to construction noise and vibration even with the implementation of mitigation measures. Mitigation measures include use of muffled construction equipment, where possible; proper equipment maintenance; locating noise construction equipment away from residential areas, where possible; adherence to the City of Long Beach regulations for construction hours; and measures to reduce impacts associated with sustained high-noise construction activities (temporary noise barriers, scheduling, etc.). As the proposed project would require demolition of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building and construction of the new commons and HRL buildings, these mitigation measures would be also applicable to the proposed project.</p>			
<p>Long-term impacts related to traffic noise and other campus activities would result in less than significant impacts. Mitigation measures would be required to reduce noise impacts associated with athletic events at the soccer field facility on campus. These mitigation measures would not be applicable to the proposed project. Additionally, the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined that no impact would occur related to a public use airport or private airstrip. No new or more severe impacts related to noise would occur as a result of the proposed project.</p>			
<p>POPULATION AND HOUSING. Would the project:</p>			
a. 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)?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Displace substantial numbers of existing people or housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------

Findings: As discussed in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR, the implementation of the 2008 Campus Master Plan provides for additional on-campus housing and would not displace any housing or people. Furthermore, the 2008 Campus Master Plan is designed to accommodate for the projected increase in student enrollment based on growth and development in the area, and would not induce population growth or housing demand. The proposed project would not displace the two single apartments within the existing Hillside Office/Commons as five new units would be constructed in the proposed commons building. Additionally, the proposed project is designed to accommodate the projected increase in student enrollment by providing the necessary facilities improvements. Therefore, consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in less than significant impacts to population and housing.

PUBLIC SERVICES. Would the project:

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

i) Fire protection?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii) Police protection?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii) Schools?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv) Parks?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v) Other public facilities?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Findings: The 2008 EIR determined that implementation of the 2008 Campus Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts related to fire and police protection. Implementation of the 2008 Campus Master Plan would result in an incremental increase in demand for fire prevention and suppression services from the Long Beach Fire Department and police protection services from the University, however, enhanced operation procedures, continued trainings, incorporation of fire suppression and security features into building design would maintain acceptable response times, service ratios, and other performance objectives. No new local or regional fire or police facilities would be required. The proposed project would replace an outdated facility on campus with two connected buildings in its place. Consistent with the 2008 EIR, the proposed buildings would include safety and security features such as fire suppression and lighting, and no new fire or police facilities would be required. Impacts would be less than significant.

As discussed in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR, the 2008 Campus Master Plan provides the needed facilities to accommodate the projected student enrollment and associated support services. Open space within the campus would be maintained or enhanced. Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not generate a need for construction of new public facilities in the surrounding community. The proposed project would replace an outdated facility with two buildings in its place that would provide space for support services for existing students. As such, it would not generate additional demand for schools, parks, or other public facilities. Consistent with the findings of the 2008 EIR, implementation of the proposed project would result in no impacts to schools, parks, or other public facilities.

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
RECREATION.			
a. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated?	Less than Significant	☒	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities that might have an adverse physical effect on the environment?	Less than Significant	☒	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Findings: As discussed in the Initial Study for the 2008 EIR, the 2008 Campus Master Plan includes preservation and enhancement of on-campus open space, and no construction of neighborhood or regional parks or other recreation facilities would be required. The proposed project would replace an outdated facility with two connected buildings in its place. Consistent with the 2008 EIR, the proposed project would maintain and enhance campus open space, and impacts would be less than significant.</p>			
TRANSPORTATION. Would the project:			
a. Conflict with a program plan, ordinance or policy addressing the circulation system, including transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities?	No Impact	☒	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Conflict or be inconsistent with CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.3, subdivision (b)?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Substantially increase hazards due to a geometric design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	No Impact	☒	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Result in inadequate emergency access?	No Impact	☒	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Findings: The Initial Study for the 2008 EIR determined that no impact would occur related to transit, roadway, bicycle and pedestrian facilities, hazardous design features, or emergency access. Consistent with the determination made in the 2008 EIR, the proposed project would not include any hazardous design features or incompatible uses as it would replace an outdated facility with new facilities, and emergency access would be maintained at all times during construction and operation. Additionally, the 2008 EIR determined that construction impacts would be less than significant with mitigation. The mitigation measures would also be applicable to the proposed project, including use of flag person to direct traffic, avoidance of residential areas for construction truck routes and peak travel times on Interstate 405, Interstate 607, and State Route 22, provision of temporary alternate routes for pedestrians and bicyclists, and temporary relocation of transit facilities on campus.</p>			
<p>At the time the 2008 Campus Master Plan was prepared, Level of Service (LOS) was used to evaluate CEQA impacts to the transportation system. As discussed in Section 1.3, Project Consistency with Campus Master Plan EIR, of this Supplemental EIR, a comprehensive update to the State CEQA Guidelines became effective in 2018, which addressed legislative changes to the CEQA. One of the legislative changes included Senate Bill 743, which required development of an alternative metric to LOS for determining significant impacts to the transportation system. Vehicle Miles of Travel (VMT) identified as the new metric in assessing impacts associated with vehicle travel. The State CEQA Guidelines changes also indicate that a project's effect on automobile delay shall not constitute a significant environmental impact, except possibly when analyzing a transportation project. Therefore, an updated project-level analysis to assess LOS was not conducted for the proposed project.</p>			

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
------------------------------------	------------------------	---------------------	---------------------------

The 2019 *CSU Transportation Impact Study Manual* provides procedures for screening out projects from detailed VMT analysis and for conducting detailed analysis, if a project is not screened out. Based on the manual, the following projects are screened out from VMT assessment due to their VMT reducing nature:

- Local serving retail that is less than 50,000 sq. ft., or retail that is located wholly within the core of a CSU campus;
- Childcare centers that serve students, faculty, and staff families;
- Student services facilities;
- Parking facilities that serve the campus demand and do not create “too much parking”;
- Healthcare centers serving students, faculty, and staff; and
- Recreation/fitness/wellness centers that serve students, faculty, and staff.
- Projects generating less than 110 vehicle trips per day, as noted in the OPR Technical Advisory.

The proposed project would construct a new HRL building to replace the recently demolished Parkside complex housing administration building, as well as expand the commons area and associated space for support services for Hillside College residents. As such, the proposed project would constitute student services facilities. The proposed project is not expected to generate additional vehicle trips during operation since the buildings would serve existing students. Therefore, the proposed project would be screened out from having to conduct detailed VMT analysis and the VMT impact would be less than significant.

TRIBAL CULTURAL RESOURCES. Would the project cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a tribal cultural resource, defined in Public Resources Code Section 21074 as either a site, feature, place, cultural landscape that is geographically defined in terms of the size and scope of the landscape, sacred place, or object with cultural value to a California Native American Tribe, and that is:

a. Listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources, or in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k)?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
b. A resource determined by the lead agency, in its discretion and supported by substantial evidence, to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of the Public Resources Code Section 5024.1? In applying the criteria set forth in subdivision (c) of Public Resources Code Section 5024.1, the lead agency shall consider the significance of the resource to a California Native American tribe.	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Findings: Tribal cultural resources are briefly discussed in Section 3.7, Archaeological Resources, of the 2008 EIR. Section 3.7 of the 2008 EIR describes the University's policy on Native American Burial Remains and consultation with Native American representatives. However, the 2008 EIR was prepared prior to the 2016 amendments to the State CEQA Guidelines to include questions related to impacts to tribal cultural resources. Therefore, this Supplemental EIR analysis addresses the project-level and cumulative impacts on tribal cultural resources in Section 3.4 Tribal Cultural Resources.

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS. Would the project:			
a. Require or result in the relocation or construction of new or expanded water, wastewater treatment or storm water drainage, electric power, natural gas, or telecommunications facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project and reasonably foreseeable future development during normal, dry and multiple dry years?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider that serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Generate solid waste in excess of state or local standards, or in excess of the future capacity of local infrastructure, or otherwise impair the attainment of solid waste reduction goals?	Significant and Unavoidable	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Comply with federal, state, and local management and reduction statutes and regulations related to solid waste?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Findings: Section 3.5, Utilities and Service Systems, of the 2008 EIR determined that implementation of the 2008 Campus Master Plan would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded local or regional facilities for water, wastewater, stormwater, or solid waste. Water supplies are discussed in Section 3.6, Water Supply and Quality, of the 2008 EIR. The 2008 EIR determined that impacts related to water supplies would be less than significant, but mitigation measures would be implemented to ensure proper water conservation is pursued. The mitigation measures, which include use of reclaimed water for irrigation, installation of low-use water fixtures, and coordination with the Long Beach Water Department, would also apply to the proposed project. The proposed project would replace an outdated facility with two sustainably designed buildings in its place. Sustainable design features, such as use of purple pipe (recycled water pipelines) would save approximately 1.6 million gallons annually. In addition, the proposed project would install bioswales so that 100 percent of the site's stormwater would be managed on site via capture and/or infiltration with groundwater recharge. Therefore, the proposed project would be consistent with the 2008 EIR determination, and impacts related to water, wastewater, and stormwater would be less than significant.

The proposed project would also comply with mitigation measures related to construction waste discussed in Section 3.9, Construction Effects, of the 2008 EIR. Mitigation measures, including recycling inert materials and complying with applicable regulations for hazardous waste, would be implemented to minimize the impacts of construction waste. The mitigation measures would also be applicable to the proposed project. However, as discussed in Section 5.0, Cumulative and Long-term Effects, of the 2008 EIR, cumulative impacts related to solid waste is considered potentially significant and unavoidable. The proposed project would comply with the mitigation measures described for the 2008 EIR. No new or more severe impacts related to generation of solid waste would occur as a result of the proposed project.

Impacts related to electric power and natural gas are discussed in Section 3.2, Energy, of this Supplemental EIR. Similar to existing conditions, electric power and natural gas for construction and

**Table 4-1
 Project Consistency with 2008 EIR**

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
<p>operation of the project would be supplied by Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas Company, respectively. The proposed project includes sustainable design features to meet and/or exceed energy goals, including exceeding Title 24 energy requirements and attaining LEED Platinum Rating. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power or natural gas facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.</p>			
<p>WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:</p>			
<p>a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?</p>	<p>Not previously evaluated</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>b. 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?</p>	<p>Not previously evaluated</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>c. 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?</p>	<p>Not previously evaluated</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability, or drainage changes?</p>	<p>Not previously evaluated</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Findings: The 2008 Campus Master Plan EIR did not address potential impacts to related to wildfire because it was prepared prior to the 2018 amendment to the State CEQA Guidelines to include a section on wildfire. According to the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection Fire Hazard Severity Zone Maps, the City of Long Beach and project site are not located in a state responsibility area or lands classified as very high fire severity zones (California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection 2011). Therefore, implementation of the Campus Master Plan and the proposed project would have no associated wildfire impacts.</p>			

4.2 SIGNIFICANT UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS

This section is prepared in accordance with Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, which requires the discussion of any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if a project is implemented. These include impacts that can be mitigated, but cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. An analysis of environmental impacts caused by the proposed project has been conducted and is contained in Chapter 3 of this Supplemental EIR. Four environmental issue areas were analyzed in detail in Chapter 3. According to the environmental impact analysis, the proposed project would result in the following significant and unavoidable adverse impacts related to historic resources (Section 3.1, Cultural Resources).

Cultural Resources

As discussed in Section 3.1, Cultural Resources, the demolition of the existing office/commons building would cause a substantial adverse change to the historic district by removing its overall integrity of design, setting, feeling, or association. Mitigation Measures CR-6 and CR-7 would be implemented to record and document the historic structure. However, even with implementation of the mitigation measures, demolition of the existing office/commons building would result in a substantial adverse change to the historic district that could not be fully mitigated. Therefore, implementation of the proposed project would result in a significant and unavoidable impact to the historical resource.

4.3 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE ENVIRONMENTAL CHANGES

Public Resources Code Section 21100(b)(2)(B) and Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR analyze the extent to which the proposed project's primary and secondary effects would impact the environment and commit non-renewable resources to uses that future generations will not be able to reverse. Construction of the proposed project would result in the use of non-renewable resources, including fossil fuels, natural gas, water, and building materials, such as concrete. As described in Chapter 2, Project Description, demolition and construction debris would be recycled to the maximum extent possible. The proposed project does not represent an uncommon construction project that would use an extraordinary amount of raw material in comparison to other development projects of similar scope and magnitude. Additionally, the proposed project would incorporate energy efficient, sustainable, water and waste efficient, and resilient features to achieve LEED Platinum Rating, NZE Rating, and Full Living Building Challenge Certification. The materials used for the interior, exterior and subterranean areas of the buildings would be vetted for compliance with the Red List, prohibiting the use of any materials which may have chemicals of concern. Materials with environmental product declarations, which disclose a product's life cycle assessment and includes its global warming potential, would be used to the extent possible. Construction waste management would be implemented using a net positive waste strategy which includes diverting 99 percent of metal, paper, cardboard, and 100 percent of soil and biomass; diverting 95 percent of rigid foam, carpet, and insulation; diverting 90 percent of all other materials; and reuse of existing brick and diverting 95 percent of total construction and demolition debris from landfills. Materials with high solar reflectance indexes would be used to help mitigate heat and allow light to reflect naturally throughout the space.

Design of the buildings would include operable windows, which would allow for passive ventilation strategies, and provide direct access to outdoor air and natural daylight. State of the art enhanced mechanical systems would optimize energy efficiency and contribute to NZE goals. Enhanced filtration media would be used at all mechanical systems to enhance air quality throughout

occupancy, which would increase volumes of fresh outdoor air. Recycled water pipelines would be installed to save approximately 4,300 gallons of potable water daily. In addition, energy and water submeters would be employed to optimize building technology as well as inform ongoing operations and maintenance demands.

Outside, on-site solar PV would be installed on the roofs and canopy to support NZE design. The canopy-covered courtyard would provide shade as well as support and activate the space between the buildings. Secured and covered bike storage would be provided to support CSULB's goal of reducing single-commuter vehicular traffic. Bioswales with native riparian planting would be installed throughout the western and northern perimeters of the project site and flow towards the proposed bioretention area. Bioswale, open space, and rainwater management would capture and/or infiltrate 100 percent of stormwater for groundwater recharge.

Following construction, the air would be flushed and indoor air quality would be tested for presence of particulate matter, formaldehyde, smoke, VOCs and other chemicals of concern prior to occupancy.

The proposed project is not anticipated to consume substantial amount of energy in a wasteful manner, and it would not result in significant impacts from consumption of utilities. Although irreversible environmental changes would result from implementation of the proposed project, such changes would not be considered significant.

4.4 GROWTH-INDUCING IMPACTS

Section 15125.2(e) of the CEQA Guidelines requires a discussion of the ways in which a project could induce growth. This includes way in which a project would foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Section 15126.2(e) of the CEQA Guidelines states that the EIR should:

“Discuss the ways in which the proposed project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. Included in this are project which would remove obstacles to population growth (a major expansion of a waste water treatment plant might, for example, allow for more construction in service areas). Increases in the population may tax existing community service facilities, requiring construction of new facilities that could cause significant environmental effects. Also discuss the characteristic of some projects which may encourage and facilitate other activities that could significantly affect the environment, either individually or cumulatively. It must not be assumed that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.”

Induced growth is any growth that exceeds planned growth and results from new development that would not have taken place without the implementation of the proposed project. Typically, the growth-inducing potential of a project would be considered significant if it results in growth or population concentration that exceeds those assumptions included in pertinent master plans, land use plans, or projections made by regional planning authorities. However, the creation of growth-inducing potential does not automatically lead to growth, whether it would be below or in exceedance of a projected level.

The environmental effects of induced growth are secondary or indirect impacts of the proposed project. Secondary effects of growth could result in significant, adverse environmental impacts, which could include increased demand on community public services, increased traffic and noise,

degradation of air and water quality, and conversion of agricultural land and open space to developed uses.

As discussed in Chapter 2, Project Description, the proposed project would construct a new HRL office building and a new commons building in place of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building. The proposed commons building would include five one- and two-bedroom apartments, replacing the two one-bedroom apartments that would be lost to demolition of the existing Hillside Office/Commons building. Although the proposed project would increase the number of residential units at the project site, the proposed project is consistent with the growing enrollment numbers identified in the 2008 Campus Master Plan, and would provide campus support services to support the additional residents on campus. Additionally, the proposed project would include sustainable design features to reduce energy and water usage. As such, the proposed project would accommodate the projected growth included in the 2008 Campus Master Plan and would not result in a significant direct or indirect growth-inducing impact.

4.5 MITIGATION MEASURES APPLICABLE TO THE PROPOSED PROJECT

The mitigation measures listed below are from the 2008 EIR and would be applicable to the proposed project. CSULB, as the CEQA lead agency, is responsible for implementing the approved mitigation.

Air Quality

1. Exposed surfaces are watered as needed
2. Soils stabilizers are applied to disturbed inactive areas as needed.
3. Ground cover is replaced quickly in inactive areas.
4. All stockpiles are covered with tarps or plastic sheeting.
5. All unpaved haul roads are watered daily and all access points used by haul trucks are kept clean during the site grading.
6. Speed on unpaved roads is reduced to below 15 miles per hour.
7. Trucks carrying contents subject to airborne dispersal are covered.
8. Grading and other high-dust activities cease during high wind conditions (wind speeds exceeding a sustained rate of 25 miles an hour).
9. Diesel particulate filters are installed on diesel equipment and trucks.
10. All construction equipment will be properly tuned.
11. To reduce emissions from idling, the contractor shall ensure that all equipment and vehicles not in use for more than 5 minutes are turned off, whenever feasible.
12. Low VOC-content paint, stucco, or other architectural coatings materials will be utilized to the extent possible.
13. Low VOC-content asphalt and concrete will be utilized to the extent possible.

14. The University will continue to comply with SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Renovation/Demolition Activities) and other pertinent regulations when working on structures containing asbestos, lead, or other toxic materials.
15. As appropriate, outdoor activities at the campus will be limited during high-dust and other heavy construction activities, including painting.
16. If construction activities occur adjacent to classrooms, student dormitories, health facilities and other sensitive receptors the University will either:
 - a. Make findings and notify each sensitive receptor that construction activity will not affect such receptor, or
 - b. Install and maintain filters on interior ventilation system to reduce intake of pollutants until construction activity ceases.
17. The University will exceed Title 24 energy saving requirements on campus by 1045% or more on all new or renovation projects by applying a range of techniques and measures that may include planting trees to provide shade and shadow to buildings; use of energy-efficient lighting in buildings and parking lots; use of light-colored roofing materials; installing energy-efficient appliances; installing automatic lighting on/off controls; use of insulation and double-paned glass windows; connecting buildings to central air and water heating and cooling systems, and/or other measures.

Geology and Soils

1. Paleontological resources have not been identified on the CSULB campus; however, if fossilized shells, plants or bones are discovered during construction of an individual project, work ~~will~~ shall be suspended in the immediate vicinity of the finds, and the potential significance of the resources ~~will~~ shall be evaluated by a qualified specialist.

Hydrology and Water Quality

1. The use of reclaimed water for irrigation will continue to be expanded to the extent feasible.
2. The University will continue to implement policies and programs to reduce water use, such as installing low-use water fixtures, waterless urinals, and ~~at~~ other measures.
3. The University will continue to coordinate with the Long Beach Water Department to reduce water use during water supply shortages.

Noise

1. Muffled construction equipment will be used wherever possible.
2. The contractor will ensure that each piece of operating equipment is in good working condition and that noise suppression features, such as engine mufflers and enclosures, are working and fitted properly.
3. The contractor will locate noisy construction equipment as far as possible from residential areas.

4. Construction hours will be consistent with the City of Long Beach regulations to between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays and between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Saturdays. No construction will take place on Sundays or federal holidays.
5. If a sustained high-noise construction activity takes place within 100 feet from classrooms or other noise sensitive uses on campus, measures will be taken to limit the amount of noise affecting the sensitive receptor. These measures may include scheduling the activity when classes are not in session or the sensitive receptor is not use, providing a temporary barrier of no less than 6 feet in height made of wood or other similar materials; and/or other measures.

Transportation

1. A flag person will be employed as needed to direct traffic when heavy construction vehicles enter the campus from Bellflower Boulevard, Palo Verde Avenue, 7th Street, and Atherton Street.
2. Construction trucks will avoid travel on residential areas to access campus and use the City of Long Beach designated truck routes to travel to and from campus.
3. Construction-related truck traffic will be scheduled to avoid peak travel time on the I-405 and I-605 freeways, and State Route 22 (SR-22), as feasible.
4. If major pedestrian or bicycle routes on campus are temporarily blocked by construction activities, alternate routes around construction areas will be provided, to the extent feasible. These alternate routes will be posted on campus for the duration of construction.
5. If any bus stop or other transit facility on campus is obstructed by construction activity, the University, in cooperation with the transit service providers, will temporarily relocate such transit facility on campus as appropriate.

Utilities and Service Systems

1. Demolition and construction inert materials, including vegetative matter, asphalt, concrete, and other recyclable materials will be recycled to the extent feasible.
2. Demolition materials that contain hazardous substances will be disposed of at certified disposal facilities in strict compliance with all applicable regulations.