Action Item
Agenda Item 4
September 19-20, 2017

San Diego State University
New Student Housing Project

CEQA Findings Of Fact

(Pursuant To Public Resources Code Sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6,
And State CEQA Guidelines Sections 15091 and 15093)

Final Environmental Impact Report
(State Clearinghouse Number 2016121025)

Project Files May Be Reviewed At:

San Diego State University
Office of Facilities Planning, Design, and Construction
5500 Campanile Drive
San Diego, CA 92182-1624

CEQA FINDINGS
FINDINGS OF FACT REGARDING FINAL EIR
FOR THE SDSU NEW STUDENT HOUSING PROJECT

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 PURPOSE

This statement of findings addresses the environmental effects associated with the New Student Housing Project ("Project"), located within the existing San Diego State University ("SDSU") campus boundaries in the City of San Diego. This statement is made pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"; Pub. Resources Code, §21000 et seq.), specifically Public Resources Code sections 21081, 21081.5, and 21081.6, and the State CEQA Guidelines (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 14, §15000 et seq.), specifically sections 15091 and 15093. The potentially significant effects of the Project were identified in both the Draft and Final Environmental Impact Report ("EIR").

Public Resources Code section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091 require that the lead agency, in this case the California State University ("CSU") Board of Trustees, prepare written findings for identified significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. Specifically, State CEQA Guidelines section 15091 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 effects 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.

The Final EIR for the Project identified potentially significant effects that could result from Project implementation. The Board of Trustees finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the Project approval will reduce all of those effects to less-than-significant levels.

As required by CEQA, the Board of Trustees, in adopting these findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program ("MMRP") for the Project. The Board of Trustees finds that the MMRP, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the Project.

In accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees adopts these findings as part of its certification of the Final EIR for the Project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21082.1, subdivision (c)(3), the Board of Trustees also finds that the Final EIR reflects the Board's independent judgment as the lead agency for the Project.

1.2 ORGANIZATION/FORMAT OF FINDINGS

Section 1.0 contains a summary description of the Project and background facts relative to the environmental review process. **Section 2.0** identifies the potentially significant effects of the Project that will be mitigated to a less-than-significant level with implementation of the identified mitigation measures. **Section 3.0** identifies the Project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant. **Section 4.0** discusses the feasibility of the Project alternatives.

1.3 SUMMARY OF PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Project is the expansion of on-campus student housing facilities to be located adjacent to the existing Chapultepec Hall on the SDSU main campus. As originally proposed and analyzed in the Draft EIR, the Project would be developed in three separate phases – Phase I, Phase II, and Phase III. Phase I would provide housing for 850 students, Phase II would provide housing for another 850 students, and Phase III would provide housing for an additional 866 students.

In response to comments and concerns raised by the surrounding community and elected officials, the proposed Project was modified following release of the Draft EIR to eliminate Phases II and III and, as now proposed and hereafter referred to in these findings as the Project, will consist of only one phase – Phase I, which will provide housing for approximately 850

students. The Project modifications, which also include minor modifications to Phase I, result in a decrease in the scope of potential environmental impacts, and eliminate previously identified significant and unavoidable impacts associated with Aesthetics and Transportation/Circulation; all potentially significant environmental effects will now be mitigated to less than significant. The modifications are described in the Final EIR.

As modified, the Project will consist of the development of facilities to accommodate 850 student housing beds in a series of residential structures to be located on the existing Parking Lot 9 (formerly "U" Parking Lot), proximate to the existing Chapultepec Hall. The Project will include construction of dining and dormitory facilities to house up to 850 students on existing Parking Lot 9, east of existing Chapultepec Hall. The Project will consist of three new buildings. One building will serve as a dining hall (2 stories), while the other buildings will be four to six stories in height and will include single-, double-, and triple-occupancy student housing units. The complex would include outdoor gathering spaces and green space.

Several project design features included in the Project are circulation and pedestrian/motorist/cyclist safety improvements to Remington Road, inclusion of a passenger drop off zone, signal synchronization, parking control around the Project site and within the adjacent neighborhood, and several energy efficiency measures to ensure that the Project meets stringent CSU and Title 24 energy efficiency guidelines. Specifically, the following improvements and features would be incorporated as part of the Project:

- A dedicated pick-up/drop-off zone on the south side of the dormitory building, removed from the flow of traffic on Remington Road.
- A move-in/move-out zone on the north side of the dormitory building, removed from Remington Road.
- The red curbs along Remington Road would be re-painted and the existing signs would be modified from "No Parking" to "No Stopping at Any Time" signs.
- Placement of a permanent sign on Remington Road at the SDSU campus boundary with the College View Estates neighborhood that reads "No SDSU or Event Parking in Residential Neighborhood – Violators May be Fined and/or Towed Away."
- Parking guards would continue to be posted on Remington Road at the College View Estates entrance to discourage parking in the residential neighborhood during large events, including events at Viejas Arena, and during baseball games.
- A temporary sandwich board sign also would be placed at the corner of 55th Street and Remington Road during such events that reads "No Event Parking Beyond This Point."

- Sufficient ADA compliant pedestrian access to all Project facilities would be provided.
- Covered bicycle storage space would be provided within the Project site.
- Additional lighting along Remington Road would be provided to help motorists better see bicyclists, skateboarders, and pedestrians utilizing the street in the evening.
- To improve traffic flow, synchronization of the five (5) traffic signals along 55th Street between Montezuma Road and Remington Road would be implemented.

1.4 PROJECT OBJECTIVES

The overall goal of the Project is to allow an increased number of students to participate in SDSU's Residential Education Program and to add vitality and services to the west campus area where the Project would be located. The specific Project objectives are as follows:

1. Create a distinct west campus housing neighborhood similar to the student residential neighborhood on the east side of campus, that is inviting and safe, that has a distinct identity, and that provides students with supportive amenities such as a tutoring center, a dining facility, community spaces, and study areas.
2. Alleviate isolation of Chapultepec Hall and respond to the deficit in student amenities in the Project vicinity, as reported by the residents and staff of Chapultepec Hall.
3. Provide additional on-campus housing for freshman students, thereby making existing housing more appropriate for sophomores, available to sophomores, in furtherance of the Sophomore Success Program.
4. Provide food and convenience services in the vicinity of the Project for students housed both in existing on-campus housing and to be housed in the new housing.
5. Increase on-campus student housing options by providing additional student housing in a distinct neighborhood, thereby reducing the demand for student housing in the adjacent off-campus neighborhoods.
6. Take advantage of an existing undeveloped area on campus to construct housing on a site that does not require taking much-needed existing beds off-line.
7. Provide additional student housing in an area that has the capacity to accommodate a large number of student housing beds and associated amenities, where the land is owned by the university and unencumbered by other uses or existing structures that must be demolished.
8. Reduce regional traffic and increase the walkability of the SDSU campus by providing

on-campus housing that includes a variety of student-friendly amenities and that is situated within a walkable distance from the academic, athletic, and social centers of campus.

1.5 INITIAL STUDY AND NOTICE OF PREPARATION

To determine the environmental topics to be addressed in the EIR, SDSU prepared a Notice of Preparation and Initial Study ("NOP/IS"), and circulated the NOP/IS in December 2016 to interested public agencies, organizations, community groups, and individuals in order to receive input on the Project. SDSU also held a public information meeting on January 18, 2017, to obtain public input on both the Project and the scope and content of the EIR. Interested parties attended the public information meeting and provided input.

Based on the NOP/IS scoping process, the EIR addressed the following topics:

(a) Aesthetics;

(b) Air Quality;

(c) Biological Resources;

(d) Cultural Resources/Tribal Cultural Resources;

(e) Energy;

(f) Geotechnical Resources;

(g) Greenhouse Gas Emissions;

(h) Hazards and Hazardous Materials;

(i) Hydrology and Water Quality;

(j) Land Use and Planning;

(k) Noise;

(l) Population and Housing;

(m) Public Services and Utilities, including Recreation; and,

(l) Transportation/Circulation and Parking.

Based on the NOP/IS scoping process, potential impacts relating to Agricultural Resources and Mineral Resources were determined to be not significant and, therefore, were not discussed in the EIR.

1.6 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

SDSU prepared the EIR in accordance with CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. The EIR is a full-disclosure informational document that informs public agency decision-makers and the public of the significant environmental effects of the Project. Measures to minimize significant effects are identified in the EIR and reasonable alternatives to the Project are evaluated.

The EIR is intended as a "project EIR" under CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. A project EIR is typically prepared for a specific construction-level project. (*See* State CEQA Guidelines § 15161.) Under CEQA, a project EIR "should focus primarily on the changes in the environment that would result from the development project . . . [and] examine all phases of the project including planning, construction, and operation." (*Ibid.*)

The Draft EIR was made available to the public for review and comment for a 45-day period. The review and comment period began on April 21, 2017 and concluded on June 5, 2017.

The Draft EIR was accessible online using the SDSU website at www.sdsu.edu/chapultepec. Copies of the Draft EIR were available for public review at the following locations: (a) College-Rolando Public Library, 6600 Montezuma Road, San Diego, California; (b) SDSU Love Library, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, California; and (c) SDSU Office of Facilities Planning, Design, and Construction, Administration Building, Suite 130, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, California.

A public meeting relating to the Draft EIR was held on Monday, May 8, 2017, at 6:30 p.m. on the SDSU campus, Parma Payne Goodall Alumni Center, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, California. Written and oral comments were received during the public meeting and are included in the Final EIR.

All comment letters received in response to the Draft EIR were reviewed and are included in the Final EIR, along with written responses to each of the comments. In accordance with State CEQA Guidelines section 15132, the Final EIR for the 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.

2.0 FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT BUT MITIGATED IMPACTS

This section identifies significant adverse impacts of the Project that require findings to be made under Public Resources Code section 21081 and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091. Based on

substantial record evidence, the Board of Trustees finds that adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce the identified significant impacts to less-than-significant levels.

2.1 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

2.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts

If construction activities associated with the Project occur during the bird nesting season (typically February through September 15), impacts to migratory birds or destruction of active migratory bird nests and/or eggs would be considered significant.

Further, potential construction and operation-related indirect impacts to adjacent special status plants and sensitive natural communities from development of the Project would result primarily from construction activities and include impacts related to or resulting from the generation of fugitive dust; changes in hydrology resulting from construction, including sedimentation and erosion; human activity; the introduction of non-native, invasive plant and animal species; habitat fragmentation; alteration of natural fire regime; and the introduction of chemical pollutants (including herbicides).

Also, temporary indirect impacts to jurisdictional waters and wetlands adjacent to or downstream from development of the Project site would result from construction and operation-related activities, including sedimentation and erosion, the introduction of chemical pollutants, generation of fugitive dust, habitat fragmentation, altered hydrology, non-native invasive species, increased human activity, and alteration of the natural fire regime.

The EIR for the Project determined the Project would have the potential to interfere substantially with the movement of 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. In particular, increased human activity and lighting associated with development and operation of the Project could result in indirect impacts to wildlife movement.

Because impacts associated with development of the Project could be significant, biological mitigation measures are identified that would reduce the Project's impacts on sensitive biological resources to less-than-significant levels.

2.1.2 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measure(s) would reduce the potential for direct and indirect impacts to special-status plant and wildlife species, sensitive natural communities, jurisdictional waters, and wildlife corridors by ensuring that special-status resources would be avoided to the extent

possible. Implementation of the following mitigation measures (MMs) would reduce impacts to a **less-than-significant level**.

MM-BIO-1 **NESTING BIRD SURVEY:** If construction activity occurs during the breeding season (typically February 1 through September 15), a biological survey for nesting bird species shall be conducted within the proposed impact area and a 300-foot buffer within 72 hours prior to construction. Any suitable raptor nesting areas will be surveyed within 500 feet of the construction limits. The number of surveys required for covering this area will be commensurate with the schedule for construction and the acreage that will be covered. Multiple surveys for nesting birds will be separated by at least 48 hours in order to be confident that nesting is detected but the survey will be no more 72 hours prior to the onset of construction. The survey is necessary to assure avoidance of impacts to nesting raptors (e.g., Cooper's hawk (*Accipiter cooperii*) and red-tailed hawk (*Buteo jamaicensis*)) and/or birds protected by the federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act. If any active nests are detected, the area shall be flagged and mapped on the construction plans along with a buffer for native passerine species and raptors, as determined by the project biologist, and will be avoided until the nesting cycle is complete. Nest buffers will be determined based on the criteria outlined in an Avian Monitoring Plan, which will be submitted to, and receive approval, from the Wildlife Agencies when the Final EIR is certified. The Avian Monitoring Plan will outline criteria for the buffer determinations, including species type, tolerance for human activities, topography, vegetation, screening, adjoining habitat, type of work proposed, and duration of proposed work. In accordance with this mitigation measure, nest buffers shall be implemented to ensure compliance with the MBTA and Fish and Game Code Sections 3503, 3503.5, and 3513. Additionally, if grading activities lapse for more than 48 hours, an additional nesting bird survey shall be conducted. The results of the nesting bird surveys and buffers, including any determinations to reduce buffers, shall be included in the monitoring report.

MM-BIO-2 **CONSTRUCTION MONITORING AND REPORTING:** To prevent inadvertent disturbance to areas outside the limits of grading for each phase, all grading shall be monitored by a biologist. The biological monitor shall be contracted to perform biological monitoring during all grading, clearing, grubbing, and construction activities.

The following shall be completed:

1. The project biologist also shall perform the following duties:

    a. Attend the preconstruction meeting with the contractor and other key construction personnel prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading to reduce conflict between the timing and location of construction activities with other mitigation requirements (e.g., seasonal surveys for nesting birds).

    b. Conduct meetings with the contractor and other key construction personnel describing the importance of restricting work to designated areas and of minimizing harm to or harassment of wildlife prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading.

    c. Review and/or designate the construction area in the field with the contractor in accordance with the final grading plan prior to clearing, grubbing, or grading.

    d. Supervise and monitor vegetation clearing, grubbing, and grading weekly to ensure against direct and indirect impacts to biological resources that are intended to be protected and preserved and to document that protective fencing is intact.

    e. Flush special-status species (i.e., avian or other mobile species) from occupied habitat areas immediately prior to brush-clearing and earthmoving activities.

    f. Verify that the construction site is implementing the following stormwater pollution prevention plan best management practices: dust control, silt fencing, removal of construction debris and a clean work area, covered trash receptacles that are animal-proof and weather-proof, prohibition of pets on the construction site, and a speed limit of 15 miles per hour during the daylight and 10 miles per hour during dark hours.

    g. Periodically monitor the construction site after grading is completed and during the construction phase to see that artificial security light fixtures are directed away from open space and are shielded and to document that no unauthorized impacts have occurred.

    h. Keep monitoring notes for the duration of the project for submittal in a final report to substantiate the biological supervision of the vegetation clearing and grading activities and the protection of the biological resources.

i. Prepare a monitoring report after the construction activities are completed, which describes the biological monitoring activities; including a monitoring log; photos of the site before, during, and after the grading and clearing activities; and a list of special-status species observed.

MM-BIO-3 **FENCING:** To prevent inadvertent disturbance to sensitive vegetation and species within or adjacent to the project area, fencing shall be installed prior to construction activities associated with each phase of development. The fencing shall be placed to protect from inadvertent disturbance outside of the limits of grading as well as to prevent unauthorized access into the canyon.

MM-BIO-4 **INVASIVE SPECIES PROHIBITION:** The final landscape plans shall comply with the following: (1) no invasive plant species as included on the most recent version of the California Invasive Plant Council (Cal-IPC) California Invasive Plant Inventory for the project region shall be included, and (2) the plant palette shall be composed of native species that do not require high irrigation rates. The project biologist shall periodically check landscape products for compliance with this requirement.

MM-BIO-5 **LIGHTING PLAN:** The lighting shall be designed to minimize light pollution and preserve dark skies, while enhancing safety, security, and functionality. All artificial outdoor light fixtures shall be installed so they are directed away from the undeveloped canyon. Light fixtures shall be installed in conformance with the County Light Pollution Code, the Building Code, the Electrical Code, and any other related state and federal regulations such as California Title 24.

MM-BIO-6 **NOISE:** For any work proposed between February 1 and September 15, prior to start of construction activities, a qualified biologist shall conduct a preconstruction survey for the coastal California gnatcatcher to document the presence/absence and extent of occupied habitat. The pre-construction survey area for the coastal California gnatcatcher shall encompass all habitats within the impact area, as well as within a 300-foot buffer. If a coastal California gnatcatcher nest is detected, on-site noise reduction techniques shall be implemented to ensure that construction noise levels do not exceed 60 A-weighted decibels Leq-h at the nest location.

2.1.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential biological resources-related impacts of the Project to less-than-significant levels, and

are adopted by the Board. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid potentially significant biological resources-related impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR.

2.2 CULTURAL RESOURCES

2.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Project could potentially cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical or an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5. While the Project area is substantially disturbed and unlikely to contain intact cultural resources, and no historical or archaeological resources have been identified through a records search, Native American Heritage Commission and tribal correspondence, or an intensive pedestrian survey, construction-related activities could unearth historical, archaeological, or Native American cultural material, and could result in potential significant impacts.

The EIR for the Project also determined the Project could potentially destroy a unique paleontological resource or site. Project development has the potential to come into contact with paleontological resources because the Project is located in an area that has paleontological sensitivities ranging from moderate to high. Construction-related activities could include the potential for loss or destruction of fossils due to erosion and the potential for illegal looting of fossils. As such, the recommendations of the San Diego Natural History Museum, incorporated into mitigation measures, would reduce any potential significant impacts.

No human remains have been identified through a records search, Native American Heritage Commission and tribal correspondence, or intensive pedestrian survey. However, construction and operation-related activities could result in in the unintended encounter with previously undocumented human remains, and could result in potential significant impacts.

No tribal cultural resources have been identified through a records search, Native American Heritage Commission (NAHC) and tribal correspondence, or intensive pedestrian survey. However, construction and operation-related activities could result in in the unintended encounter with previously unidentified tribal cultural resources, and could result in potential significant impacts.

In response to SDSU requests for consultation with tribal governments and individuals pursuant to Assembly Bill (AB) 52, representatives from the Jamul Indian Village and SDSU met to discuss Project details and cultural resources inventory findings. The Jamul Indian Village

representatives did not identify any tribal cultural resources within the project area nor did they make any specific request for tribal monitoring of the current project.

Because impacts associated with development of the Project relative to cultural and tribal resources could be significant, mitigation measures are identified that would reduce the Project's impacts on sensitive cultural resources to less-than-significant levels.

2.2.2 Mitigation Measures

The following mitigation measures would reduce the potentially significant impacts to cultural and tribal resources to less than significant:

MM-CUL-1 In the event of discovery of unanticipated archaeological material, project personnel shall comply with the following requirements during initial earth-disturbing activities:

1. Due to the disturbed nature of the project area, the negative archaeological inventory results, and the limited suitability to contain archaeological resources, an archaeological monitor is not required during construction. The decision to include a Native American monitor during initial ground disturbances of upper deposits within the project area is the responsibility of the reviewing agency.

2. In the event that previously unidentified potentially significant cultural resources are discovered, construction or other personnel shall have the authority to divert or temporarily halt ground disturbance operations in the area while the appropriate San Diego State University (SDSU) representative is informed. SDSU shall then retain the services of a qualified archaeologist (i.e., listed on the Register of Professional Archaeologists). The qualified archaeologist, in consultation with SDSU staff, shall determine the significance of the discovered resources. Construction activities will be allowed to resume in the affected area only after proper evaluation. Isolates and clearly non-significant deposits shall be minimally documented in the field. For significant cultural resources, a Research Design and Data Recovery Program to mitigate impacts shall be prepared by the qualified archaeologist and approved by SDSU, then carried out using professional archaeological methods. The Research Design and Data Recovery Program shall include (1) reasonable efforts to preserve (avoidance) "unique" cultural resources or Sacred Sites pursuant to CEQA Section 21083.2(g) as the preferred option, (2) the capping of identified Sacred Sites or unique cultural resources and

placement of development over the cap, if avoidance is infeasible, and (3) data recovery for non-unique cultural resources.

MM-CUL-2 Prior to the commencement of project construction, California State University/SDSU, or its designee, shall retain a qualified paleontologist as defined by the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines (SVP 2010). The qualified paleontologist shall attend any pre-grade meetings, coordinate with the grading and excavation contractors, acting in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology's Guidelines, and monitor all on-site activities associated with the original cutting of previously undisturbed sediments of moderate to high resources sensitivity in order to inspect such cuts for contained fossils.

The project site should be secured with construction fencing and locked gates to prevent access to work areas where paleontological resources might be exposed. The proper placement of Best Management Practices to minimize soil erosion also would reduce the potential for impacts to paleontological resources.

In the event that the monitoring results in the discovery of potentially unique paleontological resources within the meaning of California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, the qualified paleontologist will have the authority to halt excavation at that location and immediately evaluate the discovery. Following evaluation, if the resource is determined to be "unique" within the meaning of California Public Resources Code Section 21083.2, the site shall be treated in accordance with the provisions of that section. Mitigation appropriate to the discovered resource, including recovery, specimen preparation, data analysis, and reporting, shall be carried out in accordance with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines prior to resuming grading activities at that location. Grading activities may continue on other parts of the building site while appropriate mitigation is implemented.

If fossils are discovered while the qualified paleontologist is not on site, an exclusion zone of approximately 50 feet shall be established using flagging and stakes and the qualified paleontologist and SDSU representative notified. No one shall be allowed into the exclusion zone until the qualified paleontologist has evaluated the find, removed it if deemed necessary, and removed the flagging.

If sediments appropriate for the preservation of microvertebrates are encountered while monitoring (as determined by the project paleontologist), test

samples should be screened on or off site to determine the presence or absence of microvertebrates. If microvertebrate remains are recovered, then a standard sample as outlined in SVP (2010), or a lesser amount deemed appropriate by the qualified paleontologist, shall be collected and processed on or off site.

Recovered fossils, along with copies of pertinent field notes, photographs, and maps, shall be deposited in an accredited paleontological collections repository. A final summary report that discusses the methods used, stratigraphy exposed, fossils collected, and significance of recovered fossils shall be prepared in a manner that is consistent with the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology guidelines.

MM-CUL-3 In the event of discovery of unanticipated human remains, personnel shall comply with Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, CEQA Guidelines Section 15064.5 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 during earth-disturbing activities.

If any human remains are discovered, the construction personnel or the appropriate representative shall contact the County Coroner and SDSU. Upon identification of human remains, no further disturbance shall occur in the area of the find until the County Coroner has made the necessary findings as to origin. If the remains are determined to be of Native American origin, the Most Likely Descendant, as identified by the Native American Heritage Commission, shall be contacted by CSU/SDSU or their representative in order to determine proper treatment and disposition of the remains. The immediate vicinity where the Native American human remains are located is not to be damaged or disturbed by further development activity until consultation with the Most Likely Descendant regarding their recommendations as required by California Public Resources Code Section 5097.98 has been conducted. Public Resources Code Section 5097.98, CEQA Section 15064.5 and Health & Safety Code Section 7050.5 shall be followed.

2.2.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential cultural resources-related impacts of the Project to less-than-significant levels, and are adopted by the Board. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project

that mitigate or avoid potentially significant cultural resources-related impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR.

2.3 GEOTECHNICAL/SOILS

2.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The potential for the Project to expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving rupture of a known earthquake fault, strong seismic ground shaking, seismic-related ground failure including liquefaction, or landslides may be significant. The closest known fault zone to the Project site is located approximately 6 miles west of the Project site. No other known active faults are located on or near the Project site. The potential for liquefaction in the Lindavista Formation, Mission Valley Formation, and Stadium Conglomerate on-site soils may be significant. Future seismic risk would be limited by adherence to the CSU Seismic Requirements and earthquake safety protocols per the California Building Code.

The potential exists for the Project to 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. No landslides have been observed or mapped on or in the vicinity of the Project site. The potential for deep-seated landslides may be significant. Substantial remedial grading may be necessary and temporary slopes may be excavated during Project build-out, which may expose adverse geologic conditions; therefore, the Project may result in potentially significant impacts as potential slope failures could damage Project improvements and adjacent properties.

Construction of the Project on unconsolidated and expansive soils, and in a seismically active region, may result in potentially significant impacts. On-site fill soils consist of lean to fat clays, gravels, silty sand, and clayey sand, which could affect drainage and establishment of vegetation.

Because impacts associated with development of the Project relative to geotechnical/soils could be significant, mitigation measures are identified that would reduce the Project's impacts on geotechinical resources and geology/soils to less-than-significant levels.

2.3.2 Mitigation Measures

The following Mitigation Measures would reduce potential geology- and soils-related impacts by ensuring that the project is constructed such that geologic hazards would not adversely impact the environment, proposed structures, or persons living and working within the

structures or in the Project site vicinity. Implementation of the following Mitigation Measures would reduce impacts to a less-than-significant level.

MM-GEO-1 Prior to issuance of grading or construction permits for any phase of the project, a Registered Civil Engineer and Certified Engineering Geologist shall complete a final geotechnical investigation specific to the preliminary design of the proposed development. The final geotechnical investigation shall include, but not be limited to, an estimation of both vertical and horizontal anticipated peak ground accelerations, as well as an updated slope stability analysis. The results shall be included in a final geotechnical report that shall be submitted to the California State University Office of the Chancellor for review and approval. The report shall provide conclusions and design recommendations including, but not limited to, slope stability, grading and earthwork, types and depths of foundations, allowable soil bearing pressures, settlement, expansive soils, design pressures for retaining walls, and corrosivity and sulfate content of soil samples.

All geotechnical recommendations provided in the final report shall be followed during grading and construction at the project site. The final geotechnical report shall conform to all applicable laws, regulations, and requirements, including, but not limited to, all of the applicable California State University Seismic Requirements (CSU 2016).

MM-GEO-2 During project construction activities, CSU/SDSU, or its designee, shall implement the following measures:

a. Surficial overburden soils, including soils, alluvium, and colluvium, shall be overexcavated and recompacted to reduce the potential for liquefaction.

b. The existing fill material shall be removed and replaced with fill more suitable for project construction, including better drainage characteristics, higher shear strengths and R-values, and a lower expansion and compressibility potential.

c. Foundations that support new campus housing should extend into materials with low expansion and compressibility characteristics.

d. Surficial soils and alluvium left in place beneath existing fill, primarily in existing drainages, shall be removed to prevent elastic settlement associated with structure loading.

e. New fill slopes shall be constructed in conformance with current site

development and grading codes, including slope inclinations and construction of slope keyways and intermediate benches.

2.3.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential geotechnical/soils impacts of the Project to a less-than-significant level, and are adopted by the Board. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant geotechnical/soils impacts identified in the Final EIR.

2.4 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

2.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The Project could potentially create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials. Specifically, there exists the potential for the presence of PCBs, mercury, or other hazardous building materials to be released during demolition.

The Project could potentially expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including, where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands. It is expected that wildfires would have the possibility of occurring in the canyons to the north of the Project post-development. In the site's northern exposure, the Project is adjacent to native fuels and so Brush Management Zones (BMZs) would be an important component of a fire protection system. The BMZs adjacent to the Project site would vary between 6 and 65 feet.

Because impacts associated with development of the Project relative to hazards and hazardous materials could be significant, mitigation measures are identified to reduce the Project's impacts on hazards and hazardous materials to less-than-significant levels.

2.4.2 Mitigation Measures

The following Mitigation Measures would reduce the potential for impacts on the proposed project and surrounding area relative to hazards and hazardous materials.

MM-HAZ-1 In the event it is necessary to remove any minor, accessory structure to facilitate construction, a qualified environmental specialist shall inspect the existing buildings for the presence of mercury switches, PCB-containing light ballasts,

refrigerants, and any other hazardous wastes/materials. If found, these materials shall be managed in accordance with all applicable federal and state guidelines and regulations (e.g., Metallic Discards Act of 1991, Public Resources Code Sections 42160–42185). Demolition plans and contract specifications shall incorporate any necessary abatement measures in compliance with all applicable federal and state regulations (e.g., Metallic Discards Act, particularly Section 42175, Materials Requiring Special Handling for the removal of mercury switches, PCB-containing light ballasts, and refrigerants).

MM-HAZ-2 All structures exposed to the urban wildland-urban interface with less than 100 feet of Brush Management Zone (BMZ) shall incorporate the following fire protection measures:

1. Phase I – west: A concrete or non-combustible retaining wall shall be installed at the northern edge of the proposed project along the fire access road. The BMZ would include 30 feet of paved road with no combustible fuels. The building shall be further separated from fuel a total of 7 to 32 feet above natural fuel levels in open space.
2. Phase I – east: A concrete or non-combustible retaining wall shall be installed at the northern edge of the proposed project along the fire access road. The BMZ would include 47 to 60 feet of paved road with no combustible fuels. The building shall be further separated from fuel a total of 19 to 42 feet above natural fuel levels in open space.
3. All structures shall be fitted with ember resistant vents to prevent embers from entering any portion of the structure.

2.4.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential hazards-related impacts of the Project to less-than-significant levels, and are adopted by the Board. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant hazards-related impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR.

2.5 NOISE

2.5.1 Potential Significant Impacts

Construction activities at the Project site could (i) expose persons to or generate noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies, or (ii) result in a substantial temporary or periodic increase in existing ambient noise levels. This is considered a potentially significant impact.

Specifically, the nearest off-site existing residences to the Project site are located west along Hewlett Drive, approximately 80 feet away, and northeast along 55th Street, approximately 100 feet away. During Project construction, the noise levels would range from approximately 71 to 78 dBA L_{eq} when construction would take place within 100 feet of the residences located along 55th Street to the northeast. More typical noise levels during Project construction would range from approximately 65 to 75 dBA $L_{eq.}$ As a result, construction-related noise potentially could exceed the City's 75dB temporary construction noise level criterion. This represents a temporary increase in noise levels of approximately 15 to 25 or more dB above measured ambient noise levels.

With respect to interior noise levels, the Project occupants would be exposed to noise levels greater than 60bB CNEL. Habitable rooms fronting Remington Road and 55th Street could be exposed to interior noise levels greater than 45 dB CNEL. Noise levels generated by outdoor mechanical equipment such as heating, ventilation, and air conditioning could generate noise levels that exceed standards.

Because impacts associated with development of the Project relative to noise could be significant, mitigation measures are identified to reduce the Project's impacts on noise to less-than-significant levels.

2.5.2 Mitigation Measures

The following Mitigation Measures would reduce the potential for noise impacts by ensuring that construction and operation of the proposed project are carried out in a manner that reduces noise to the extent practicable and in compliance with applicable noise standards. Implementation of the following mitigation measure(s) would reduce impacts to a **less-than-significant level**.

MM-NOI-1 Prior to initiation of campus construction, San Diego State University (SDSU) shall approve a construction noise mitigation program to include the following:

- Construction equipment shall be properly outfitted and maintained with all feasible noise-reduction devices to minimize construction-generated noise.

- Stationary noise sources such as generators shall be located as far as feasible from noise-sensitive land uses.
- Laydown and construction vehicle staging areas shall be located away from noise-sensitive land uses if feasible.
- All academic, administrative, and residential areas that will be subject to construction noise shall be informed of construction activities at least 1 week before the start of each construction project.
- All construction projects pursuant to the proposed project shall be required to implement the above measures for control of construction noise.

MM-NOI-2 Prior to construction of the residence hall associated with the proposed project, SDSU, or its designee, shall conduct an interior noise study to demonstrate and ensure that, following construction, the interior noise level for all habitable rooms fronting on Remington Road and 55th Street is mitigated to 45 decibels (dB) Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL) or less. It is anticipated that compliance with the applicable standard shall be achieved by implementation of various noise abatement strategies, such as sound-rated windows and air-conditioning or mechanical ventilation.

MM-NOI-3 During the planning and design phase, SDSU, or its designee, shall prepare mechanical equipment plans, which shall implement best engineering practices, and shall consider the placement of noise-generating equipment and shielding when installing stationary noise sources, including heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems. In addition, SDSU, or its designee, shall prepare an acoustical evaluation of the mechanical equipment plans to ensure that outdoor mechanical equipment noise will not exceed the City of San Diego's Noise Ordinance standards for commercial and residential uses at adjacent properties. The acoustical evaluation shall identify all noise-generating equipment and predict noise levels from all identified equipment at the applicable property lines. Where predicted noise levels would exceed those levels deemed acceptable as established by the City's noise ordinance standards, the acoustical evaluation shall identify noise reduction measures shown to effectively reduce noise levels to comply with the City's noise ordinance standards. It is anticipated that compliance with the applicable standards shall be achieved by implementation measures such as selecting quieter types of equipment, constructing rooftop equipment screen walls/parapets or locating the

equipment within the interior portion of the sites, in order to ensure compliance with the noise ordinance. All such noise reduction measures identified by the acoustical evaluation shall be implemented by SDSU or its designee prior to building occupancy.

2.5.3 Findings

The 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 Board. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant noise-related impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR.

2.6 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

2.6.1 Potential Significant Impacts

The existing water infrastructure is inadequately sized to accommodate the Project. Because of the inadequate existing infrastructure, the Project would require the construction of necessary laterals to the existing water infrastructure and water meters to provide water to all Project buildings. In addition, because the Project would require additional capacity, the Project would require upsizing the water mains to 12-inch water lines surrounding the Project site to ensure adequate fire water service is provided to the new buildings. As a result, the Project would result in a potentially significant impact to water distribution infrastructure.

Because impacts associated with development of the Project could be significant, mitigation measures are identified to reduce the Project's impacts on public services and utilities to less-than-significant levels.

2.6.2 Mitigation Measures

The following Mitigation Measures are proposed to minimize the identified potential impacts to public utilities and service systems. With the implementation of mitigation, all potential impacts would be reduced to less than significant.

MM-PUB-1 Prior to occupancy of the New Student Housing Project, California State University (CSU)/San Diego State University (SDSU) shall pay applicable City of San Diego water supply infrastructure connection fees and applicable fair-share capital facilities fees consistent with Government Code Section 54999.3, to the extent the payment of such fees is made necessary by the proposed project. In the event CSU/SDSU, in coordination with the City of San Diego, determines that

necessary infrastructure upgrades currently programmed as City Group Job 807 will not be in place and operational prior to the time when the increase in supply is necessary, SDSU shall coordinate with the City to advance implementation of the necessary infrastructure upgrades such that they are in place and operational when necessary.

MM-PUB-2 During construction of the New Student Housing Project, CSU/SDSU, or its designee, shall dispose of all recyclable demolition waste products at a construction waste recycling facility. Following occupancy of the proposed project, CSU/SDSU, or its designee, shall maintain an active recycling program to reduce solid waste generated by the project.

2.6.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, will reduce the potential public services and utilities-related impacts of the Project to less-than-significant levels, and are adopted by the Board. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant public services and utilities-related impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR.

2.7 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION AND PARKING

2.7.1 Potential Significant Impacts

Construction-related traffic in the form of equipment and employee trips would be coming and going to/from the Project site throughout Project development. As a result, temporary potentially significant construction-related traffic impacts would occur without mitigation; therefore, a traffic control plan (TCP) would be developed and implemented prior to the start of construction to reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Because impacts associated with development of the Project relative to traffic could be significant, mitigation measures are identified to reduce the Project's impacts to less-than-significant levels.

2.7.2 Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measure listed below would mitigate the identified potentially significant impact associated with Project construction to less than significant.

MM-TRA-5 **Project Vicinity.** Prior to the commencement of construction activities, SDSU, or its designee, shall prepare and implement a traffic control plan (TCP). The primary function of the TCP shall be to provide for the safe and effective movement of vehicles, pedestrians, and bicyclists through or around temporary traffic control zones. The TCP shall institute construction traffic management controls in accordance with City Engineer standards and the Caltrans *California Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices* (2014 edition). These traffic management controls will include measures determined on the basis of site-specific conditions, including the use of construction signs, delineators, and lane closures. The TCP will limit the number of peak hour construction employee and delivery trips, require workers to park in remote parking lots (e.g., Lot 17C), , and include graphics illustrating the placement of signage, striping, traffic personnel, and road cones, as applicable, such that the amount of construction-related trips generated during peak commuter hours would not result in significant traffic impacts based on City of San Diego and California State University standards.

2.7.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, will reduce the potential transportation/circulation and parking-related impacts of the Project to less-than-significant levels, and is adopted by the Board. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Public Resources Code section 21081, subdivision (a)(1), and State CEQA Guidelines section 15091, subdivision (a)(1), changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the Project that mitigate or avoid the potentially significant transportation/circulation and parking-related impacts of the Project identified in the Final EIR.

3.0 FINDINGS ON LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

3.1 AESTHETICS AND VISUAL QUALITY

3.1.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project would not have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista because there are no scenic vistas in the Project area visible from the SDSU campus. Also, the Project site is not located in an area known for scenic vistas and distant views are not available due to the built-up nature of the surrounding College Area community. The nearest publicly accessible scenic vistas offering available views of the Project site are limited and located approximately 3 to 5 miles away in Mission Trails Regional Park. Construction and operation-related Project

activities would not be visually prominent from Mission Trails Regional Park and would be back-screened by terrain, vegetation, and existing development.

The Project also would not substantially damage scenic resources because there are no scenic resources in the surrounding area, as determined in the EIR through the review of applicable planning documents and a field survey. Project construction and operation-related activities would be screened from view by intervening terrain. Relatedly, the Project site is not located within the viewshed of a state scenic highway.

The Project would not substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because the existing developed character of the Project site, the existing 11-story Chapultepec Hall, and the street trees and landscaping establish a visual buffer. Further, the style, bulk, and scale of the buildings associated with the Project generally would be consistent with the prevalent architectural styles on campus, including existing Chapultepec Hall, and provide a pleasant aesthetic.

With the elimination of Phases II and III from development, the Project would not substantially degrade existing visual character or quality of the site.

New shading associated with operation of the Project would not shade shadow-sensitive uses for more than 3 hours between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. Pacific Standard Time (between late October and early April), or for more than four hours between the hours of 9:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. Pacific Daylight Time (between early April and late October) and, therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The Project would not create a new source of substantial light or glare that would adversely affect day or night-time views in the area. The Project would incorporate SDSU's lighting policy and would voluntarily follow the City of San Diego ordinances that reduce potential lighting impacts. As a result of these measures, construction-related activities would minimize light trespass. While the Project would introduce new interior and exterior lighting for security and general illumination purposes, the introduction of lighting would not result in a significant impact.

The light trespass from operation-related Project lighting was evaluated and, based on measurements taken at the Project site, all lighting levels during operation of the Project would be below the illuminance significance threshold. Further, due to the bulk and scale of Project structures and the use of non-reflective exterior surfaces, existing sources of glare, including sports field lighting, would be blocked from sites located to the west of the Project. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

3.1.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.1.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact on scenic vistas, scenic resources, light and glare, and shadows; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.2 AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

3.2.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

With respect to air quality, the Project would not conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan. As a state entity, CSU/SDSU is not subject to local and regional planning documents. Nonetheless, the Project proposes development that is anticipated in the local air quality plans and that is consistent at a regional level with the underlying growth forecasts anticipated in the Regional Air Quality Strategy developed by the San Diego Air Pollution Control District ("SDAPCD") and the San Diego Association of Governments.

The Project would not violate any air quality standard, contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation, or expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations. With application of the SDAPCD's fugitive dust control and architectural coatings measures, construction-related emissions of criteria pollutants would remain below the applicable daily and annual SDPACD's significance thresholds. Operational-related emissions also would remain below the applicable daily and annual SDPACD's significance thresholds. The results of the carbon monoxide/hot spots analysis for intersections with the highest volumes (College Ave/Canyon Crest Dr. and College Ave/Zura Way) also demonstrate that predicted carbon monoxide concentrations would be below federal and state standards.

A Health Risk Assessment performed for construction and operation-related activities related to the Project determined that exposure of Project-related toxic air contaminant emissions would be infrequent, not substantial, and would not pose a significant risk or result in significant health effects to nearby sensitive receptors.

The Project would not create any objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people, and would not result in the development of land uses that generate odors.

The Project would not emit GHG emissions either during its construction or operational phases in excess of applicable thresholds, and would not result in a significant environmental impact. With incorporation of SDSU's commitment to achieve a LEED Silver rating for the Project,

mobile source emission reductions attributable to federal and state regulatory efforts, and California's renewable portfolio standard, the Project's emissions would be consistent with the State's applicable GHG emissions reduction mandates and comply with the Climate Action Plans prepared by the City and SDSU.

3.2.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.2.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have less-than-significant air quality and GHG emissions impacts.

3.3 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

3.3.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

With the elimination of Phases II and III, the Project would not result in potentially significant adverse effects, either directly or through habitat modifications, on species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Additionally, with the elimination of Phases II and III, the Project would not result in potentially significant adverse effects on riparian habitat or other sensitive natural communities identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

3.3.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.3.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have less-than-significant impacts to biological resources relative to habitat modifications and sensitive natural communities.

3.4 ENERGY

3.4.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project would not result in wasteful, inefficient, or unnecessary consumption of energy because the Project would implement energy efficient measures in its design and would only account for 0.04% of the County's total electricity demand and 0.2% of the County's total natural gas demand on the local utilities, and 0.0002% of the State's total petroleum use. Based on these numbers, the Project also would not conflict with existing energy standards and regulations; and, the Project would not place a significant demand on local and regional energy supplies or require a substantial amount of additional capacity because it would not exceed the available capacity of the local utility infrastructure.

3.4.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.4.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact on energy resources; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.5 GEOTECHNICAL/SOILS

3.5.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project would result in less-than-significant impacts attributable to soil erosion or the loss of topsoil because grading and construction of the Project would be completed in accordance with a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan ("SWPPP"), as mandated by a required National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System ("NPDES") permit. The SWPPP would require temporary Best Management Practices ("BMPs"), permanent erosion and sediment control measures, and tracking measures to reduce to less than significant levels any potential erosion-related impacts.

3.5.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.5.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact with respect to the above-referenced geotechnical/soils concerns; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.6 HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

3.6.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project would not create a significant hazard to the public or environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment. Also, because the closest airport is located approximately five miles away, the Project would not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the area. The Project would not emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school. The Project would not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

3.6.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.6.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact with respect to the above-referenced hazards and hazardous materials concerns; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.7 HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

3.7.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project would not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements, and the Project would not substantially degrade water quality. There are no natural water features within the footprint of the Project, so all impacts with respect to water quality or water discharge requirements would be indirect. Any indirect impacts would be reduced by implementation of a SWPPP and appropriate BMPs, and compliance with Construction General Permit (SWRCB Order No. 2009-0009-DWQ, as amended). Also, the Project would involve no non-stormwater discharges to the storm drain system and construction of a new storm drain system to convey on-site and off-site runoff. In compliance with the State Water Resources Control Board MS4 Permit, the Project would implement stormwater quality control and flow control facilities as project features.

Given the existing and proposed developed nature of the Project site, coupled with the fact that the Project would not result in the introduction of new wells, the Project would not substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater

recharge. Water service for the Project site is and would continue to be provided through the purchase of municipal water from the City, and less than 1% of the City's supply is from groundwater.

The Project also would not result in substantial on- or off-site erosion and siltation because the Project would not result in or require any modifications to the natural drainage courses to accommodate runoff. The Project would include detention facilities to ensure there is no increase in peak flow volumes, and with detention basins, peak discharge in the 100-year event from the post-development site would be less than pre-development conditions.

The Project would not place structures within a designated flood area, and would not impede or redirect water flows. Finally, the Project would not be at risk of inundation by seiche, tsunami or mudflow, or at risk of flooding as a result of dam or levee failure.

3.7.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.7.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact with respect to the above-referenced hydrology and water quality concerns; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.8 LAND USE AND PLANNING

3.8.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project includes an amendment to the existing Campus Master Plan to add the new student housing and related facilities, and as such, the Project would be consistent with the applicable land use plan.

3.8.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.8.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact with respect to land use and planning; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.9 NOISE

3.9.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project would not expose persons to or generate excessive groundborne vibration or noise levels. The vibration level calculated during construction-related activities would be well below the applicable thresholds.

The Project also would not expose people residing or working in the Project area to excessive noise levels attributable to aircraft as the Project site is located approximately five miles away from the closest airport.

Neither the near-term nor long-term increases in traffic levels resulting from the Project would lead to a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels existing without the Project. Specifically, the Project's near-term traffic, in combination with cumulative traffic, would increase the noise along adjacent roadways by one dB CNEL or less. With Project-related traffic, the long-term increase in CNEL levels over existing conditions would be essentially the same as without the Project.

3.9.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.9.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact with respect to the above-referenced noise concerns; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.10 POPULATION AND HOUSING

3.10.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

The Project would not induce population growth; rather, the Project would accommodate the population growth anticipated in the regional forecasts used to prepare housing elements, policies, land use designations, and regulatory processes.

3.10.2 Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measure below, while not required to mitigate any potentially significant impact, is nevertheless included to ensure that impacts associated with regional growth forecasts remain less-than-significant:

PH-1 Following approval of the proposed project, San Diego State University (SDSU) will promptly submit the following information to the San Diego

Association of Governments (SANDAG) and the City of San Diego and request that the information be incorporated into SANDAG's next update to the 2050 Regional Growth Forecast:

1. The New Student Housing Project would add the equivelant of up to 182 housing units (850 beds) to the existing SDSU housing inventory, thereby resulting in an increase in housing units to the College Area Community.

SANDAG and the City of San Diego can and should consider this information in preparing the next update to SANDAG's regional population and housing growth forecasts, local housing elements, policies, land use designations, incentive programs and regulatory processes intended to accommodate future housing demand.

3.10.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measure is feasible, is adopted, and will ensure that the Project's population and housing impacts, as identified in the Final EIR, remain at less-than-significant levels.

3.11 PUBLIC UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

3.11.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

Because the Project would result in a limited number of additional calls for fire and police service, and because the Project would not result in the need for new or physically altered fire and police facilities, the Project would result in less-than-significant impacts to fire and police protection.

The Project also would not significantly impact school service ratios because the student housing component of the Project would not generate additional demand for elementary or secondary schooling. The Project would result in a less-than-significant impact relative to the maintenance of acceptable park/recreation and library service ratios through the provision of on-campus recreational and library options.

The Project would not significantly impact emergency medical facilities as the Project is not expected to significantly increase the annual percentage of Capulli Center patients or those requiring hospital transport. Additionally, while Project-related traffic may impact the movement of emergency vehicles, this impact would not be significant because emergency vehicles are equipped with sirens that help increase maneuverability and adequate right-of-way exists in the vicinity of Alvarado Hospital.

As the Project would comply with the wastewater treatment requirements of the Regional Water Quality Control Board, the Project would not exceed applicable wastewater treatment requirements. Additionally, the Project would not increase the demand for regional water treatment facilities, which currently are sized to accommodate the densities envisioned by City of San Diego planning documents and planned as part of the Project. The Project also would not significantly impact the use or distribution of recycled water as (i) recycled water is not available in the Project area, and (ii) the City of San Diego currently does not have plans to extend recycled water infrastructure to the College Area

Relatedly, CSU's policies on energy conservation and utilities management, as well as SDSU's commitment to secure a LEED Silver rating for the Project, ensure that the Project would be water efficient and would not utilize an excessive amount of natural gas or electricity.

The Project would not result in a determination by the local wastewater treatment provider that it does not have adequate capacity to serve Project demand because the Project is consistent with the intensification of uses planned for in the region and accommodated by the local provider. Finally, the Project would comply with all applicable federal, state and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

3.11.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.11.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact with respect to the above-referenced public utilities and service systems concerns; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.12 TRANSPORTATION/CIRCULATION AND PARKING

3.12.1 Less Than Significant Impacts

With the elimination of Phases II and III, the Project, under the existing plus project scenario, would not generate traffic levels that would exceed allowable thresholds and, therefore, the Project would not result in significant impacts to the area roadways; impacts in this regard would be less than significant.

Because the Project is located approximately five miles from the nearest airport, the Project would not result in a change in air traffic patterns. The Project also would not substantially

increase hazards due to a design feature or incompatible use. The Project would not result in inadequate emergency access.

Under cumulative conditions, the Project would not result in significant impacts because the Project's contribution to the study area intersections and segments would not exceed the allowable thresholds.

Based on the design passenger capacity of the trolley serving the SDSU Transit Center, sufficient capacity would be available to accommodate the forecasted increase in trolley riders that would result from the Project. Sufficient capacity also would be available to accommodate the minimal forecasted increase in bus riders that would result from the Project.

An analysis of parking-related issues demonstrated the Project would result in less than significant impacts to parking. While the Project would result in the removal of Parking Lot 9 as a result of Project development, the Project also would result in a net decrease in overall demand for parking as students residing on campus are less likely to bring a car requiring a parking space to campus than those residing off-campus. Also, based on parking occupancy surveys, there is an adequate number of student parking spaces available on campus to accommodate the parking demand that would be generated by the Project. Relatedly, continued enforcement of the existing residential parking permit program in the adjacent residential neighborhood limits campus spillover parking during the school week, Monday through Friday from 8 AM to 7 PM. In summary, based on the shift of students presently residing off-campus to on-campus as a result of the Project, in combination with the excess parking supply on campus, the Project would result in less than significant impacts related to parking.

The Project would be consistent with adopted policies, plans, and programs regarding bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

3.12.2 Mitigation Measures

Consistent with State CEQA Guidelines section 15126.4(a)(3), mitigation measures are not required for effects that are not found to be significant.

3.12.3 Findings

The Board of Trustees finds that the Project will have a less-than-significant impact with respect to the above-referenced transportation/circulation and parking concerns; therefore, no mitigation is required.

3.13 NO POTENTIAL IMPACT

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, including the NOP/IS, the Project will result in no impact to the following environmental impact categories:

Agricultural Resources

- No conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance.
- No conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract.
- No change in the existing environment that could result in the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

Biological Resources

- No substantial adverse effect on any protected species identified by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- No 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.
- No substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands.
- No substantial interference with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species, including wildlife corridors.
- No conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources.
- No conflict with the provisions of an adopted/approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan.

Cultural Resources

- No effect on a resource listed or eligible for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources.
- No effect on a resource listed or eligible for listing in a local register of historical resources as defined in Public Resources Code Section 5020.1(k).
- No effect on a resource, including California Native

	American tribal resources, determined by the lead agency to be significant pursuant to criteria set forth in Public Resources Code Section 5024.1(c).
Geotechnical Resources *Geology and Soils*	• No inclusion of soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of waste water. • No impact to a unique geological resource.
Hazards and Hazardous Materials	• Not located on a site included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. • Not located within an airport land use plan. • Not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. • Not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
Land Use and Planning	• No ability to physically divide an established community.
Mineral Resources	• No loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state. • No 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	• Not located within an airport land use plan. • Not located within two miles of a public airport or public use airport. • Not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip.
Population and Housing	• No displacement to substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere.

4.0 FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

4.1 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

The alternatives section of the Final EIR contains an analysis of alternatives to the Project, including the "No Project" alternative. (For a detailed discussion of these alternatives, please see **Section 6.0,** Alternatives, of the Final EIR.) Based on the analysis, the Board of Trustees finds as follows:

(a) **The No Project Alternative**

The No Project alternative, which is required by CEQA to be considered, would result in the continuation of the existing land uses on the Project site such that the Project would not be built. This alternative generally would avoid the Project's potentially significant impacts. However, the failure to provide additional on-campus student housing would adversely affect efforts to meet existing and future student housing demands, including the campus' ability to implement the Sophomore Success program.

This alternative is not feasible or desirable as it would not attain any of the basic objectives of the Project, as defined in **Section 1.4**, above.

(b) **Reduced Density Alternative**

Under this alternative, the Project would be limited to development of Phase I, which would provide a total of 850 additional student housing beds on campus. As previously explained in Section 1.3, in response to comments and concerns raised by the surrounding community and elected officials, the Project as proposed in the Draft EIR has been modified to eliminate Phases II and III and, as now proposed, will consist of only Phase I, which will provide housing for approximately 850 students similar to the Reduced Density Alternative.

While this alternative would not fully attain all of the Project objectives as set forth in the Draft EIR, the alternative would meet the basic objectives and would substantially reduce potential environmental impacts and, on that basis, the Alternative is feasible.

(c) **Alternative On-Campus Site 1**

Under this alternative, the Project would be developed on Parking Lot 2A located in the southeastern portion of the SDSU campus. The site would be near existing freshman housing and existing amenities such as outdoor space, shared community space, and dining facilities. However, a significant grade differential exists between the site and the east campus residential neighborhood, which would work against any sense of connectivity with the existing east campus residential and support facilities. Additionally, any new facilities built to serve this

housing would effectively serve only this housing. Finally, the size of any structure on this parking lot would be severely limited by the existence of a subterranean trolley tunnel that crosses through the center of the lot. Building a larger footprint over this tunnel would necessitate extremely costly foundations, making the project economically infeasible.

This alternative is not feasible or desirable because it would result in proportionately greater impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials than the Project because Parking Lot 2A is located in proximity to known hazardous waste sites, including former and current gas stations and dry cleaners.

Additionally, this alternative would not attain many of the basic objectives of the Project, as defined in **Section 1.4**, above, including creation of a distinct west campus housing neighborhood, alleviating the current isolation of Chapultepec Hall, or providing food and convenience services in the vicinity of an underserved student residence.

(d) **Alternative On-Campus Site 2**

Under this alternative, the Project would be developed on Parking Lot 17 located in the northeastern portion of the SDSU campus.

This alternative would avoid potentially significant impacts related to aesthetics, biological and cultural resources, and noise. However, this alternative would increase the potential for impacts related to hazards and hazardous materials because Parking Lot 17 is located approximately 0.5 mile from an active gasoline service station.

This alternative would not attain the basic objective of the Project, as defined in **Section 1.4**, above, because the student housing would be located in the northeast corner of campus away from critical existing amenities (i.e., existing freshman housing, recreation, sports, and dining facilities). Therefore, this alternative is neither feasible nor desirable.

4.2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: ON-SITE ALTERNATIVES

CSU/SDSU considered eleven (11) on-campus sites for potential development as student housing. Each of these alternatives, separately addressed below, was determined to be infeasible.

The eleven on-campus sites analyzed include Parking Lots 15, 16, and 17C, which would be infeasible for failing to meet the project objectives because their remote location would not create a distinct west campus housing neighborhood, would not alleviate the current isolation of Chapultepec Hall, would not be capable of creating an on-campus housing community, and would not provide food and convenience services for the west campus area. Additionally, Parking Lots 15, 16, and 17C, as well as Parking Lot 2B and the University Towers Parking Lot,

are too remote from the SDSU campus core and similar student housing. The site of the proposed Project is located across the street from and within walking distance to existing student housing, several recreational and athletic centers, the Tony Gwynn stadium, and the Viejas arena. This proximity to the athletic facilities would improve the student athlete experience and offer opportunities for dining and convenience services to the student athletes that spend considerable time on the west side of campus that would not be available at the referenced remote locations.

Additionally, Parking Lot 2B would be infeasible also because the site presents technical challenges relative to site development. And, development at the University Towers Parking Lot would, in addition to its remote location, also negatively impact the proximately located surrounding community.

Development of Recreation Field 103 and Sports Fields 600 and 700, which also were considered, would require the removal of an existing use that would have to be relocated; and, these field sites do not have the capacity to accommodate a sufficient number of student housing beds and associated amenities. In addition, these alternative locations would not create a distinct west campus housing neighborhood; would not alleviate Chapultepec Halls' current isolation; would not create an on campus housing community; and would not provide food and convenience services for the west campus area, all objectives of the Project.

As to the site located on the east side of College Avenue, the site is not currently owned or controlled by SDSU and presently houses existing structures. As a result, the site would not achieve the Project objective to provide additional student housing where the land is owned by SDSU and unencumbered by other uses or existing structures that must be demolished. In addition, due to its location, this alternative would not create a distinct west campus housing neighborhood, would not alleviate Chapultepec Hall's current isolation, is not located in an area that has capacity to accommodate a sufficient number of student housing beds and associated amenities, and would not provide food and convenience services for the west campus area, all objectives of the Project.

Finally, the Alvarado Medical Center and Adobe Falls sites, which also were considered, are infeasible because these sites are not located in close proximity to other student housing facilities or amenities; would require demolition of existing structures; would not alleviate the current isolation of Chapultepec Hall; are not located near any existing housing; and would not provide food and convenience services in the west campus vicinity.

4.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT REJECTED: OFF-SITE ALTERNATIVES

CSU/SDSU also considered two (2) off-campus sites for potential acquisition and development

as student housing.

The Qualcomm Stadium Redevelopment alternative would consist of redeveloping part of the Qualcomm Stadium site with new housing that would take advantage of the presence of the San Diego Trolley at both Qualcomm Stadium and SDSU. This alternative is infeasible because it involves the use of land that SDSU does not own or control, and it would not meet most of the project's basic objectives, as defined in **Section 1.4**, above.

The 55th Street Peninsula Redevelopment alternative would consist of demolishing and redeveloping the existing student housing currently located on the 55th Street site. Development of the site would first require that control of the property be transferred to the State. Additionally, demolition of the existing student housing would result in the loss of approximately 770 beds from the campus inventory during the period of construction, thereby negatively impacting current student bed capacity as well as displacing student residents during the construction period. As a result, SDSU would have to obtain or lease replacement housing, at a cost, for these displaced students. Further, as a result of the loss of existing housing, CSU/SDSU would then need to construct 1,620 new student housing beds in order to achieve a net increase of 850 beds, as would be provided by the Project. As a result, this alternative is infeasible because it involves the use of land that SDSU does not own or control, would result in an inefficient expenditure of funds, and it would not meet most of the project's basic objectives, as defined in **Section 1.4**, above.

CEQA Guidelines section 15126.6 states that an EIR should consider alternate locations to the Project if an alternate location would avoid or substantially lessen the Project's significant environmental effects. In this case, relocation of the Project to another area merely would have the effect of shifting the impacts to another location, rather than avoiding or lessening potential significant impacts.