The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) requires that an EIR describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the project, or to the location of the project that could feasibly avoid or lessen any significant environmental impacts while substantially attaining the basic objectives of the proposed project. An EIR should also evaluate the comparative merits of the alternatives. This section sets forth potential alternatives to the proposed project and evaluates them, as required by CEQA.

Key provisions of the State CEQA Guidelines[1] pertaining to the alternatives analysis are summarized below:

- The discussion of alternatives shall focus on alternatives to the project or its location that are capable of avoiding or substantially lessening any significant effects of the project, even if these alternatives would impede to some degree the attainment of the project objectives, or would be more costly.
- The range of alternatives required in an EIR is governed by a "rule of reason;" therefore, the EIR must evaluate only those alternatives necessary to permit a reasoned choice. The alternatives shall be limited to ones that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project.
- The No Project alternative shall be evaluated along with its impact. The No Project analysis shall discuss the existing conditions at the time the notice of preparation is published. Additionally, the analysis shall discuss what would be reasonably expected to occur in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and consistent with available infrastructure and community services.
- For alternative locations, only locations that would avoid or substantially lessen any of the significant effects of the project need be considered for inclusion in the EIR.
- An EIR need not consider an alternative whose effects cannot be reasonably ascertained and whose implementation is remote and speculative.

The range of feasible alternatives is selected and discussed in a manner to foster meaningful public participation and informed decision-making. Among the factors that may be taken into account when addressing the feasibility of alternatives are environmental impacts, site suitability, economic viability, availability of infrastructure, general plan consistency, regulatory limitations, jurisdictional boundaries,

1 California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15126.6.

residence and the campus. The alternative would have greater traffic and traffic-related air quality and noise impacts. For the reasons presented above, this alternative was not carried forth for detailed evaluation.

This subsection presents an analysis of the project alternatives, including the following:

•

development faculty/staff housing along Grandview Avenue. Unlike the proposed project, the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would not include construction of faculty and student housing along Grandview Avenue. For this reason, significant impacts to views from vantage points along Grandview Avenue would be avoided and the impact would be less than significant.

Construction of the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would generate criteria pollutants and fugitive dust, which with mitigation, would not adversely affect local air quality in the vicinity of the construction site. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would construct fewer housing facilities which would in turn reduce criteria pollutants and fugitive dust related to construction.

Buildout of the Campus Master Plan would add mobile, stationary, and area sources to the project area that would result in long-term increases in criteria pollutants emissions. The Campus Master Plan would implement strategies to reduce air emissions that would reduce this impact. Implementation of the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would provide less on-site faculty and staff housing than the proposed project, but would require the same number of faculty and staff. Because more employees would reside off campus under this alternative and would commute to and from the campus, the total daily trips generated from this alternative would be greater than those generated by the proposed Master Plan. Therefore, slightly greater emissions of criteria pollutants would result under this alternative. Criteria pollutants from stationary and area sources would remain substantially the same because a central plant system would be in place. Overall, this alternative would result in slightly greater air pollutant emissions.

The grassland and mixed scrub areas that generally border the developed portions of the campus could potentially support special-status plant, bird, and bat species. The proposed project includes development of peripheral faculty and staff housing at three sites within these undeveloped areas. The potential loss or disturbance of special-status species due to development at these sites would be significant. However, implementation of mitigation would reduce these impacts to actJ 1 0 0 1 1 tognificant.

5.0 Al

would decrease the volume of runoff and reduce impacts to water quality and the receiving storm drain system.

The proposed Master Plan would generally be consistent with local land use plans. Development of faculty/staff housing at the site off of Hayward Boulevard across from the University Theatre, and along Grandview Avenue would be designed to minimize impacts to the existing adjacent neighborhoods and additional environmental review would be conducted to evaluate potentially significant environmental impacts. Under the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative, no development would occur at the Grandview Avenue site, but development would still occur at the Carlos Bee Boulevard/Bunker Hill Boulevard and Hayward Boulevard/Campus Drive sites. Therefore, this alternative would reduce the less than significant land use incompatibility impacts.

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would increase traffic noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors located along surrounding roadways. Mitigation would reduce impacts due to noise level increases exceeding the threshold of 3.0 A-weighted decibels (dB(A)) to a less than significant level. The Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would provide less on-site faculty and staff housing than the proposed project, but would require the same number of faculty and staff. Therefore, more employees would reside off campus under this alternative. As discussed further below, the total peak-hour trips for this alternative would be almost identical to peak-hour trips generated by the proposed project. Traffic distribution would however change under this alternative because there would be no additional local traffic along Grandview Avenue and the adjacent neighborhood streets. As a result, noise levels along roadways leading to the campus would increase by a greater amount than under the proposed Master Plan. However, the increase would not be sufficient to result in a noise impact at another location in addition to the five locations that would be affected by the traffic associated with the proposed Master Plan.

The proposed project's construction noise impacts to off-site sensitive receptors, including the residences along Grandview Avenue, would be less than significant with mitigation. This alternative would not include construction of faculty and staff housing or any other use at the Grandview Avenue site. However, since residences along Grandview Avenue would be 15 feet of the nearest construction activity under the proposed project whereas they would be more than 500 feet away under this alternative, this alternative would result in a substantial reduction in construction noise that would be experienced by residents along Grandview Avenue.

employees would reside off campus under this alternative the peak-hour trips to and from the campus would be slightly greater.

The traffic impacts of the Reduced Faculty/Staff Housing alternative would be virtually the same as the proposed Master Plan case at all external intersections studied. However, elimination of new housing at the Grandview Avenue site would eliminate the local traffic effects on the adjacent neighborhood streets which were determined to be less than significant for the proposed project.

The proposed project would increase the water demand within the City of Hayward to accommodate growth to an enrollment capacity of 18,000 FTES. As discussed for the proposed project, because the City's Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP) states that cutbacks would be required in multiple-dry years and water demand associt5unGrr te procussd Mastet Pl Hayam(e)-45-10(d)-389(i)-10 ud6(ui)-10(r)-249h-

Impacts related to the increase in electricity and natural gas consumption as a result of the proposed

sequences, open space amenities and key facilities is still provided. However, under the proposed project,

substantially reduce the potential for impacts to special-status species. Impacts to special-status species on the developed portion of the campus would be comparable to those of the proposed project.

A small drainage and associated bay woodland in the far western portion of the CSUEB property is located near the proposed Carlos Bee Boulevard/Bunker Hill Boulevard faculty and staff housing site for the proposed project. This drainage is expected to fall under the jurisdiction of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), while the bay woodland is considered to be riparian habitat likely to fall under the jurisdiction of the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG). Construction activities and installation of infrastructure could affect this drainage or result in the loss of the associated riparian vegetation, which constitutes a potentially significant impact. Implementation of mitigation would

The proposed project's construction noise impacts to nearby residences, including residences along Grandview Avenue and Campus Drive, would be significant. Mitigation restricting construction hours would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Since this alternative would not include construction of faculty and staff housing or any other use at this location, construction noise impacts to residences along Grandview Avenue and Campus Drive would be substantially reduced.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the population in the City of Hayward. However, based on ABAG growth projections, the impact would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would permit growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES as proposed by the Master Plan. Accordingly, less housing would be required. Therefore, this alternative would reduce the population and housing impacts of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for fire protection services, but would not result in a significant impact related to the provision of fire protection services to the campus at buildout under the proposed Master Plan. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase the demand for fire protection services as enrollment increases, but would lessen the less than significant impact of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for law enforcement services. Since the Hayward Police Department and the campus police department would collaborate to maintain adequate service on and around the campus, impacts would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase the demand for law enforcement services as enrollment increases, but would further reduce the proposed project's less than significant impact.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would indirectly increase enrollment at Hayward area schools as dependents of students, faculty, and staff relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase enrollment at Hayward schools as enrollment and campus employment increases, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would generate a nominal increase in the usage of off-campus recreational resources as students, employees and their dependents relocate to the Hayward area as the campus grows towards capacity. However, this increase would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also generate a nominal increase in the usage of off-campus recreational resources, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would contribute to sub-standard intersection operations at eight study intersections. Since further physical improvements to the affected intersections are not feasible, this impact would be significant and unavoidable even with incorporation of mitigation. Growth under the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also contribute to sub-standard intersection operations, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES. Since there would be fewer students and employees commuting to the campus, this alternative would generate approximately 849 AM peak-hour trips and 1,408 PM peak-hour trips. The net new trips generated by this alternative constitute about 60 percent of the net new trips generated by campus growth under the proposed Master Plan. Therefore, the alternative would reduce the overall traffic impact of the proposed project. However, given that existing levels of service at severalpe4a

Sufficient capacity currently exists to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project at Master Plan buildout and to accommodate increased wastewater volumes as the Master Plan is implemented. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater service would be less than significant. The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would also increase wastewater generation as the campus grows, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 15,000 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Impacts related to the increase in solid waste generation as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant provided that waste diversion goals are met. Assuming comparable waste diversion goals are met, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would result in lower solid waste generation due to the reduced enrollment capacity and smaller quantity of demolition debris. Therefore, this alternative would further reduce the proposed project's less than significant solid waste impacts.

Impacts related to the increase in electricity and natural gas consumption as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of required infrastructure improvements and energy conservation goals. Assuming the required infrastructure improvements are developed and comparable energy conservation goals are met, the Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would result in lower energy consumption due to the reduced enrollment capacity. Therefore, this alternative would reduce energy impacts.

Conclusion and Relationship to Project Objectives

The Reduced Enrollment Capacity alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, traffic, and public utilities. Impacts related to cultural

- Identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.

5.0 Al

The potential impact to archaeological resources from ground-disturbing activities would be much reduced as limited ground disturbance would occur under this alternative.

With implementation of mitigation, development under the proposed Master Plan would not expose people and structures on campus to significant adverse effects associated with seismic ground shaking or seismic-

additional environmental review would be conducted to evaluate potentially significant environmental impacts. Under the No Project Alternative, no development would occur at these housing sites. Therefore, this alternative would further reduce the less-than-significant land use impact.

Buildout of the campus under the proposed Master Plan would increase traffic noise levels at noise-sensitive receptors located along surrounding roadways, although the impact would not be significant. Growth under the No Project Alternative would also contribute to increased traffic noise levels, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to an enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES. It should also be noted that since no faculty and staff housing would be constructed under this alternative, all future faculty, and staff would be required to commute to campus. While this could increase the number of trips generated by University employees, the reduction in student trip generation due to the lower enrollment capacity would decrease overall traffic noise impacts.

The proposed project's construction noise impacts to nearby sensitive receptors would be significant. Mitigation restricting construction hours would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. Nevertheless, since this alternative would not include construction of faculty and staff housing or any other use at this location, construction noise impacts to nearby residences would be substantially reduced.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the population in the City of Hayward. However, based on ABAG growth projections, the impact would be less than significant. The No Project alternative would permit growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES as proposed by the Master Plan. Accordingly, less housing would be required. Therefore, this alternative would reduce the population and housing impacts of the proposed project.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for fire protection services, but would result in a less than significant impact. The No Project alternative would also increase the demand for fire protection services as enrollment increases, but would substantially lessen the less than significant impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would increase the demand for law enforcement services. Since the Hayward Police Department and the campus police department would collaborate to maintain adequate service on and around the campus, impacts would be less than significant. The No Project alternative would also increase the demand for law enforcement services as enrollment increases, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would indirectly increase enrollment at Hayward area schools as dependents of students, faculty,

than trips generated by the proposed project. However, given that existing levels of service at several study intersections are presently unacceptable, this alternative would substantially lessen, but not avoid, the significant and unavoidable traffic impacts associated with the proposed project.

The proposed project would increase the water demand within the City of Hayward to accommodate growth to an enrollment capacity of 18,000 FTES. However, because the City's UWMP states that cutbacks would be required in multiple-dry years and water demand associated with the proposed Master Plan was not included in its demand projections, this is considered a significant impact. Implementation of mitigation would reduce this impact to a less than significant level. The No Project alternative would also increase water consumption as the campus grows, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES, but not to a less than significant level, and mitigation would still be required.

Sufficient capacity currently exists to treat wastewater generated by the proposed project at Master Plan buildout, and to accommodate increased wastewater volumes as the Master Plan is implemented. Therefore, impacts related to wastewater service would be less than significant. The No Project alternative would also increase wastewater generation as the campus grows, but would reduce the impact of the proposed project by limiting campus growth to the current enrollment capacity of 12,586 FTES instead of 18,000 FTES.

Impacts related to the increase in solid waste generation as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant provided that waste diversion goals are met. Assuming comparable waste diversion goals are met, the No Project alternative would result in lower solid waste generation due to the reduced enrollment capacity and smaller quantity of demolition debris. Therefore, this alternative would reduce solid waste impacts.

Impacts related to the increase in electricity and natural gas consumption as a result of the proposed project would be less than significant with implementation of required infrastructure improvements and energy conservation goals. Under the No Project alternative, the campus would not implement the Master Plan strategies for energy independence as well as the goal of overall carbon neutrality by 2030.

Therefore, although due to a lower increase in enrollment, the increase in total campus energy use would be lower than under the proposed project, however the per capita energy consumption would likely be higher and the No Project alternative could potentially result in energy impacts that are comparable or greater than those of the proposed Master Plan.

5.5.3.2 Conclusion and Relationship to Project Objectives

The No Project alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, hazards and hazardous materials, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, traffic, and all public utilities except energy. Impacts related to energy use, hydrology and water quality, and geology and soils would be comparable to or greater than those of the proposed project.

By not implementing the proposed Master Plan, this alternative would not achieve the following objectives:

- Enhance the campus learning environment within a walkable campus core by providing adequate sites for planned and future programs and to accommodate growth in campus enrollment up to the CPEC-approved Master Plan ceiling of 18,000 FTES.
- Create supportive student neighborhoods that would help create a sense of community for both residents and commuting students, and increase on-campus housing to accommodate 5,000 students. In addition, identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.
- Plan for other design improvements, including improved campus entry and image to help orient visitors and make destination finding easier; special landmark building sites to create a memorable impression of the campus; and improved campus pedestrian promenades
- Implement comprehensive environmentally sustainable development and operations strategies, including land use and transportation, as well as resource consumption and waste generation.
- Continue the planning and design criteria from the original campus master plan that aim at preserving views of the bay and the hills; creating a clear design vocabulary; and protecting the users from the elements.

The findings of the alternatives impact analysis discussed above are summarized in . Of the alternatives analyzed in this document, the No Project Alternative is considered the environmentally superior alternative, as it would avoid all impacts related to the proposed project. However, the No Project Alternative would not meet the objectives of the proposed project.

UTILITIES - WATER	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
UTILITIES - WASTEWATER	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
UTILITIES - SOLID WASTE	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Less
UTILITIES – ELECTRICITY AND NATURAL GAS	Less than significant	Similar	Less	Greater

The State CEQA Guidelines require that an environmentally superior alternative be identified among the selected alternatives (excluding the No Project alternative).[5] If the No Project Alternative is determined to be the environmentally superior alternative, an environmentally superior alternative must also be identified among the remaining alternatives.

The environmentally superior alternative would be the Reduced Enrollment alternative. This alternative would reduce impacts related to aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, land use, noise, population and housing, public services, traffic, and public utilities. Impacts related to cultural resources and geology and soils would be comparable to those of the proposed project.

By reducing enrollment capacity and not developing faculty and staff housing on campus, this alternative would not achieve the following key objectives to the same extent as the proposed project:

- Enhance the campus learning environment within a walkable campus core by providing adequate sites for planned and future programs and to accommodate growth in campus enrollment up to the CPEC-approved Master Plan ceiling of 18,000 FTES.
- Identify locations on campus for faculty and staff housing to strengthen the sense of campus community.

5 California Public Resources Code, Title 14, Division 6, Chapter 3, California Environmental Quality Act Guidelines, Section 15125.6(e)(2).