4.0 SIGNIFICANT IRREVERSIBLE CHANGES

4.1 PURPOSE

Section 15126 of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* states that use of nonrenewable resources during the initial and continued phases of a proposed project may be irreversible if a large commitment of these resources makes their subsequent removal or nonuse thereafter unlikely. Primary development impacts (such as conversion of land to a new use) and secondary impacts (such as highway construction to access a new use) generally commit future generations to those same uses. This section of the EIR evaluates whether the Master Plan would result in the irretrievable commitment of resources or cause irreversible changes in the environment. This section also identifies any irreversible damage that could result from environmental accidents associated with the proposed Master Plan.

4.2 IRREVERSIBLE COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES

4.2.1 Intensification of Land Use

Implementation of the Master Plan (in particular, the construction of new buildings, roadways, and parking) would represent a long-term commitment to more intensive land use than currently exists on the campus, in order to accommodate the increased enrollment cap as well as more faculty and staff. However, the mere conversion of developed land to a more intensive use would not constitute the commitment of a "nonrenewable resource" within the meaning of §15126.2(c).

4.2.2 Nonrenewable Energy Resources

Construction of each of the proposed project components would result in the use of nonrenewable resources and energy sources, including fossil fuels, electricity, and natural gas. Fossil fuels would be used to power construction equipment as well as delivery and construction employee vehicles. Construction equipment would also use electricity and natural gas. Use of these energy sources would be considered a permanent commitment of resources. In addition, a variety of resource materials would be used during the construction process, including steel, wood, concrete, and fabricated materials. Once these materials and fuels are used for purposes of construction, the commitment of such materials and fuels would be considered irreversible. Once operational, the project components would consume somewhat more energy on a daily basis than is presently consumed on site. Assuming at least a portion of the energy used would be provided by nonrenewable sources, the proposed project would result in the commitment of nonrenewable energy resources during project operation. However, continued use of

such resources is consistent with the anticipated growth and planned changes on the campus and within the project area.

4.2.3 Environmental Accident

The *CEQA Guidelines* require a discussion of the potential for irreversible environmental damage caused by an accident associated with the project. No unique hazards are known to exist on the California State University, Northridge (CSUN) campus, nor does the campus contain any uniquely hazardous uses. The following discussion identifies the characteristics of the Master Plan and proposed future uses that could be sources of potential accidents.

While the site is located within a seismically active region and would be exposed to ground shaking in the event of a seismic event, conformance with the regulatory provisions of the Uniform Building Code pertaining to construction standards would minimize, to the extent feasible, damage and injuries in the event of such an occurrence.

Within campus boundaries, pesticides (insecticides, herbicides, and fungicides) may be used on the proposed recreation and open space areas. The application of these chemicals is subject to stringent regulations at both the federal and state level. Humans would not be subject to either acute overexposure or chronic exposure to these substances if used and handled according to state and federal regulations.

Uses proposed by the project (such as academic research uses) would be expected to use and store chemicals and/or substances, which are typically found in such settings. CSUN's Environmental Health and Safety Office manages existing programs, policies, and procedures designed to protect students, faculty, staff, and surrounding residents. To account for the presence, use, storage, transport, and disposal of hazards and hazardous materials on the CSUN campus, the campus has prepared, adopted, and implemented numerous programs, policies, and procedures designed to protect not only the students, faculty, and staff on the University campus, but also to protect land uses surrounding the project site. To comply with federal, state, and local hazardous material regulations, CSUN is required to complete a Unified Program (UP) Form for every building, room, and chemical used, stored, transported, and/or disposed of on the University campus. In addition to the Environmental Health and Safety's Campus Emergency Procedures, the CSUN Department of Public Safety has prepared Emergency Preparedness Recommendations for all students, faculty, and staff on the University campus. Given the multitude of federal, state, and local regulations governing the use of such substances, the proposed project is not expected to involve activities that would damage the environment or pose a risk to public health.

CSUN provides education to nearly 33,000 undergraduate and graduate students (24,473 full-time equivalents [FTEs]) and employs 2,017 faculty members and 1,964 staff members. The University is nearly at the California State University (CSU) system-wide historic enrollment cap of 25,000 FTEs, and its facilities are reaching capacity. In May 2003, in keeping with its state charter as well as CSU's mandate concerning the provision of postsecondary education and in response to projections of unprecedented demand for higher education enrollment, the Board of Trustees adopted a resolution directing each campus within the CSU to take the necessary steps to accommodate a projected system-wide enrollment increase of 107,000 FTEs by 2011. To comply with this directive, each campus is required to periodically review and revise its master plan, in part to ensure that proposed capital improvement programs remain in compliance with those plans. The 2005 Master Plan for the CSUN campus is intended to respond to the Board of Trustees' directive to plan for its share of increased enrollment, as well as accommodate the evolving needs of the University's academic, administrative, and student- and campus-support programs.

Because implementation of the proposed project would enable CSUN to accommodate the projected increase in student enrollment over the next 30 years, the commitment of the resources discussed above is deemed justified.

5.0 ALTERNATIVES

5.1 PURPOSE

Section 15126.6 of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* states that an EIR must describe a range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed project that would feasibly attain most of the basic objectives of the project, but would avoid or substantially lessen any of the project's significant effects. The alternatives discussion must evaluate the comparative merits of each alternative relative to the proposed project. According to *CEQA Guidelines* §15126.6, discussion of each alternative should be sufficient "to allow meaningful evaluation, analysis and comparison with the proposed project." Therefore, the significant effects of each alternative are discussed in less detail than those of the project, but in sufficient detail to permit decision makers to make a reasoned choice among alternatives to the proposed project. An EIR's evaluation of alternatives is key to CEQA's substantive mandate that avoidable significant environmental damage be avoided or reduced where feasible (*CEQA Guidelines* §§15002(a)(3), 15021(a)(2), and 15126.6).

The proposed California State University, Northridge (CSUN) 2005 Master Plan is intended to provide the University with a common vision for guiding land and building uses, and a tool for guiding day-to-day decisions on resource management and allocation, capital outlay programs, and construction planning for facilities and improvements needed to accommodate the growing enrollment at CSUN. The Master Plan is intended to enhance CSUN's ability to support faculty and staff through the provision of appropriate teaching, research and administrative facilities; make efficient use of developable land to preserve a balance between built-up areas and open space; provide appropriate facilities for informal and organized recreational and intercollegiate athletics; provide student, faculty and staff housing; maintain stewardship of the campus landscape and natural resources; serve as a regional center for intellectual, cultural, and life-long learning; and maintain good relations with the Northridge community and local government and organizations. The Master Plan will decisions concerning the allocation and management of resources, capital outlay programs, and construction planning for facilities and improvements needed to accommodate growing enrollment over the next 30 years.

The analysis contained in this EIR determined that implementation of the proposed 2005 Master Plan would result in the following significant and unavoidable impacts:

- **Air Quality:** (1) Master Plan and near-term project construction emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrogen dioxide (NO_x), and carbon monoxide (CO) in excess SCAQMD thresholds; and 2) Master Plan and near-term project operational emissions of summertime VOCs, wintertime NO_x, and PM_{10} in excess SCAQMD thresholds.

- **Noise:** (1) Master Plan program construction and near-term Phase 1 and 2 project-level construction would result in exterior ambient noise levels at off-campus residential land uses in excess of City of

Los Angeles Municipal Code thresholds; and (2) Master Plan program construction and near-term Phase 1 and 2 project-level construction would result in exterior ambient noise levels at on-campus residential facilities in excess of the State of California, Department of Health Services, Environmental Health Division's recommended ambient exterior noise level standards for residential land uses.

- **Traffic (Master Plan and Near-Term Projects):** (1) Intersection impacts at Zelzah Avenue and Devonshire Street during the AM peak hour and at Balboa Boulevard and Devonshire Street during the PM peak hour; (2) Street segment impacts along Dearborn Street west of Darby Avenue, West University Drive/Etiwanda Avenue south of Nordhoff Street, and Prairie Street east of Zelzah Avenue; and (3) freeway segment impacts on westbound SR 118 between Balboa Boulevard and Havenhurst Avenue and between Woodley Avenue and I-405 during the AM peak period, and on eastbound SR 118 between Reseda Boulevard and Balboa Boulevard during the AM peak period.

- **Public Utilities: Water Demand and Supply (Master Plan and Near-Term Projects):** Impacts on off-site Los Angeles Department of Water and Power (LADWP) water service (infrastructure) facilities, which are presently at capacity.

All other potential impacts associated with the proposed Master Plan, including near-term Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects, were determined to be less than significant or would be reduced to less than significant levels following implementation of the mitigation measures identified in this EIR.

5.2 SELECTION OF RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

CEQA Guidelines §15126.6(f) state that an EIR must evaluate the comparative merits of a reasonable range of alternatives. That is, an EIR need not consider every conceivable alternative to a proposed project; rather, the number and range of alternatives is governed by the "rule of reason," which requires that an EIR set forth only those alternatives necessary to permit informed decision making and a reasoned choice. Alternatives are limited to those that meet the project objectives; are ostensibly feasible; and would avoid or substantially lessen at least one significant environmental impact of the proposed project. Feasibility may be determined by, but is not limited to, site suitability, jurisdictional boundaries, infrastructure or services availability, economic viability, and regulatory limitations. An EIR will typically evaluate two classes of alternatives: alternative uses for the same site and alternatives sites for a proposed project.

A "No Project" scenario must be evaluated in addition to other alternatives, in order to compare the impacts of project approval with impacts resulting from not approving the project. The No Project Alternative must consider existing conditions at the time of Notice of Preparation (NOP) issuance and must also evaluate what might reasonably be expected to occur on the project site in the foreseeable future if the project were not approved, based on current plans and available infrastructure and services. When the project site is development at a specific location, as is the case for the 2005 Master Plan, the No Project Alternative normally considers the effects of the site remaining in its existing state, rather than being developed for other uses.

An "Environmentally Superior" Alternative must be identified from among the alternatives evaluated in an EIR. If the No Project Alternative is identified as the Environmentally Superior Alternative, an EIR must also identify an environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives (*CEQA Guidelines* §15126.6(e)(2)). In general, the Environmentally Superior Alternative is defined as that alternative with the least adverse impacts on the environment.

5.3 ALTERNATIVES REJECTED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION

CEQA Guidelines §15126 state that an EIR must describe those alternatives that were initially considered but rejected as infeasible during the scoping process and provide a brief rationale for their rejection, such as failure to meet basic project objectives or reduce significant project effects.

To develop the final 2005 Master Plan, CSUN initiated an 18-month-long collaborative process involving the academic and administrative campus communities and the local Northridge community, in order to ascertain the campus's needs over the next 30 years. In January 2004, CSUN President Jolene Koester appointed a 25-member Campus Physical Master Planning Committee comprising faculty, staff, and student and community representatives. The committee participated in a series of four public data-gathering forums and exercises between October 2004 and May 2005 that were intended to solicit input from all interested parties. Regular meetings of the Master Plan Committee were held to provide reports on Master Plan progress and send feedback to the team responsible for preparing the Master Plan.

A number of project alternatives were initially evaluated in an effort to reduce significant environmental effects associated with the proposed project. The alternatives considered a number of arrangements of Master Plan components (primarily University academic, administrative, housing, and recreational facilities) across campus, in attempts to co-locate complementary uses and distribute support services, housing, and parking facilities where they were most needed or appropriately sited.

One alternative, called Scenario A, concentrated housing in the north part of campus, concentrated new parking on the east side of campus along Zelzah Avenue, and relocated the track to the north of its present location, with additional playfields. However, this alternative was rejected because it isolated housing from the rest of campus and concentrated parking too much in one part of campus, leading to potential traffic circulation problems on campus and on Zelzah Avenue.

Scenario B contemplated fewer faculty housing units (325) concentrated along Lindley Avenue, concentration of student housing in the campus core, developing 51 net acres of play fields, and concentrating play fields along Zelzah. This scenario was rejected because of the need for more faculty/staff housing to aid in employee recruitment; to concentrate academic facilities in the academic

core; and to use more of the developable campus land for buildings as opposed to open space or recreational facilities.

Scenario C contemplated 3,300 student beds (700 more than under the final 2005 Master Plan), 330 faculty/staff dwelling units, 5,540 parking spaces concentrated along Zelzah Avenue, and 48 acres of playfields. Elements of this scenario were rejected because of the need for more faculty/staff housing to aid in employee recruitment; the potential for vehicular circulation problems on campus and on Zelzah Avenue associated with parking concentrated on Zelzah Avenue, among other reasons.

Alternative sites were not considered during the master planning process and are not evaluated in detail in this EIR, since development of University facilities at other locations is infeasible and would not meet project objectives, which relate to the CSUN campus.

5.4 PROJECT ALTERNATIVES

5.4.1 No Project Alternative

For purposes of the No Project Alternative, it is assumed the proposed 2005 Master Plan for the CSUN campus would not be adopted. Campus development and growth would continue in conformance with the existing 1998 Master Plan. The University's student enrollment ceiling, or cap, would remain at 25,000 full-time equivalents (FTEs), which it is currently approaching. The number of faculty and staff would remain at or near current levels. Although significant portions of the 1998 Master Plan, which was developed as a plan for campus reconstruction following the 1994 Northridge earthquake, have been implemented, any projects contained in the current master plan and not yet implemented could be built, including 200,000 square feet of biotechnology space on the north campus proposed but not yet developed; 300,000 of entertainment industry space; and a new 12,000–15,000-seat stadium on the main campus. However, none of the proposals in the 2005 Master Plan would be implemented, including the development of new and expanded academic and administrative facilities; student support and recreational facilities; student and faculty/staff housing; landscaping, open space, and pedestrian circulation improvements; transportation improvements; parking facilities; or campus utility system and infrastructure upgrades.

As discussed below in more detail, the No Project Alternative would avoid any of the significant, unavoidable impacts Air Quality, Noise, Traffic, and Water Supply (infrastructure) impacts associated with the proposed Master Plan. However, this alternative would not enable CSUN to increase its enrollment ceiling to accommodate projected increases, or revise its existing campus master plan to accommodate the projected increases. Since the Master Plan is intended to fulfill the CSU Trustee's 2003 directive that CSU campuses plan for projected system-wide increases of 107,000 FTEs by 2011, the No

Project Alternative could result in the redistribution of project impacts to other campuses, since CSUN would be precluded from accommodating its share of the projected enrollment increase and students would likely seek educational opportunities elsewhere.

Finally, the No Project Alternative would prevent attainment of the basic project objectives stated in **Section 2.0, Project Description**, of this EIR.

Aesthetics

The proposed Master Plan would result in a number of beneficial, and thus less than significant, impacts on aesthetic character and views. Specifically, the Master Plan proposes enhancement of the existing Orange Grove and other campus open space areas; integration of existing facilities through campus landscaping; creation of shaded outdoor gathering places; implementation of a landscaped buffer between the campus and surrounding land uses using signature perimeter landscaping; the introduction of distinctive campus identification signage at points of entry; and the creation of view "windows" into the campus from off-site vantages.

Implementation of some Master Plan projects, including proposed near-term Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects such as play fields and parking structures, would result in significant impacts related to views from off-site vantages of parking structures along the campus perimeter, and nighttime light spillover and sky glow associated with new parking structures and play fields at or near the campus perimeter. These impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation.

Under the No Project Alternative, the aesthetic benefits associated with the Master Plan would not be implemented. However, the proposed new parking structures and play fields would not be built, and there would be no significant impacts associated with views of the parking structures or nighttime lighting of the parking structures or play fields. Aesthetic impacts would, therefore, be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

The 2005 Master Plan and proposed near-term Phase 1 and 2 projects would result in significant, unavoidable construction emissions of VOCs, NO_x, and CO. These impacts would be caused by the operation of construction equipment and site demolition, clearing, grading, and finishing activities associated with proposed new buildings and facilities. The Master Plan and near-term projects would also result in significant operational emissions of summertime VOCs, wintertime NO_x, and PM_{10} largely attributable to project-related traffic. No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the No Project Alternative, no 2005 Master Plan construction would take place and no construction emissions would be generated. Operational emissions associated with project traffic would be reduced, although if FTEs seek educational opportunities elsewhere, it is possible that those emissions would merely be shifted elsewhere within the South Coast Air Basin. Air quality impacts would nonetheless be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 2005 Master Plan, as well as proposed near-term Phase 1 and 2 projects, could result in potentially significant impacts related to the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment associated with project construction and operations, since the status of proposed development sites, and associated potential for site contamination, is unknown at this time. Mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

The No Project Alternative would not result in the development of new facilities, and therefore sites, proposed under the Master Plan, and would result in less than significant impacts related to hazardous materials. Impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Construction of the proposed Master Plan and near-term Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects would result in significant, unavoidable ambient exterior noise impacts at off-campus residential land uses. Construction of near-term projects sited at or near the perimeter of campus, including the proposed Transit Hub, parking structures, and the Valley Performing Arts Center, would result in short-term, but significant, noise impacts at residences in proximity to the project sites. Construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 student housing would also result in short-term, but significant, noise impacts on existing on-campus student housing in University Park, and construction of faculty/staff housing under Phase 2 is expected to cause significant noise impacts for already-constructed Phase 1 faculty/staff housing.

Under the No Project Alternative, none of the proposed Master Plan projects would be implemented, with the possible exception of the Valley Performing Arts Center, which was previously evaluated at the program level in the 1998 Master Plan EIR, and the Science 5 facility, which was evaluated in subsequent CEQA documentation. The No Project Alternative would, therefore, avoid most of the significant, unavoidable noise impacts off site or on the CSUN campus associated with Master Plan implementation.

Population and Housing

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts related to local population projections, since it is intended to accommodate projected enrollment increases at CSUN; would be implemented as infill on the already-established CSUN campus; and would not displace any existing housing. Under the Master Plan, additional student housing would be developed on campus to increase the 24-hour on-campus population, together with new faculty/staff housing intended to aid in recruitment and maintain the necessary faculty:student ratio at the University.

Under the No Project Alternative, no new student housing would be implemented and the existing student housing would remain in use. Likewise, no new faculty/staff housing would be built. Impacts related to growth projections and displacement of housing would be less than significant, comparable to the proposed project, but none of the benefits associated with the provision of new housing would be realized.

Public Services

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts on police and fire protection services. CSUN is served by the University Police Department; the Department would increase staffing as needed to meet campus police protection needs over time, and Master Plan implementation would not increase demand for City of Los Angeles police services. With respect to fire protection services, adherence to applicable building codes and required review of facility plans during Master Plan project construction would reduce the potential for increased fire hazards, and project implementation is not expected to interfere with emergency access.

Under the No Project Alternative, CSUN would not increase its enrollment cap above the current 25,000 FTE level, and no new facilities proposed under the Master Plan to accommodate the increased enrollment would be built. The No Project Alternative would result in less than significant impacts on police and fire protection services, and impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project because of the reduced need for University or City services.

Recreation

The 2005 Master Plan would result in beneficial, and, therefore, less than significant, impacts related to recreational and athletic opportunities and facilities. The 2005 Master Plan proposes to increase play field acreage by 6 acres, for a total of 46 acres; develop a new Student Recreation Center; develop facilities for restrooms, storage, concession operations, and other support needed for outdoor facilities and events;

and enhance existing outdoor space on campus to provide more usable, shaded gathering places and new "secondary" open spaces such as courtyards, quadrangles, and plazas through new building placement.

Under the No Project Alternative, existing recreational and athletic facilities would remain in use, but no new facilities would be provided. Facilities in need of enhancements and upgrades would not necessarily be improved. Campus open space would remain largely unchanged, and no new usable open space, such as shaded or otherwise enhanced places, would be created. Impacts on recreation would be less than significant, as under the proposed Master Plan, but none of the beneficial impacts of the Master Plan would be realized.

Traffic

Operations associated with the 2005 Master Plan would result in significant, unavoidable impacts at two project intersections in the project area; the project area street segments; and on two freeway segments during the AM peak period and one freeway segment during the PM peak period. The impacts are attributable to the projected increased enrollment at CSUN and attendant vehicle trip generation by students, faculty, and staff. The Master Plan proposes improvements related to campus access, internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and campus parking supply, which would constitute beneficial, and thus less than significant, impacts. The Master Plan also proposes the development of a Transit Center to accommodate increased use of public transit; the addition of a new internal campus tram route; and a recommendation to MZTA for a new bus stop near campus.

Under the No Project Alternative, CSUN would not increase its enrollment cap beyond the existing 25,000 FTE levels, and would not build new facilities to accommodate that increased enrollment. Trip generation associated with Master Plan build out would not occur in the project area, although it is possible that those impacts would merely be shifted elsewhere in the region, as prospective students as well as faculty and staff seek educational and employment opportunities at other area schools. Project impacts on area intersections, street segments, and freeway segments would, therefore, be less than significant, and reduced compared to the proposed project.

Under the No Project Alternative, traffic and pedestrian circulation patterns would remain essentially unchanged, and the demand for parking would not increase substantially beyond existing levels. However, proposed Master Plan improvements related to campus access, internal circulation, parking, and public transit would not be realized.

Public Utilities: Water Demand and Supply

The 2005 Master Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on off-site water supply infrastructure, since increased water demand on campus associated with Master Plan build out would necessitate upgrades to off-site infrastructure maintained by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. No feasible mitigations exist to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the No Project Alternative, CSUN would not increase its enrollment cap beyond 25,000 FTEs, and the new facilities proposed under the Master Plan to accommodate the enrollment increase would not be built. Demand for water supplies, and associated impacts on water supply systems, could increase slightly as facilities already proposed under the existing 1998 master plan are developed, but impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities: Wastewater

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts on wastewater conveyance infrastructure and treatment facilities, since existing infrastructure and facilities would adequately accommodate Master Plan build out.

Under the No Project Alternative, impacts on wastewater infrastructure and treatment facilities would remain less than significant, and would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

5.4.2 Reduced (5,000) FTE Alternative

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, CSUN would increase its enrollment cap to 30,000 FTEs by the 2034-2035 academic year, rather than the 35,000 FTE cap proposed under the Master Plan. The number of student residential housing units to be built on campus would be reduced by 50 percent, from 2,688 to 1344. The proposed number of new parking spaces would also be reduced somewhat because of reduced demand for student residential parking.

The number of remaining Master Plan projects implemented under this alternative would decrease compared to the proposed project. Even though a reduced future enrollment of 30,000 students would still necessitate new facilities and improvements to existing facilities, the new developed square footage would likely be decreased by half compared to the proposed project, given the CSU system average of 115,000 gross square feet (gsf) per 1,000 FTE students.

As discussed below, the Reduced FTE Alternative would result in the same potentially significant impacts as the 2005 Master Plan, although impacts would be proportionately reduced. Implementation of this alternative would reduce trip generation and associated impacts on area intersections and street and

freeway segments. However, since many of the affected roadways and freeway segments are projected to be operating at unacceptable levels by the date of project build out even without the proposed project, implementation of this alternative would nonetheless likely result in significant impacts on the same roadway and freeway segments as full build out of the 2005 Master Plan.

Because the Reduced FTE Alternative would not enable CSUN to accommodate the full 10,000 FTEs projected by 2035, and because Master Plan projects to be implemented would be adjusted to accommodate this lower enrollment cap, this alternative would not meet CSUN's basic project objectives related to accommodation of its share of increased enrollment and the provision of associated academic and residential opportunities. Lowering the enrollment cap may also result in prospective students seeking educational opportunities elsewhere in the region, thereby shifting enrollment growth to other schools.

Aesthetics

The proposed Master Plan would result in a number of beneficial, and thus less than significant, impacts on aesthetic character and views. Specifically, the Master Plan proposes enhancement of the existing Orange Grove and other campus open space areas; integration of existing facilities through campus landscaping; creation of shaded outdoor gathering places; implementation of a landscaped buffer between the campus and surrounding land uses using signature perimeter landscaping; the introduction of distinctive campus identification signage at points of entry; and the creation of view "windows" into the campus from off-site vantages.

Implementation of some Master Plan projects, including proposed near-term Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects such as play fields and parking structures, would result in significant impacts related to views from off-site vantages of parking structures along the campus perimeter, and nighttime light spillover and sky glow associated with new parking structures and play fields at or near the campus perimeter. These impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, many of the aesthetic benefits associated with the Master Plan would still be implemented. However, the number of students, and thus the new developed square footage and demand for parking, would be reduced under this alternative. Fewer buildings and fewer or smaller parking structures would likely be built. This would reduce the potential for significant aesthetic impacts, and the accompanying need for mitigation measures, compared to the proposed project. Additionally, since less acreage would be developed with student housing and parking facilities, more of the campus would likely remain as open space or would support a reduced intensity of development. Aesthetic impacts would, therefore, be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Air Quality

The 2005 Master Plan and proposed near-term Phase 1 and 2 projects would result in significant, unavoidable construction emissions of VOCs, NO_x, and CO. These impacts would be caused by the operation of construction equipment and site demolition, clearing, grading, and finishing activities associated with proposed new buildings and facilities. The Master Plan and near-term projects would also result in significant operational emissions of summertime VOCs, wintertime NO_x, and PM_{10} largely attributable to project-related traffic. No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, the proposed number of student residential units would be reduced by half. However, student residences constitute a minor proportion of the overall developed square footage proposed under the 2005 Master Plan and are proposed in addition to the proposed academic, administrative, and student support facilities. Accordingly, the corresponding reduction in construction-related emissions would be substantially decreased compared to the proposed project.

Operational air emissions associated with project traffic would be reduced under this alternative, although if students seek educational opportunities elsewhere, it is possible that those emissions would merely be shifted elsewhere within the South Coast Air Basin. Air quality impacts associated with operations would nonetheless be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 2005 Master Plan, as well as proposed near-term Phase 1 and 2 projects, could result in potentially significant impacts related to the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment associated with project construction and operations, since the status of proposed development sites, and associated potential for site contamination, is unknown at this time. Mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

The Reduced FTE Alternative would result in the development of approximately half the developed square footage proposed under the 2005 Master Plan, and a correspondingly reduced number of project sites. This alternative would result in less than significant impacts related to hazardous materials, and impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Noise

Construction of the proposed Master Plan and near-term Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects would result in short-term but significant and unavoidable ambient exterior noise impacts at off-campus residential land

uses. Construction of near-term projects sited at or near the perimeter of campus, including the proposed Transit Center, parking structures, and the Valley Performing Arts Center, would result in short-term, but significant, noise impacts at residences in proximity to the project sites. Construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 student housing would also result in short-term but significant and unavoidable noise impacts on existing on-campus student housing in University Park, and construction of faculty/staff housing under Phase 2 is expected to cause significant and unavoidable noise impacts for already-constructed Phase 1 faculty/staff housing.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, approximately half the square footage associated with the proposed Master Plan would be implemented; the amount of student housing would also be reduced. Impacts on off-site residences associated with construction of parking structures at or near the campus perimeter would, therefore, be somewhat reduced under this alternative. Impacts on existing campus student housing, and proposed faculty/staff housing, would also be reduced under this alternative, since less student housing would be built in proximity to existing campus housing. This alternative would still result in significant and unavoidable construction-related noise impacts. Nonetheless, noise impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts related to local population projections, since it is intended to accommodate projected enrollment increases at CSUN; would be implemented as infill on the already-established CSUN campus; and would not displace any existing housing. Under the Master Plan, additional student housing would be developed on campus to increase the 24-hour on-campus population, together with new faculty/staff housing intended to aid in recruitment and maintain the necessary faculty:student ratio at the University.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, approximately half of the student housing proposed under the 2005 Master Plan would be implemented and the amount of proposed new faculty/staff housing would remain unchanged. Impacts related to growth projections and displacement of housing would be less than significant, comparable to the proposed project, but fewer of the benefits associated with the provision of new student housing would be realized.

Public Services

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts on police and fire protection services. CSUN is served by the University Police Department; the Department would increase staffing as needed to meet campus police protection needs over time, and Master Plan implementation would not increase demand for City of Los Angeles police services. With respect to fire protection services, adherence to

applicable building codes and required review of facility plans during Master Plan project construction would reduce the potential for increased fire hazards, and project implementation is not expected to interfere with emergency access.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, CSUN would only increase its enrollment cap by 5,000 FTEs, and approximately half of the new facilities proposed under the 2005 Master Plan would be built. The Reduced FTE Alternative would result in less than significant impacts on police and fire protection services, and impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project because of the reduced need for University and City services.

Recreation

The 2005 Master Plan would result in beneficial, and, therefore, less than significant, impacts related to recreational and athletic opportunities and facilities. The 2005 Master Plan proposes to increase play field acreage by 6 acres, for a total of 46 acres; develop a new Student Recreation Center; develop facilities for restrooms, storage, concession operations, and other support needed for outdoor facilities and events; and enhance existing outdoor space on campus to provide more usable, shaded gathering places and new "secondary" open spaces such as courtyards, quadrangles, and plazas through new building placement.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, some of the improvements to, or proposed new, recreational and instructional athletic facilities would be implemented, and, therefore, some of the beneficial impacts of the Master Plan would be realized. Impacts would remain less than significant and comparable to the proposed project.

Traffic

Operations associated with the 2005 Master Plan would result in significant, unavoidable impacts at two project intersections in the project area; the project area street segments; and on two freeway segments during the AM peak period and one freeway segment during the PM peak period. The impacts are attributable to the projected increased enrollment at CSUN and attendant vehicle trip generation by students, faculty, and staff. The Master Plan proposes improvements related to campus access, internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and campus parking supply, which would constitute beneficial, and thus less than significant, impacts. The Master Plan also proposes the development of a Transit Center to accommodate increased use of public transit; the addition of a new internal campus tram route; and a recommendation to MZTA for a new bus stop near campus.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, CSUN would only increase its enrollment cap by 5,000 FTEs. Associated trip generation would be reduced by approximately half compared to the proposed project,

although it is possible that those impacts would merely be shifted elsewhere in the region, as prospective students as well as faculty and staff seek educational and employment opportunities at other area schools. However, since many of the potentially affected street and freeway segments are projected to operate at unacceptable levels by the academic year 2034-2035 even without the proposed project, traffic impacts associated with this alternative would likely remain significant. Nonetheless, traffic impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, some of the proposed Master Plan improvements related to campus access, internal circulation, and public transit would be realized. Since parking demand would decrease compared to the proposed project, less new parking would be built. Impacts on public transit and parking would be less than significant and would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities: Water Demand and Supply

The 2005 Master Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on off-site water supply infrastructure, since increased water demand on campus associated with Master Plan build out would necessitate upgrades to off-site infrastructure maintained by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. No feasible mitigations exist to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, CSUN would only increase its enrollment cap by 5,000 FTEs, and only approximately half of the new facilities proposed under the 2005 Master Plan would be built. Demand for water supplies, and associated impacts on water supply systems, would be decreased compared to full Master Plan build-out. Impacts would remain less than significant and would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities: Wastewater

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts on wastewater conveyance infrastructure and treatment facilities, since existing infrastructure and facilities would adequately accommodate Master Plan build out.

Under the Reduced FTE Alternative, impacts on wastewater infrastructure and treatment facilities would remain less than significant, but would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

5.4.3 No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, the portion of campus north of Lassen Street would not be developed with housing for faculty and staff or commercial uses to serve that residential community, but instead would be developed in the future with academic, administrative, or student support facilities

as the University's need for such facilities arose, and at a density consistent with the Master Plan program for the remainder of campus. Additionally, the proposed faculty/staff housing in the Northwest Precinct, at the corner of Halsted Street and Darby Avenue, would not be built. CSUN would still raise its enrollment cap to 35,000 FTEs and all other Master Plan components and projects would be implemented.

As discussed below, this alternative would result in the same potentially significant impacts as the 2005 Master Plan, although impacts would be proportionately reduced. Implementation of this alternative would reduce the number of vehicle trips associated with the residential and commercial uses, and associated impacts on area intersections and street and freeway segments. However, since many of the affected roadways and freeway segments are projected to be operating at unacceptable levels by the date of Master Plan build out even without project implementation, implementation of the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative would nonetheless likely result in significant and unavoidable impacts on the same roadway and freeway segments as full build out of the 2005 Master Plan.

The No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative would not enable CSUN to meet its basic project objectives of providing on-campus housing to aid in faculty and staff recruitment. This could effectively preclude the University from achieving the necessary faculty:student ratio, which could in turn reduce its ability to meet project objectives related to the accommodation of projected enrollment increases; increasing opportunities for interactions and collaborations between students and faculty; and development as a regional center for intellectual, cultural, and lifelong learning.

Aesthetics

The proposed Master Plan would result in a number of beneficial, and thus less than significant, impacts on aesthetic character and views. Specifically, the Master Plan proposes enhancement of the existing Orange Grove and other campus open space areas; integration of existing facilities through campus landscaping; creation of shaded outdoor gathering places; implementation of a landscaped buffer between the campus and surrounding land uses using signature perimeter landscaping; the introduction of distinctive campus identification signage at points of entry; and the creation of view "windows" into the campus from off-site vantages.

Implementation of some Master Plan projects, including proposed near-term Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects such as play fields and parking structures, would result in significant impacts related to views from off-site vantages of parking structures along the campus perimeter, and nighttime light spillover and sky glow associated with new parking structures and play fields at or near the campus perimeter. These impacts would be reduced to less than significant levels with mitigation.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, many of the aesthetic benefits associated with the Master Plan would still be implemented. However, the portion of campus north of Lassen Street could remain undeveloped, or less consistently developed, for a longer period of time than the rest of the campus. Since this part of campus currently supports less landscaping, a less consistent plant palette, and less usable open space than the rest of the campus, some of the aesthetic benefits proposed for this part of campus by the 2005 Master Plan would not be realized, and this alternative would thus result in increased aesthetic impacts as compared to the Master Plan.

Air Quality

The 2005 Master Plan and proposed near-term Phase 1 and 2 projects would result in significant, unavoidable construction emissions of VOCs, NO_x, and CO. These impacts would be caused by the operation of construction equipment and site demolition, clearing, grading, and finishing activities associated with proposed new buildings and facilities. The Master Plan and near-term projects would also result in significant operational emissions of summertime VOCs, wintertime NO_x, and PM_{10} largely attributable to project-related traffic. No feasible mitigation measures exist to reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, the 600 dwelling units and associated commercial uses proposed under the Master Plan would not be built. However, it is likely that the sites proposed by the Master Plan for faculty/staff housing would be developed piecemeal as the need arose, with a mix of facilities similar to those on the rest of the campus. While it cannot be precisely determined what facilities would be built in place of the faculty/staff housing, it is possible that development densities would equal or exceed those of the proposed housing, and construction emissions could, therefore, be at least comparable to the proposed Master Plan.

Operational air emissions associated with project traffic would be reduced under this alternative for the foreseeable future, until other development proposals for the sites are prepared. However, since the provision of housing on campus is intended, in part, to reduce the need for employee commutes to the campus, this alternative could result in increased air emissions regionally, as compared to the proposed project, since the need for housing on the part of employees would remain.

Hazards and Hazardous Materials

The 2005 Master Plan, as well as proposed near-term Phase 1 and 2 projects, could result in potentially significant impacts related to the potential release of hazardous materials into the environment associated with project construction and operations, since the status of proposed development sites, and associated

potential for site contamination, is unknown at this time. Mitigation measures would reduce these impacts to less than significant levels.

The No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative would result in the development of most of the new facilities, and, therefore, project sites, proposed under the 2005 Master Plan, with the exceptions of the two locations proposed for faculty/staff housing. However, it is reasonable to assume that those sites would be developed in the future with a mix of academic, administrative, and/or student support uses as the need arose. Therefore, this alternative would result in comparable impacts to the proposed project.

Noise

Construction of the proposed Master Plan and near-term Phase 1 and Phase 2 projects would result in short-term but significant and unavoidable ambient exterior noise impacts at off-campus residential land uses. Construction of near-term projects sited at or near the perimeter of campus, including the proposed Transit Center, parking structures, and the Valley Performing Arts Center, would result in short-term, but significant, noise impacts at residences in proximity to the project sites. Construction of Phase 1 and Phase 2 student housing would also result in short-term but significant and unavoidable noise impacts on existing on-campus student housing in University Park, and construction of faculty/staff housing under Phase 2 is expected to cause significant and unavoidable noise impacts for already-constructed Phase 1 faculty/staff housing.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, most of the proposed Master Plan projects would be implemented, with the exception of faculty/staff housing. Construction-related noise impacts on off-site residences and on-campus student housing would be reduced under this alternative, since the sites proposed under the Master Plan for development in several phases with faculty/staff housing would instead be developed over time with a mix of uses. Since the remaining Master Plan projects would still be implemented under this alternative, this alternative would still result in significant and unavoidable construction-related noise impacts. Nonetheless, noise impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Population and Housing

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts related to local population projections, since it is intended to accommodate projected enrollment increases at CSUN; would be implemented as infill on the already-established CSUN campus; and would not displace any existing housing. Under the Master Plan, additional student housing would be developed on campus to increase the 24-hour on-campus population, together with new faculty/staff housing intended to aid in recruitment and maintain the necessary faculty:student ratio at the University.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, impacts related to growth projections and displacement of housing would be less than significant, comparable to the proposed project, but fewer of the benefits associated with the provision of new employee housing would be realized.

Public Services

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts on police and fire protection services. CSUN is served by the University Police Department; the Department would increase staffing as needed to meet campus police protection needs over time, and Master Plan implementation would not increase demand for City of Los Angeles police services. With respect to fire protection services, adherence to applicable building codes and required review of facility plans during Master Plan project construction would reduce the potential for increased fire hazards, and project implementation is not expected to interfere with emergency access.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, CSUN would increase its enrollment cap by the same number as is proposed by the Master Plan, and the remaining new facilities proposed under the Master Plan would still be built. The No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative would result in less than significant impacts on police and fire protection services, and impacts would be comparable to the proposed project.

Recreation

The 2005 Master Plan would result in beneficial, and, therefore, less than significant, impacts related to recreational and athletic opportunities and facilities. The 2005 Master Plan proposes to increase play field acreage by 6 acres, for a total of 46 acres; develop a new Student Recreation Center; develop facilities for restrooms, storage, concession operations, and other support needed for outdoor facilities and events; and enhance existing outdoor space on campus to provide more usable, shaded gathering places and new "secondary" open spaces such as courtyards, quadrangles, and plazas through new building placement.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, all of the improvements to, or proposed new, recreational and instructional athletic facilities would be implemented, and the beneficial recreational impacts of the Master Plan would be realized. Impacts would be less than significant and comparable to the proposed project.

Traffic

Operations associated with the 2005 Master Plan would result in significant, unavoidable impacts at two project intersections in the project area; the project area street segments; and on two freeway segments during the AM peak period and one freeway segment during the PM peak period. The impacts are

attributable to the projected increased enrollment at CSUN and attendant vehicle trip generation by students, faculty, and staff. The Master Plan proposes improvements related to campus access, internal vehicular and pedestrian circulation, and campus parking supply, which would constitute beneficial, and thus less than significant, impacts. The Master Plan also proposes the development of a Transit Center to accommodate increased use of public transit; the addition of a new internal campus tram route; and a recommendation to MTA for a new bus stop near campus.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, trip generation would be reduced as compared to the proposed project, since housing would generate more daily trips than a mix of academic, administrative, and student support uses. However, since many of the potentially affected street and freeway segments are projected to operate at unacceptable levels by the academic year 2034-2035 even without the proposed project, traffic impacts associated with this alternative would likely remain significant. Nonetheless, traffic impacts would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, proposed Master Plan improvements related to campus access, internal circulation, and public transit would be realized. Impacts on public transit and parking would be less than significant and would comparable to the proposed project.

Public Utilities: Water Demand and Supply

The 2005 Master Plan would result in significant and unavoidable impacts on off-site water supply infrastructure, since increased water demand on campus associated with Master Plan build out would necessitate upgrades to off-site infrastructure maintained by Los Angeles Department of Water and Power. No feasible mitigations exist to reduce impacts to less than significant levels.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, demand for water supplies, and associated impacts on water supply systems, would decrease substantially compared to full Master Plan build out, since the proposed 600 dwelling units would generate more demand for water, and infrastructure upgrades, than a mix of academic, administrative, and student support facilities would. Impacts would remain less than significant and would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

Public Utilities: Wastewater

The 2005 Master Plan would result in less than significant impacts on wastewater conveyance infrastructure and treatment facilities, since existing infrastructure and facilities would adequately accommodate Master Plan build out.

Under the No Faculty/Staff Housing Alternative, since housing would place more demands on wastewater conveyance systems and treatment facilities than a mix of academic, administrative and student support facilities, impacts on wastewater infrastructure and treatment facilities would. Impacts would remain less than significant, but would be reduced compared to the proposed project.

5.5 ENVIRONMENTALLY SUPERIOR ALTERNATIVE

The No Project Alternative would result in the avoidance of all significant impacts associated with the proposed 2005 Master Plan, and is, therefore, the environmentally superior alternative.

Apart from the No Project Alternative, the Reduced FTE Alternative would be considered the environmentally superior alternative, since it would result in reduced impacts for most environmental issues compared to the proposed project. However, the Reduced FTE Alternative would nonetheless result in significant, unavoidable impacts on the same environmental resources as the proposed 2005 Master Plan build out, and in contrast to the 2005 Master Plan furthermore preclude attainment of many of the basic project objectives.

6.0 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

6.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the growth-inducing potential of the proposed Master Plan project. Section 15126(d) of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* requires that an EIR discusses the ways in which a project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. This discussion is intended to include projects that would remove obstacles to population growth as well as projects that may encourage and facilitate other activities that, either individually or cumulatively, could significantly affect the environment. Increases in the population may further tax existing community service facilities, so consideration must be given to this impact in an EIR. It should not be assumed, however, that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

6.2 THE PROJECT'S GROWTH-INDUCING POTENTIAL

Consideration of a project's potential for growth inducement addresses two separate, but related, issues: (1) population growth, which could result from enhanced higher education facilities that encourages people to move to the area for school or employment opportunities; and (2) an increase in demand for housing as a result of the University's student/faculty/staff population growth. Each is discussed below.

The *CEQA Guidelines* also require that consideration be given to potential impacts on community service facilities resulting from increases in population. **Section 3.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, of this EIR addresses potential impacts on community service facilities (e.g., police and fire protection services, water, and wastewater) resulting from expected project-related population growth both on and off the project site.

The *CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to "discuss the ways" a project could be growth-inducing and to "…discuss the characteristics of some projects that may encourage…activities that could significantly affect the environment." However, the *CEQA Guidelines* do not require that an EIR specifically predict or speculate where such growth would occur, in what form it would occur, or when it would occur; the answers to those questions require speculation, which CEQA discourages (*CEQA Guidelines* §15145).

6.2.1 Growth Inducement Related to Enhanced Educational Opportunities

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would result in the demolition of certain existing campus facilities and replacement with new facilities intended for academic, administrative, and student support

purposes. The project also involves the development of campus housing for students, faculty, and staff. Implementation of the Master Plan would allow California State University, Northridge (CSUN) to expand its facilities in order to accommodate a projected enrollment increase of 10,000 additional full-time equivalent (FTE) students during the Master Plan time horizon. The increase in enrollment and corresponding provision of additional academic and campus support facilities for students, faculty, and staff, and the corresponding is consistent with California State University's (CSU's) system-wide enrollment growth projections.

In 1995, the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, projected that CSU would have a total enrollment of 406,317 graduate and undergraduate students (headcount) by fall 2004. In 2000, the Department of Finance had revised its projections for fall 2004 upwards to 414,091 headcount students. In 2003, projections for fall 2004 were once again revised upward to 418,002 headcount students. The Department projected enrollment of 518,110 headcount students in the CSU by 2012.[1]

In May 2003, in keeping with its state charter and in response to projections of unprecedented demand for higher education enrollment, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted a resolution directing each campus within the CSU to take the necessary steps to accommodate a projected system-wide enrollment increase of 107,000 FTEs by 2011.[2, 3] To comply with this directive, each campus is required to periodically review and revise its master plan, in part to ensure that proposed capital improvement programs remain in compliance with those plans.

The Board of Trustees' May 2003 directive for campuses to accommodate projected enrollment increases was made in response to current system-wide enrollment projections as well as CSU's mandate concerning the provision of postsecondary education. The CSU system is required by the State Board of Education to accept the top academic one-third of graduating high school students in California, and each campus within the system is required by the state's Education Code to accommodate its share of present and anticipated future enrollment.[4] The Trustees took into consideration a number of demographic, economic, social, and educational trends expected to influence future demand for postsecondary education. The Board of Trustee's Resolution acknowledged that, based on demographic projections and

---

1 California Department of Finance. Demographic Research Unit. November 2003. Website: http://www.dof.ca.gov. Accessed: June 1, 2005.

2 Whereas headcount simply accounts for the number of students enrolled, for masterplanning and academic planning purposes, CSUN utilizes the full-time equivalent (FTE), unit of measurement to calculate enrollment. One FTE is defined as one student taking 15 course units, which represents a full course load. Students taking fewer course units are considered to constitute a fraction of an FTE (10 course units = .66 FTE), whereas students taking more than 15 course units constitute more than one FTE (20 units = 1.33 FTEs).

3 California State University Committee on Educational Policy. *Campus Options to Achieve California State University Enrollment and Access Goals (REP 05-03-04).* May 13–14, 2003.

4 California Education Code, §66201 through 66207. Website: http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cacodes/edc/66201-66207.html. Accessed: July 7, 2005.

implementation of state policy directions regarding educational equity and access, the CSU system was required to prepare to accept 107,000 additional FTEs by 2011.

Since the last comprehensive Master Plan update in 1998, CSUN has seen a steady increase in enrollment, due in part to regional and statewide population trends. With a current student population of 24,473 FTEs, the University is nearly at its current enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTEs, and facilities are reaching capacity.

The 2005 Master Plan for the CSUN campus is, therefore, intended to respond to the Board of Trustees' directive to plan for its share of increased enrollment and accommodate the evolving needs of the University's academic, administrative, and student and campus support programs. In light of projected enrollment increases through 2011 and beyond, the 2005 Master Plan's horizon was set at 30 years to facilitate long-term planning. The Master Plan is intended to allow construction of additional facilities to accommodate an increase of 10,000 FTEs and 1,320 faculty and staff.

The University consulted with its academic units in preparation for the master planning process to determine the implications of increasing its enrollment ceiling on campus facilities. The Master Plan architects were then asked to determine the capacity of the campus to support the increased enrollment. At the CSU system average of 115,000 gross square feet (gsf) per 1,000 FTE students, an increase of approximately 1.15 million gsf of new academic and administrative facilities is needed to accommodate an additional 10,000 FTEs. The final Master Plan proposes 1.9 million gsf of academic, administrative, and student support facilities, which includes recreational and athletic instructional, food service, performing arts, and other facilities.

The Master Plan project, therefore, is not prompting population growth but rather is responding to California's projected population growth in this region. An increasing statewide population is resulting in an increasing need for college education facilities. As indicated in the report entitled *Providing for Progress: California Higher Education Enrollment Demand and Resources into the 21st Century Report*, prepared by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (February 2000), approximately 72 percent of the anticipated increase in college-bound students is caused by the state's growing population, which is, in turn, attributed to rising birth rates, declining death rates, and immigration from other regions of the country as well as internationally.

It should also be noted the remaining 28 percent of the projected statewide higher education enrollment increase will be the result of improved college participation rates (*Providing for Progress*, pg. 4). The rising cost of living in California, coupled with the changing nature of the economy, from an industrial to a predominantly information- and service-based system, is prompting greater numbers of people to pursue

a college degree. These larger social shifts are taking effect regardless of higher education facilities' ability to support this growing demand. Furthermore, statewide population growth over the last several years has already strained current higher education facilities, and improvements are long overdue to support the existing demand for higher education. Accordingly, the proposed Master Plan is considered growth accommodating rather than growth inducing.

As discussed in **Section 3.5, Population and Housing**, implementation of the Master Plan would accommodate an additional 10,000 FTEs, a total on-campus student residential population of 4,188 persons, a total faculty/staff residential population of up to 1,500 persons, and an additional 1,320 faculty and staff jobs on the campus, which could indirectly foster additional economic growth. The increased need for University employees could induce people to move into the area and lead to associated economic growth in the region. The increased student-led University employee population on campus could also lead to increased use of local businesses that serve the campus, such as restaurants, and thereby indirectly lead to economic growth.

Additionally, the Master Plan would create additional short-term employment opportunities during construction of individual Master Plan projects. The temporary employment opportunities provided by the Master Plan might induce a small number of people to move into the area and thereby indirectly induce minor indirect economic growth, by increasing demand for goods and services and housing. However, it is more likely that the majority of employees filling construction jobs associated with Master Plan implementation would be drawn from the local area or region; therefore, Master Plan-related construction is not considered to be a growth-inducing feature of the project.

As discussed in **Section 3.5, Population and Housing**, according to the South California Association of Governments (SCAG), the population in the City of Los Angeles subregion is currently 4,032,474, occupying 1,330,724 households. In 2030, the population is predicted to grow to 4,413,425 and occupy 1,663,002 households. The Northridge Community Plan projects the local population through year 2010. The Plan estimates that in 2010 the population within the Northridge Community Plan area will be 66,351 persons, occupying 23,627 dwelling units. The Master Plan would create an additional 1,320 faculty and staff employment opportunities, which would provide regional employment opportunities that would accommodate the anticipated residential population.

Finally, it is important to note the role that CSUN, and any university, serves in providing higher education opportunities including workforce training, continuing education, and the general advancement of human knowledge and research, which, in turn, support the state, regional, and local economy.

6.2.2 Growth Inducement Related to Additional Housing Demand

The total on-campus student residential population would increase by 4,188, and the faculty/staff residential population would total 1,500, with the construction of all proposed student and faculty/staff housing units. According to SCAG projections, the City of Los Angeles will have a population of 4,309,625 by the year 2030. Growth associated with Master Plan implementation would account for 1.2 percent of SCAG's projected growth in the City. This increase constitutes a minor percentage of SCAG's total growth projections for the City. Moreover, as previously stated, the Master Plan is intended to accommodate, not generate, projected growth.

The Northridge Community Plan projects the local population through year 2010. The Plan estimates that the population within the Northridge Community Plan area will be 66,351 persons, occupying 23,627 dwelling units. The residential components of the Master Plan that would be completed by the year 2010 include 252 student beds and 250 faculty/staff residential units. These beds and units represent a small fraction of the expected growth and would be consistent with Community Plan projections, goals, and policies regarding population growth and housing.

In addition to being consistent with the SCAG and Community Plan projections, the additional housing proposed on campus, as with all components of the 2005 Master Plan, is specifically intended to accommodate projected enrollment increases at CSUN through 2035. Faculty/staff housing is intended to aid in faculty/staff recruitment to maintain the necessary faculty to student ratio at the University. As previously stated, Master Plan implementation is not growth inducing and would not result in the exceedance of local population projections. Impacts related to local growth projections would be less than significant.

6.0 GROWTH INDUCEMENT

6.1 PURPOSE

The purpose of this section is to evaluate the growth-inducing potential of the proposed Master Plan project. Section 15126(d) of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* requires that an EIR discusses the ways in which a project could foster economic or population growth, or the construction of additional housing, either directly or indirectly, in the surrounding environment. This discussion is intended to include projects that would remove obstacles to population growth as well as projects that may encourage and facilitate other activities that, either individually or cumulatively, could significantly affect the environment. Increases in the population may further tax existing community service facilities, so consideration must be given to this impact in an EIR. It should not be assumed, however, that growth in any area is necessarily beneficial, detrimental, or of little significance to the environment.

6.2 THE PROJECT'S GROWTH-INDUCING POTENTIAL

Consideration of a project's potential for growth inducement addresses two separate, but related, issues: (1) population growth, which could result from enhanced higher education facilities that encourages people to move to the area for school or employment opportunities; and (2) an increase in demand for housing as a result of the University's student/faculty/staff population growth. Each is discussed below.

The *CEQA Guidelines* also require that consideration be given to potential impacts on community service facilities resulting from increases in population. **Section 3.0, Environmental Impact Analysis**, of this EIR addresses potential impacts on community service facilities (e.g., police and fire protection services, water, and wastewater) resulting from expected project-related population growth both on and off the project site.

The *CEQA Guidelines* require an EIR to "discuss the ways" a project could be growth-inducing and to "…discuss the characteristics of some projects that may encourage…activities that could significantly affect the environment." However, the *CEQA Guidelines* do not require that an EIR specifically predict or speculate where such growth would occur, in what form it would occur, or when it would occur; the answers to those questions require speculation, which CEQA discourages (*CEQA Guidelines* §15145).

6.2.1 Growth Inducement Related to Enhanced Educational Opportunities

Implementation of the proposed Master Plan would result in the demolition of certain existing campus facilities and replacement with new facilities intended for academic, administrative, and student support

purposes. The project also involves the development of campus housing for students, faculty, and staff. Implementation of the Master Plan would allow California State University, Northridge (CSUN) to expand its facilities in order to accommodate a projected enrollment increase of 10,000 additional full-time equivalent (FTE) students during the Master Plan time horizon. The increase in enrollment and corresponding provision of additional academic and campus support facilities for students, faculty, and staff, and the corresponding is consistent with California State University's (CSU's) system-wide enrollment growth projections.

In 1995, the California Department of Finance, Demographic Research Unit, projected that CSU would have a total enrollment of 406,317 graduate and undergraduate students (headcount) by fall 2004. In 2000, the Department of Finance had revised its projections for fall 2004 upwards to 414,091 headcount students. In 2003, projections for fall 2004 were once again revised upward to 418,002 headcount students. The Department projected enrollment of 518,110 headcount students in the CSU by 2012.[1]

In May 2003, in keeping with its state charter and in response to projections of unprecedented demand for higher education enrollment, the CSU Board of Trustees adopted a resolution directing each campus within the CSU to take the necessary steps to accommodate a projected system-wide enrollment increase of 107,000 FTEs by 2011.[2, 3] To comply with this directive, each campus is required to periodically review and revise its master plan, in part to ensure that proposed capital improvement programs remain in compliance with those plans.

The Board of Trustees' May 2003 directive for campuses to accommodate projected enrollment increases was made in response to current system-wide enrollment projections as well as CSU's mandate concerning the provision of postsecondary education. The CSU system is required by the State Board of Education to accept the top academic one-third of graduating high school students in California, and each campus within the system is required by the state's Education Code to accommodate its share of present and anticipated future enrollment.[4] The Trustees took into consideration a number of demographic, economic, social, and educational trends expected to influence future demand for postsecondary education. The Board of Trustee's Resolution acknowledged that, based on demographic projections and

---

1 California Department of Finance. Demographic Research Unit. November 2003. Website: http://www.dof.ca.gov. Accessed: June 1, 2005.

2 Whereas headcount simply accounts for the number of students enrolled, for masterplanning and academic planning purposes, CSUN utilizes the full-time equivalent (FTE), unit of measurement to calculate enrollment. One FTE is defined as one student taking 15 course units, which represents a full course load. Students taking fewer course units are considered to constitute a fraction of an FTE (10 course units = .66 FTE), whereas students taking more than 15 course units constitute more than one FTE (20 units = 1.33 FTEs).

3 California State University Committee on Educational Policy. *Campus Options to Achieve California State University Enrollment and Access Goals (REP 05-03-04).* May 13–14, 2003.

4 California Education Code, §66201 through 66207. Website: http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cacodes/edc/66201-66207.html. Accessed: July 7, 2005.

implementation of state policy directions regarding educational equity and access, the CSU system was required to prepare to accept 107,000 additional FTEs by 2011.

Since the last comprehensive Master Plan update in 1998, CSUN has seen a steady increase in enrollment, due in part to regional and statewide population trends. With a current student population of 24,473 FTEs, the University is nearly at its current enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTEs, and facilities are reaching capacity.

The 2005 Master Plan for the CSUN campus is, therefore, intended to respond to the Board of Trustees' directive to plan for its share of increased enrollment and accommodate the evolving needs of the University's academic, administrative, and student and campus support programs. In light of projected enrollment increases through 2011 and beyond, the 2005 Master Plan's horizon was set at 30 years to facilitate long-term planning. The Master Plan is intended to allow construction of additional facilities to accommodate an increase of 10,000 FTEs and 1,320 faculty and staff.

The University consulted with its academic units in preparation for the master planning process to determine the implications of increasing its enrollment ceiling on campus facilities. The Master Plan architects were then asked to determine the capacity of the campus to support the increased enrollment. At the CSU system average of 115,000 gross square feet (gsf) per 1,000 FTE students, an increase of approximately 1.15 million gsf of new academic and administrative facilities is needed to accommodate an additional 10,000 FTEs. The final Master Plan proposes 1.9 million gsf of academic, administrative, and student support facilities, which includes recreational and athletic instructional, food service, performing arts, and other facilities.

The Master Plan project, therefore, is not prompting population growth but rather is responding to California's projected population growth in this region. An increasing statewide population is resulting in an increasing need for college education facilities. As indicated in the report entitled *Providing for Progress: California Higher Education Enrollment Demand and Resources into the 21st Century Report*, prepared by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (February 2000), approximately 72 percent of the anticipated increase in college-bound students is caused by the state's growing population, which is, in turn, attributed to rising birth rates, declining death rates, and immigration from other regions of the country as well as internationally.

It should also be noted the remaining 28 percent of the projected statewide higher education enrollment increase will be the result of improved college participation rates (*Providing for Progress*, pg. 4). The rising cost of living in California, coupled with the changing nature of the economy, from an industrial to a predominantly information- and service-based system, is prompting greater numbers of people to pursue

a college degree. These larger social shifts are taking effect regardless of higher education facilities' ability to support this growing demand. Furthermore, statewide population growth over the last several years has already strained current higher education facilities, and improvements are long overdue to support the existing demand for higher education. Accordingly, the proposed Master Plan is considered growth accommodating rather than growth inducing.

As discussed in **Section 3.5, Population and Housing**, implementation of the Master Plan would accommodate an additional 10,000 FTEs, a total on-campus student residential population of 4,188 persons, a total faculty/staff residential population of up to 1,500 persons, and an additional 1,320 faculty and staff jobs on the campus, which could indirectly foster additional economic growth. The increased need for University employees could induce people to move into the area and lead to associated economic growth in the region. The increased student-led University employee population on campus could also lead to increased use of local businesses that serve the campus, such as restaurants, and thereby indirectly lead to economic growth.

Additionally, the Master Plan would create additional short-term employment opportunities during construction of individual Master Plan projects. The temporary employment opportunities provided by the Master Plan might induce a small number of people to move into the area and thereby indirectly induce minor indirect economic growth, by increasing demand for goods and services and housing. However, it is more likely that the majority of employees filling construction jobs associated with Master Plan implementation would be drawn from the local area or region; therefore, Master Plan-related construction is not considered to be a growth-inducing feature of the project.

As discussed in **Section 3.5, Population and Housing**, according to the South California Association of Governments (SCAG), the population in the City of Los Angeles subregion is currently 4,032,474, occupying 1,330,724 households. In 2030, the population is predicted to grow to 4,413,425 and occupy 1,663,002 households. The Northridge Community Plan projects the local population through year 2010. The Plan estimates that in 2010 the population within the Northridge Community Plan area will be 66,351 persons, occupying 23,627 dwelling units. The Master Plan would create an additional 1,320 faculty and staff employment opportunities, which would provide regional employment opportunities that would accommodate the anticipated residential population.

Finally, it is important to note the role that CSUN, and any university, serves in providing higher education opportunities including workforce training, continuing education, and the general advancement of human knowledge and research, which, in turn, support the state, regional, and local economy.

6.2.2 Growth Inducement Related to Additional Housing Demand

The total on-campus student residential population would increase by 4,188, and the faculty/staff residential population would total 1,500, with the construction of all proposed student and faculty/staff housing units. According to SCAG projections, the City of Los Angeles will have a population of 4,309,625 by the year 2030. Growth associated with Master Plan implementation would account for 1.2 percent of SCAG's projected growth in the City. This increase constitutes a minor percentage of SCAG's total growth projections for the City. Moreover, as previously stated, the Master Plan is intended to accommodate, not generate, projected growth.

The Northridge Community Plan projects the local population through year 2010. The Plan estimates that the population within the Northridge Community Plan area will be 66,351 persons, occupying 23,627 dwelling units. The residential components of the Master Plan that would be completed by the year 2010 include 252 student beds and 250 faculty/staff residential units. These beds and units represent a small fraction of the expected growth and would be consistent with Community Plan projections, goals, and policies regarding population growth and housing.

In addition to being consistent with the SCAG and Community Plan projections, the additional housing proposed on campus, as with all components of the 2005 Master Plan, is specifically intended to accommodate projected enrollment increases at CSUN through 2035. Faculty/staff housing is intended to aid in faculty/staff recruitment to maintain the necessary faculty to student ratio at the University. As previously stated, Master Plan implementation is not growth inducing and would not result in the exceedance of local population projections. Impacts related to local growth projections would be less than significant.

7.0 EFFECTS NOT FOUND TO BE SIGNIFICANT

7.1 PURPOSE

Section 15128 of the *California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines* requires an EIR to briefly describe any possible significant effects that were determined not to be significant and were, therefore, not discussed in detail in the EIR. This section addresses the potential environmental effects that have been found not to be significant as a result of the distribution of a Notice of Preparation (NOP), the responses to the NOP and the NOP scoping process. This section includes the environmental questions and issues addressed in the latest Initial Study checklist in Appendix G of the 2005 *CEQA Guidelines*. Any issues not addressed in this section are evaluated in detail **Section 3.0, Environmental Analysis**, of this EIR.

7.2 INTRODUCTION

Based on the NOP scoping process, potential impacts on the following resources were determined to be less than significant and are, therefore, not discussed in detail in this EIR: Agricultural Resources; Biological Resources; Cultural Resources; Geotechnical/Soils; Hydrology and Water Quality; Land Use and Planning; Mineral Resources; and certain Public Services (Libraries, Parks, Schools).

7.2.1 Agricultural Resources

The CSUN campus is developed with buildings, paved areas, or landscaped open space and is completely surrounded by urban and suburban uses. No farmland or agricultural activities are present in the area or on the campus. For this reason, implementation of the Master Plan would not involve changes that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. Therefore, no conversion of Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance to non-agricultural use would occur.

The campus is currently zoned for CSUN uses and is surrounded by urban and suburban development. Therefore, no impacts related to possible conflicts with zoning for agricultural uses or a Williamson Act contract would occur.

Since no farmland, agricultural land, or related uses are found in the area or on the campus, implementation of the Master Plan would not involve changes in the existing environment that could result in conversion of farmland to non-agricultural use.

7.2.2 Biological Resources

CSUN was established on its present site in 1956. The campus is located in a suburban setting and is fully developed with buildings, parking, roadways, and landscaped open space (including athletic fields and passive recreational facilities), and no longer contains any natural habitat. Existing vegetation, including trees, shrubs, lawn areas, and the Orange Grove provide habitat to a wide range of birds and mammals that are typically found in urban areas, such as pigeons and starlings. No natural habitat exists on the campus to support endangered, threatened, rare, or otherwise sensitive wildlife species, and no such species are known or expected to be present on campus.[1] Likewise, existing ornamental landscaping is not expected to constitute suitable habitat for any known special status species. Therefore, Master Plan implementation would have no impact on such species.

Trees on campus may be used for nesting by migratory and other birds. However, Master Plan implementation would increase the number of trees and amount of ornamental landscaping on the campus, and few trees are anticipated to require removal. No significant areas of landscaping, including Magnolia Walk and the Orange Grove, would be removed. The location of the proposed Science 5 building may require removal of some trees in the southern portion of the University's Botanic Garden. However, the Botanic Garden is an instructional space maintained by the College's Biology Department and removal of existing trees would be reviewed with the College during the design process. Master Plan implementation is not anticipated to substantially adversely affect migratory birds potentially present on campus.

The neighborhoods surrounding the campus are completely developed with commercial, residential, and other use, and all open space on the campus is landscaped and maintained by the University. No riparian habitat or sensitive natural community is present on campus or in the surrounding area. Therefore, no substantial adverse effects to such biological resources would result from implementation of the Master Plan.

The campus contains no wetland habitat or U.S. Geological Survey-designated blueline streams; therefore, implementation of the Master Plan would not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act through their direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means.

The campus is not suitable for, or used as, a wildlife dispersal or migration corridor because it is developed and entirely surrounded by urban and suburban uses and major roadways. It is not close to

---

1 California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDB), Habitat Conservation Division. Canoga Park and surrounding quadrangles. Database accessed November 10, 2005.

any major open space areas or wildlife migration corridors. Therefore, implementation of the Master Plan would not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites.

The campus is not included in an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. No known biological resources occur on the campus that are protected by local policies or ordinances. Therefore, no conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources would occur with implementation of the Master Plan.

7.2.3 Cultural Resources

Implementation of the Master Plan would result in the modification and expansion of existing facilities on the campus and the construction of new buildings. CSUN was established on its present site in 1956; there are no known historical structures on the campus that would be affected by the Master Plan. Therefore, implementation of the Master Plan would not cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an historical resource.

The City of Los Angeles General Plan indicates that the potential for archeological resources to occur within the City's planning area is limited. The project site is currently developed as a college campus; therefore, the opportunity to disturb archaeological resources that have not been disturbed by previous construction activities is minimal. For these reason, Master Plan implementation is neither anticipated to destroy any known archaeological resource nor cause a change in the significance of such a resource.

The City of Los Angeles General Plan indicates that the potential for paleontological resources to occur within the City's planning area is limited. The project site is currently developed as a college campus; therefore, the opportunity to disturb paleontological resources that have not been disturbed by previous construction activities is minimal. For these reasons, the project is neither anticipated to destroy any known paleontological resource nor cause a change in the significance of such a resource.

The Master Plan would not disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries that have not been previously disturbed by the existing development, and no impacts on human remains are anticipated.

7.2.4 Geotechnical/Soils

Geotechnical impacts were assessed in the CSUN Campus Master Plan Update, Final Master EIR, April 1998.[2] Because geological conditions have not changed since the Final Master EIR was prepared, the conclusions drawn in that document are applicable to the currently proposed 2005 Master Plan project.

The closest active faults to the site are the Northridge Hills fault, approximately three miles north of the site, and the Sierra Madre-San Fernando fault, approximately ten miles east of the project site. On January 17, 1994, an earthquake occurred in the Northridge area, registering an estimated magnitude of 6.8 on the Richter scale. The epicenter of this earthquake was within a few miles of the campus. According to Caltech seismologists, the earthquake occurred on an unnamed fault underneath the San Fernando Valley. The fault is believed to be related to the Elysian Park thrust-fault system that extends from the San Gabriel Valley through downtown Los Angeles, the Hollywood Hills, and the Santa Monica Mountains. The EIR determined that there are no known geologic conditions that would prevent development of the site. No known active faults pass through or are immediately adjacent to the campus, and the campus is not located within any Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The 1998 Final Master EIR concluded that the potential for fault rupture affecting the site is, therefore, considered to be low.

CSUN and all of the uses on the campus would be subject to strong ground motion during a significant earthquake on faults in the vicinity of the campus. Although the Northridge Hills fault is located within three miles of the site, the campus is not exposed to a greater than normal seismic risk for the Los Angeles basin. Southern California is a seismically active regions, and, thus, all new and existing development is susceptible to sustaining damage during strong seismic events. All new structure will be designed and constructed in conformance with the Uniform Building Code. Even so, during a significant seismic event, such as the January 1994 earthquake, damage to buildings could occur, but major structural damage or building collapse would not be expected.

The 1998 Master Plan EIR concluded that no significant geologic hazards are anticipated to result from implementation of that Campus Master Plan. Construction activities have occurred on the campus for over 40 years without incidence of expansive soils or subsidence. There are no significant slopes on the campus, and no known existing or potential landslides are present on or immediately adjacent to the site. According to the Los Angeles County Safety Element (1990), the campus is not within an area of shallow groundwater; therefore, the possibility of liquefaction occurring is considered low. The site is sufficiently distant and elevated from the Pacific Ocean that it would not be prone to hazards from tsunami, seiche, or flooding from a breached upgradient reservoir.

---

2 California State University, Northridge Campus Master Plan Update, Final Master EIR, April, 1998, Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates, Inc. (HBA).

No septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems are proposed as part of the implementation of the proposed development. Sewer connections would be made to existing lines in the surrounding area.

There are no unique geologic or physical features found on site. No significant impact will occur.

7.2.5 Hydrology and Water Quality

Hydrology and water quality impacts were assessed in the CSUN Campus Master Plan Update, Final Master EIR, April 1998.[3] Because hydrological conditions have not changed substantially since the Final Master EIR was prepared, the conclusions drawn in that document are applicable to the currently proposed 2005 Master Plan project.

The campus is located in a developed area, which contains an existing stormwater collection and conveyance system. Development of the Master Plan would result in a small increase in the amount of impervious surfaces on the existing campus, thereby requiring stormwater to be collected and drained into the adjacent storm drains. The uses anticipated within the Master Plan would not create effluent discharges from point sources and, thus, would not violate any waste discharge requirements. Infrastructure systems for the campus would comply with all federal, state, and county requirements for waste discharge. Based on the above, impacts with regard to the Master Plan project's potential to violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements would be less than significant.

The Master Plan would not directly use any groundwater to serve the campus; therefore, no substantial depletion to groundwater resources is anticipated. It should be noted that hardscape typically associated with building foundations, driveways, and roadways would limit the amount of permeable surfaces. Because only small portion of the future development would occur in areas presently unpaved, a small decrease in the amount of permeable surfaces is expected to occur; however, the Master Plan would not interfere with groundwater recharge. Therefore, impacts would be less than significant.

The topography of the CSUN campus is characteristic of the topography of the San Fernando Valley, gently sloping from north to south. The change in elevation from the north end of the campus to the south end of the campus is over 50 feet. However, subtle terraces which transverse the site in an east-west direction reduce the effect of this elevation change. In some areas, the campus appears to be generally flat. As a result of the topography, combined with other existing conditions, including a substantial amount of impervious surfaces and inadequate drainage facilities, several areas of the campus experienced severe flooding at the time the 1998 Master Plan EIR was prepared. At that time, the predominant "flood-prone" areas on the campus included Etiwanda, the lawn south of the Oviatt

3 Ibid.

Library, the entrance to the bookstore, and the south end of the athletic fields. The 1998 Master Plan EIR contained a section, which addressed the drainage and flooding problem on campus at that time and identified both infrastructure improvements and the introduction of subtle topographical features. The 1998 Master Plan incorporated features designed to minimize site-generated water runoff due to future development through landscaped areas and on-site drainage systems. With implementation of the 1998 Master Plan, all surface runoff would be collected in storm drains connected to the regional storm drainage system. As of 2004, the majority of the improvements have been made. The 2005 Master Plan also incorporates features designed to minimize site-generated water runoff due to Master Plan development through landscaped areas and on-site drainage systems. Impacts with regard to flooding and substantial erosion or siltation on or off site will be less than significant.

The on-site sewer system would be expanded to accommodate the 2005 Master Plan project. (Refer to **Section 3.10, Public Utilities: Wastewater**, for more information.) The 2005 Master Plan drainage infrastructure would be designed to accommodate flows from implementation of the Master Plan. Development of the Master Plan could result in the declining quality of stormwater runoff due to non-point source urban pollutants (from increased traffic on area streets, for example) and increased soil erosion and downstream sedimentation during project-related local construction. However, construction-related impacts would be avoided through preparation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, which is required under NPDES for any development over five acres. CSUN would also implement standard Best Management Practices to reduce non-point source pollution during project operation.

The campus does not contain a stream or river. The campus is located in an urbanized area that contains a fully developed stormwater collection and conveyance system. Consequently, the opportunity for the Master Plan to contribute to substantial erosion, siltation, or flooding on or off site is considered minimal.

The CSUN campus is not located in a 100-year flood hazard zone (City of Los Angeles, 1999). Therefore, the implementation of Master Plan would not place, within a 100-year flood hazard area, structures that would impede or redirect flood flows. The campus is not located in a potential inundation area; therefore, the project would not create a risk of loss, injury, or death involving flooding from failure of a dam or levee (City of Los Angeles, 1996).

The potential for mudflows or related natural disasters do not exist in this project because the campus is not located in an area subject to such events; therefore, these events are not considered a significant hazard at the campus.

7.2.6 Land Use and Planning

Northridge, the community within which the campus is located, is an established community. The existing campus is part of this community and the Master Plan would be located within the existing campus. As such, it would not divide a community. Therefore, implementation of the Master Plan would neither divide nor disrupt the arrangement of any established community and no impact would occur.

The campus is located on property within an urbanized area and is not included in an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan. Therefore, no impact would occur.

7.2.7 Mineral Resources

According to the City's *General Plan*, the campus is not located within a regionally significant aggregate resources zone. In addition, implementation of the Master Plan would not result in any substantial loss of known mineral resources that would be of value to the region or state because the campus is already developed and thus, is not available for extraction of mineral resources. Further development of the campus would not result in the additional loss of important mineral resource recovery. Therefore, no impact would occur.

According to the City's *General Plan*, the campus is not located within a regionally significant aggregate resources zone. Therefore, no impact would occur.

7.2.8 Public Services (Libraries, Parks, Schools)

An increasing statewide population is resulting in an increasing need for college education facilities. The 2005 Master Plan for the CSUN campus is intended to respond to the CSU's Board of Trustees' directive to plan for its share of increased enrollment and accommodate the evolving needs of the University's academic, administrative, and student- and campus-support programs. Thus, the Master Plan project is not prompting population growth but rather is responding to California's projected population growth in this region. This is discussed in detail in **Section 2.0, Project Description**.

As discussed in **Section 3.5, Population and Housing**, the total on-campus residential population would account for 1.2 percent of SCAG's projected growth in the City of Los Angeles. This increase, therefore, constitutes a minor percentage of SCAG's total growth projections for the City. The Northridge Community Plan projects the local population through year 2010. The residential components of the Master Plan that would be completed by the year 2010 represent a small fraction of the expected growth

and would be consistent with Community Plan projections, goals, and policies regarding population growth and housing.

In addition to being consistent with the SCAG and Community Plan projections, the additional housing proposed on campus, as with all components of the 2005 Master Plan, is specifically intended to accommodate projected enrollment increases at CSUN through 2035. Faculty/staff housing is intended to aid in faculty/staff recruitment to maintain the necessary faculty to student ratio at the University. As previously stated, Master Plan implementation is not growth inducing and would not result in the exceedance of local population projections.

Libraries

While project implementation would result in the generation of a direct increase in residential population, library facilities provided on campus would accommodate additional student and faculty/staff demand for library services, and the additional residential population is not expected to generate a greater demand for public library services. Finally, as stated above, the increased residential population related to the project is within the population projections of SCAG and the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, the impact to libraries would be less than significant.

Schools

Project implementation would result in the generation of a direct increase in residential population; however, the additional 600 faculty/staff housing units are not expected to generate more students than can be accommodated at local public schools. Implementation of the Master Plan would have a beneficial impact on the CSUN capacity by allowing the campus to accommodate additional students. Finally, as stated above, the increased residential population related to the project is within the population projections of SCAG and the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, the impact to schools would be less than significant.

Parks

While project implementation would result in the generation of a direct increase in residential population, park and recreational facilities provided on campus would accommodate additional student and faculty/staff demand for such facilities, and the additional residential population is not expected to generate a greater demand for park and recreational services. Finally, as stated above, the increased residential population related to the project is within the population projections of SCAG and the City of Los Angeles. Therefore, the impact to parks would be less than significant.

8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

Colin Donahue, Director of Facilities Planning, Design & Construction

AC MARTIN PARTNERS, INC.

Richard Thompson, AIA, AICP, Principal

Susan Painter, Ph.D., FCPA, Associate Senior Planner

Oscar Moran, Planner

IMPACT SCIENCES, INC.

Tom Worthington, President

Tony Locacciato, Principal

Anne Doehne, Associate Principal

Dave Deckman, Director of Air Quality Services

Nicole Cobleigh, Senior Project Manager

Julie Berger, Project Manager

Minta Schaefer, Staff Planner

Lucy Barraza, Staff Planner

Rahul Pendse, Staff Engineer

George Lu, Staff Planner

Paul Manzer, Arts and Communications Director

Leslie Fitzgerald, Production Coordinator

Ian Hillway, Production Coordinator

Naomi Kress, Production Coordinator

KAKU ASSOCIATES

Tom Gaul, Project Manager

Elizabeth Cheng, Project Engineer

WHEELER AND GRAY, INC.

John Kelly, Principal

Michelle Ma, Project Engineer

9.0 REFERENCES

The documents listed below are incorporated into this EIR by this reference.

California State Department of Finance, *E-1 City/County/State Population Estimates with Annual Percent Change*, January 1, 2004 and 2005, May 2005.

California State University Committee on Educational Policy, Campus Options to Achieve California State University Enrollment and Access Goals, May 13–14, 2003.

California State University, Northridge. "California State University, Northridge" [Online] October 26, 2005. <http://www.csun.edu>

California State University, Northridge Campus Master Plan Update, Final Master EIR, April, 1998. Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates, Inc. (HBA)

California State University, Northridge Department of Public Safety, Department of Public Safety Annual Report, 2003.

California State University, Northridge Draft Infrastructure Master Plan, Wheeler and Grey, revised September 30, 2005.

Cansler, Captain James H. Los Angeles Police Department, Los Angeles, California. Correspondence to Impact Sciences, Inc., October 5, 2005.

City of Los Angeles. "Department of Public Works, Bureau of Sanitation" [Online] <www.lacity.org/SAN/wpd/WPD/general/hypern1.htm>.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power, 2000 Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power, 2005 Draft Urban Water Management Plan for the City of Los Angeles Department of Water and Power.

City of Los Angeles, Department of Water and Power, Los Angeles Department of Water and Power 2004 Water Quality Report.

City of Los Angeles, Draft CEQA Thresholds Guide, May 14, 1998.

City of Los Angeles, Fire Code of the Los Angeles Municipal Code, Section 57.09.06.

City of Los Angeles, Los Angeles Municipal Code, Chapter XI, Article I, Section 111.03.

City of Los Angeles Planning Department. "Fire Protection and Prevention Plan." In *City of Los Angeles General Plan*. Los Angeles, California: City of Los Angeles Planning Department, January 1979.

City of Los Angeles City Planning Department. "Northridge Community Plan." In *Los Angeles General Plan*, (Los Angeles, California: City of Los Angeles City Planning Department, July 10, 1996.

City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning/Demographic Research Unit, Northridge Community Plan Population Estimates, May 2005.

City of Los Angeles. "Department of Recreation and Parks." [Online] October 5, 2005. <http://www.laparks.org>

Cowan, James P. Handbook of Environmental Acoustics, 1994.

Glavin, Anne. California State University, Northridge, Northridge, California. Correspondence to Impact Sciences, Inc., September 1, 2005.

Harris, M. Handbook of Noise Control, Revised 1989.

Hendriks, Rudolf W. California Vehicle Noise Emission Levels, California Department of Transportation, January 1987.

Hernandez, Alfred B. Los Angeles Fire Department, Los Angeles, California. Correspondence to Impact Sciences, Inc., December 28, 2004.

Kaku Associates, Inc., Traffic and Parking Study for the California State University Northridge Master Plan, October 2005.

Los Angeles Fire Department. "About the Los Angeles Fire Department." [Online] September 6, 2005. <www.lafd.org/about.htm>.

Metropolitan Transit Authority, 2004 Guidelines for CMP Transportation Impact Analysis, July 22, 2004.

State of California. California Education Code Section 66201 through 66207. [Online] July 7, 2005. <http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cacodes/ edc/66201-66207.html>.

Wells, Captain William N. Los Angeles Fire Department, Los Angeles, California. Correspondence to Impact Sciences, Inc., September 1, 2005.

U.S. Census Bureau. "2000 Census, American Fact Finder." [Online] October 14, 2005. <http://censtats.census.gov>.

U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Highway Noise Fundamentals, September 1980.