

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

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

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

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

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
AESTHETICS. Would the project:			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?	Less than Significant	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to trees, rock outcroppings and			

Table 4-1
Project Consistency with 2008 EIR

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

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

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

Table 4-1-1 shows maximum daily regional emissions during construction presented in the 2008 EIR in



emissions in the 2008 EIR. Regarding previously disclosed impacts, particulate matter 2.5 microns or less in diameter (PM_{2.5}) emissions would increase by 2.9 percent, which is not considered a more severe impact than that disclosed in the 2008 EIR. Maximum daily NO_x emissions would increase by 10 percent for a brief period of intense construction activities. This would not exacerbate the previously discussed significant impact due to the short-term duration of haul activity. The revised project would not result in new

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

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
cumulatively considerable impact. In addition, in accordance with SCAQMD guidance, the proposed project would not exacerbate the existing cumulatively considerable impact as project-specific emissions would not be significant.			
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES. Would the project:			
a. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service?	No Impact	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other			

Table 4-1
Project Consistency with 2008 EIR

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

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

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

GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS. Would the project:

- | | |
|---|--------------------------|
| a. Generate greenhouse gas emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment? | Not previously evaluated |
|---|--------------------------|

Table 4-1

Table 4-1
Project Consistency with 2008 EIR

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

The 2019 *CSU Transportation Impact Study Manual* provides procedures for screening out projects from detailed VMT analysis and for conducting detailed analysis, if a project is not screened out. Based on the

Table 4-1

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

Issues and Supporting Data Sources	2008 EIR Determination	2008 EIR Sufficient	Further Analysis Required
operation of the project would be supplied by Southern California Edison and Southern California Gas Company, respectively. The proposed project includes sustainable design features to meet and/or exceed energy goals, including exceeding Title 24 energy requirements and attaining LEED Platinum Rating. Therefore, the proposed project would not require the relocation or construction of new or expanded electric power or natural gas facilities. Impacts would be less than significant.			
WILDFIRE. If located in or near state responsibility areas or lands classified as very high fire hazard severity zones, would the project:			
a. Substantially impair an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Due to slope, prevailing winds, and other factors, exacerbate wildfire risks, and thereby expose project occupants to, pollutant concentrations from a wildfire or the uncontrolled spread of a wildfire?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Require the installation or maintenance of associated infrastructure (such as roads, fuel breaks, emergency water sources, power lines or other utilities) that may exacerbate fire risk or that may result in temporary or ongoing impacts to the environment?	Not previously evaluated	<input type="checkbox"/>	
d. Expose people or structures to significant risks, including downslope or downstream flooding or landslides, as a result of runoff, post-fire slope instability or debris flows/avalanches, or adverse impacts on soils stability?			

This section is prepared in accordance with Section 15126.2(c) of the CEQA Guidelines, which requires the discussion of any significant environmental effects that cannot be avoided if a project is implemented. These include impacts that can be mitigated, but cannot be reduced to a less than significant level. An analysis of environmental impacts caused by the proposed project has been conducted and is contained in Chapter 3 of this Supplemental EIRtal1Qq0.00000912 0 612 792 re6(10

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

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

The mitigation measures listed below are from the 2008 EIR and would be applicable to the proposed project. CSULB, as the CEQA lead agency, is responsible for implementing the apprtEIR use TJ7

14. The University will continue to comply with SCAQMD Rule 1403 (Asbestos Emissions from Renovation/Demolition Activities) and other pertinent regulations when working on structures containing asbestos, lead, or other toxic materials.
15. As appropriate, outdoor activities at the campus will be limited during high-dust and other heavy construction activities, including painting.
16. If construction activities occur adjacent to classrooms, student dormitories, health facilities and other sensitive receptors the University will either:
 - a. Make findings and notify each sensitive receptor that construction activity will not affect such receptor, or
 - b. Install and maintain filters on interior ventilation system to reduce intake of pollutants until construction activity ceases.

17) either:

4. Construction hours will be consistent with the City of Long Beach regulations to between 7 a.m. and 7 p.m. on weekdays and between 9 a.m. and 6 p.m. on Saturdays. No