

This Environmental Impact Report (EIR) assesses the potential environmental effects of the proposed University of California Merced Long Range Development Plan (hereinafter LRDP). This EIR (1) serves as a Supplement to the Site Selection EIR that was prepared and certified in 1995 by the Regents of the University of California; (2) addresses the overall long-term impacts from the full development of the LRDP; and (3) addresses impacts of the first phase of campus development.

As required by the California Environmental Quality Act, this EIR (1) assesses the expected individual and cumulative impacts of the University's physical development and land use plan and their effects on meeting the academic and institutional objectives for the Merced campus, (2) identifies means of minimizing potential adverse impacts, and (3) evaluates reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, including the required No Project Alternative. The Regents of the University of California is the "lead agency" for the project evaluated in this EIR and as such has the principal responsibility for approving the project.

1.1 PURPOSE OF THE EIR

The University of California has commissioned this EIR on the LRDP for the following purposes:

- To satisfy the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA);
- To inform the general public, the local community, responsible and interested public agencies, and the Board of Regents of the nature of the LRDP, its possible environmental effects, possible measures to mitigate those effects, and alternatives to the proposed LRDP;
- To enable the Regents of the University of California (the Regents) to consider environmental consequences when deciding whether to approve the LRDP;
- To provide a basis for preparation of any further environmental documents; and
- To serve as a source document for information needed by several regulatory agencies to issue permits and approvals for the proposed project.

As described in the CEQA Guidelines, public agencies are charged with the duty to avoid or minimize significant environmental damage where feasible. In discharging this duty, the public agency has an obligation to balance a variety of public objectives, including economic, environmental, and social. This EIR is an informational document, the purpose of which is to identify the potential significant effects of the proposed project on the environment and to indicate the manner in which those significant effects can be avoided, minimized, or mitigated; to identify any unavoidable adverse impacts that cannot be mitigated; and to identify reasonable and feasible alternatives to the proposed project that would eliminate any significant adverse environmental effects or reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

The lead agency (the Regents) is required to consider the information in the EIR, along with any other relevant information, in making its decision on the project. Although the EIR does not determine the ultimate decision that will be made regarding implementation of the project, CEQA requires the Regents to consider the information in the EIR and make findings regarding each significant effect identified in the EIR.

For the proposed LRDP, CEQA requires the University to prepare an EIR reflecting the independent judgment of the University regarding the impacts, the level of significance of the impacts both before and after mitigation, and the mitigation measures proposed to reduce impacts. The EIR is circulated to responsible agencies, trustee agencies with resources affected by the project, and interested agencies and individuals. The purpose of public and agency review of the EIR includes sharing expertise, disclosing agency analysis, checking for accuracy, detecting omissions, discovering public concerns, and soliciting counterproposals. In reviewing the EIR, reviewers should focus on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing possible impacts on the environment and avoiding or mitigating the significant effects of the proposed project.

1.2 OVERVIEW OF THE UC MERCED LRDP

The purpose of the proposed LRDP is to guide the physical planning and development of a new UC campus in Merced County. The proposed campus is located approximately 2 miles northeast of the city limits of Merced on property owned by the Virginia Smith Trust and the County of Merced. The site is immediately east of Lake Yosemite Regional Park and a portion of Lake Road.

The core of the LRDP is a land use map that designates major land use areas to guide the siting of the future physical development. There are three primary campus subareas addressed in the LRDP: the Main Campus, the Campus Land Reserve, and the Campus Natural Reserve. The Main Campus would include the academic core, support services, housing, parking, circulation, recreation, and open space. The Campus Land Reserve would be an area with no planned development. The Campus Natural Reserve would encompass a permanently undeveloped area dedicated to environmental conservation, open space, and scientific research.

1.3 PROJECT BACKGROUND

The University of California, Merced, would be the tenth campus of the University of California. It has been proposed to increase the University's enrollment capacity and to provide the benefits of a research university to Californians in the San Joaquin Valley. The rapidly growing San Joaquin Valley has the state's largest population concentration without ready proximity to a UC campus. Between now and 2020 the Valley's population will grow by over 60 percent, twice the rate of growth of the population of California as a whole.

In 1988, The Regents of the University of California (The Regents) authorized the President of the University to initiate planning for additional campuses to accommodate the student population expected in the latter part of the 20th century and into the 21st century. In 1990, The Regents further determined that the search for the first new campus should focus on the central portion of California, specifically the San Joaquin Valley, which is not served by a UC campus and where the university attendance rates for high school graduates are much lower than the state average. More than 85 sites in the central region were considered and, based on a number of factors including but not limited to demographics, transportation, and access to amenities, three finalist sites were identified. A programmatic EIR was then prepared that presented the environmental impacts from developing a campus at any one of the three finalist sites. This EIR, titled the Site Selection EIR (SSEIR), was certified by The Regents in 1995, and the Lake

Yosemite site in eastern Merced County was selected by The Regents as the site for the tenth UC campus.

In September 1997, The Regents authorized the University to proceed with the formal steps of the statewide approval process and the continued planning for development of the tenth campus. The addition of a UC Merced campus would enable the University to maintain overall undergraduate access at levels contemplated in the California Master Plan for Higher Education, as well as fulfill its teaching, research, and public service mission in the San Joaquin Valley.

In February 1999, the University submitted a completed “Needs Study” to the California Post-Secondary Education Commission (CPEC). In its formal review of the Needs Study in June 1999, CPEC endorsed the creation of a new UC campus on the Lake Yosemite site and gave its support for an ultimate campus buildout of 25,000 full-time-equivalent (FTE)¹ students, beginning with an enrollment level of about 1,000 FTE students. CPEC also endorsed the general academic goals for the new campus, specifically, to develop UC Merced as a research university with an initial orientation that highlights the sciences and engineering. Over time, UC Merced will develop the complete array of undergraduate and graduate letters, arts, sciences, and engineering programs, together with selected professional programs that characterize a general UC campus.

Enrollment Shortfall and Need for New Facilities

The California State Department of Finance’s Demographic Research Unit (DRU) and the University of California’s internal projections both project a dramatic increase in the number of qualified California students seeking admission to the UC system over the next decade. The most recent DRU analysis predicts a growth in enrollment of over 30 percent between 2000 and 2010. Accordingly, the University estimates the need to accommodate 63,000 additional students (FTE) for the period 1998–99 through 2010–11.

This growth is anticipated as a result of several converging demographic factors that collectively increase the demand for a college education. These factors include a substantial population growth, a relative increase in the proportion of college-age students as the children of the post–World War II baby boom reach college age, and the recent economic expansion. Another factor increasing future enrollments is the changing participation rate of Hispanic students. Currently, only about 3.2 percent of Hispanic high-school students attend UC. If the University is successful in raising the Hispanic participation rate to the state average of 7.7 percent, it will generate another 10,000 new students above the current planning targets.

In response to the anticipated enrollment demand, state policy makers have asked the universities and colleges in California to begin studying the feasibility of accommodating the projected growth. Based on the present LRDP constraints applicable to each of the University’s nine existing campuses, only 34,100 of the 63,100 new students can be accommodated. If all potential LRDP amendments can be adopted at the existing campuses, the UC system could accommodate an additional 24,000 students. A shortfall of approximately 5,000 students would

¹ A full-time-equivalent student is defined as one who enrolls for 30 credit hours for a semester-system school and 45 credit hours for a quarter-system school. Since universities have part-time students, there are fewer FTE students than the number of actual students enrolled.

remain, and enrollment demands beyond 2010 would become even more difficult to accommodate because remaining expansion potential at existing campuses will have been substantially exhausted.

Because the University of California remains committed to fulfilling its responsibility under the California Master Plan for Higher Education to accommodate all eligible students from among the top 12.5 percent of public school graduates who choose to attend, the University must prepare for the increasing enrollment demands. The UC Merced campus is critical to the University's long-term ability to accommodate the projected systemwide enrollment growth of 63,100 students by 2010 and the enrollment demands beyond then.

Higher Educational and Economic Regional Disparities in the San Joaquin Valley

From the outset of planning for the UC Merced Campus in the late 1980s, The Regents recognized UC's obligation to better serve California's fast-growing San Joaquin Valley. The location of the new campus in the San Joaquin Valley was based upon the University's desire to address the economic, demographic, and cultural gap in the University's admissions for San Joaquin Valley students.

The per capita income figures for the San Joaquin Valley lag behind the State's. The disparity in per capita income for this region has grown since 1990 from 25 percent below the State's figures to now more than 31 percent below. Current per capita personal incomes range from a low of \$18,732 in Kings County to \$21,544 in San Joaquin County (Johnson, 2001). The regional unemployment rate of 8.8 percent in comparison with the statewide rate of 5.1 percent also illustrates the economic circumstances of the region (Employment Development Department, 6/13/01).

Demographically, Californians are approximately 46.7 percent white and 32.4 percent Hispanic. In the San Joaquin Valley, over 40 percent of the children are Hispanic. About 44.3 percent of the population in Madera County and 51 percent in Tulare County are Hispanic (U.S. Census 2000, 3/30/01). Population projections for the State indicate that the Hispanic population will increase from 9 million to 28 million, while the Caucasian population will increase only from 17 to 18 million (Johnson, 1999).

The diverse and economically disadvantaged San Joaquin Valley population has been significantly underrepresented at UC campuses. In comparison with the statewide average of about 7.5 percent, student attendance percentages for San Joaquin Valley students ranged from 2.8 to 3.3 percent during the period of 1989 to 1996. Overall eligibility and college-attendance rates in the San Joaquin Valley lag behind those of other parts of state.

The University's Site Selection Task Force (SSTF) recognized that the San Joaquin Valley has the largest population concentration in California that is at a distance greater than 50 miles from a UC Campus. Part of the UC mission is to assure the widest possible geographic distribution of educational and economic benefits. As illustrated at other UC Campuses such as Berkeley, a large percentage of students enrolled at a campus come from the surrounding region. By locating a new campus in the underserved San Joaquin Valley, the region's participation rates are expected to improve significantly.

Although the University as a whole has a statewide mission, each campus generates distinctly local benefits. In addition, research universities facilitate development of business and industry in the same proximate area in which they are located. University spending provides a direct stimulus to the local economy from the millions of dollars spent on goods and services.

The UC Merced Campus is the centerpiece of University of California's commitment to increase San Joaquin Valley higher-education participation and help generate a more equitable distribution of State economic and social opportunities. Campus administrators have initiated an intensive joint program with other regional institutions of higher education to improve San Joaquin Valley K-12 student preparation for college. UC Merced will also form substantial programmatic ties with local community colleges to further stimulate the migration of qualified, postsecondary students into the UC system.

1.4 EIR REVIEW PROCESS

Public Review

A Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared and circulated on February 15 through March 19, 2001, for a 32-day period of public comment. A copy of the NOP is included in this document (Appendix A). Comments on the NOP are also included in this EIR (Appendix A). This Draft EIR will be publicly circulated on August 13, 2001, for a 45-day period of review and comment by the public and other interested parties, agencies, and organizations. The public review period will conclude at 5 p.m. on September 27, 2001. All comments or questions about the EIR should be addressed to

Ric Notini
Environmental and Permitting Manager
University of California, Merced
1170 W. Olive Avenue
Merced, CA 95348

Following the close of the written public comment period, responses to written and oral comments raising major environmental issues regarding the project will be prepared and published in a supplement to this document. The Final EIR (consisting of this Draft EIR and a published supplement containing comments received on this Draft EIR and responses to comments) will then be considered by The Regents in a public meeting and will be certified if it is determined to be in compliance with CEQA. Upon certification of the EIR, the LRDP will be considered for approval by The Regents.

CEQA Findings and Mitigation Monitoring

CEQA requires that when a public agency makes findings based on an EIR, the public agency must adopt a reporting or monitoring program for those measures that it has adopted or made a condition of the project approval in order to mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment. The reporting or monitoring program must be designed to ensure compliance during project implementation.

The Mitigation Monitoring Program for the LRDP EIR will be prepared, and will be considered by The Regents in conjunction with LRDP EIR.

1.5 USES OF THE LRDP EIR

This document serves four purposes. First, it supplements the SSEIR to address the implications of adjusting the location of the proposed campus relative to the location previously identified in 1995. Second, the EIR will be used by The Regents of the University of California to evaluate the environmental implications of its decision whether to adopt the LRDP. In the event that this approval is granted, this EIR will be used to focus environmental review of subsequent phases of campus development. This EIR will also be used to evaluate the effects of approving Phase 1 of the campus. The environmental effects of the Phase 1 Campus are described in Volume 2. Lastly, this document will also be used as a source of information by responsible agencies with permitting or approval authority over the project.

Other Agency Approvals

This EIR has been designed to provide information to a number of agencies to assist them in the permitting processes for the LRDP.

Section 404 Permit. Implementation of the LRDP would result in the filling of wetlands and other waters of the United States on the proposed site. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates the nation's waterways and wetlands. USACE responsibilities include regulating activities in wetlands, including issuing dredge and fill permits and authorizing the establishment of wetland areas. The regulatory branch of the Army Corps is responsible for implementing and enforcing Section 404 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA). Army Corps regulations require that any activity that discharges fill material and/or requires excavation in "waters of the United States" (see below), including wetlands, must obtain a Section 404 permit. As part of the permit process, mitigation for unavoidable impacts to wetlands is required. Mitigation can be in the form of wetland restoration, creation, enhancement, or preservation.

In issuing a Section 404 permit pursuant to Section 404(b), the USACE requires that an evaluation be conducted to demonstrate that the proposed project is the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative. The analysis included in Section 4 of this EIR provides information that may be used for this alternatives analysis. The USACE is also required to comply with the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) before it may issue an individual Section 404 permit. This EIR represents a substantial source document for the USACE's NEPA compliance document.

Section 10 Compliance. Under the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, the USACE requires permits for activities involving the obstruction of the navigable capacity of any waters of the United States or the construction of structures or alteration of capacity in any port, canal, navigable river, or other water of the United States. "Navigable waters" under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act are defined as "those waters of the United States that are subject to the ebb and flow of the tide shoreward to the mean high water mark and/or are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible to use to transport interstate or foreign commerce." Pursuant to Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, the USACE administers this regulatory program separately from the Section 404 program. This EIR represents a substantial

source document for the USACE's NEPA compliance document for the issuance of a Section 10 permit, should one be necessary for the project.

Section 10 of the Endangered Species Act. Section 10 of the Federal Endangered Species Act also provides a non-federal applicant a mechanism to obtain incidental take authorization for federally listed threatened or endangered species. The County is undertaking the preparation of a habitat conservation plan (HCP) under Section 10. Although this process is not expected to be complete until sometime after permit and approvals are issued for the Main Campus, the USFWS may consider the information contained in this EIR as part of the HCP process.

Section 401 Water Quality Certification. The State Water Resources Control Board and the Regional Water Quality Control Boards (RWQCB) promulgate and enforce narrative and numeric water quality standards in order to protect water quality and adopt and approve Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans). The State Board and the Regional Boards also regulate discharges of harmful substances to surface waters, including wetlands, under the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act (Porter-Cologne). Issuance of a Section 404 permit is subject to water quality certification under Section 401 of the Clean Water Act. The RWQCB would use this EIR to make a determination whether the filling of wetlands due to project implementation would result in water quality impacts under the Clean Water Act or the Porter-Cologne Act.

Waste Discharge Requirements. Under the Porter-Cologne Act, the RWQCBs regulate the discharge of "waste" into "waters of the state." Water Code Section 13260 requires "any person discharging, or proposing to discharge waste, within any region that could affect the waters of the state to file a report of discharge." A report of waste discharge ("RWD") is essentially an application for waste discharge requirements ("WDRs"). WDRs contain conditions imposed on a given discharge by the appropriate RWQCBs for the purpose of protecting the beneficial uses of the waters of the state. Upon receipt of a RWD, the RWQCB may issue WDRs imposing conditions on the proposed discharge, or it may waive the requirement for WDRs. In the event that the Central Valley RWQCB determines WDRs are necessary, the Central Valley RWQCB would use this EIR to make a determination whether WDRs should be issued for the project.

Section 7 Consultation. The Federal Endangered Species Act requires a federal agency (in this case the USACE with regard to the issuance of a Section 404 permit) to seek formal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for species listed as threatened or endangered, or proposed for listing as threatened or endangered. Based on this consultation, the USFWS issues a biological opinion determining whether the project is likely to adversely affect or jeopardize the continued existence of a federally listed species, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat proposed to be designated for such species. Substantial information regarding federal special-status species is presented in Section 4.4 and Appendix D of this EIR.

Section 106 Compliance. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA), as amended—by 16 U.S.C. § 470 et seq.; § 106; 36 C.F.R. 800, includes provisions for protection of significant archaeological and historical resources. Procedures for dealing with previously unsuspected cultural resources discovered during construction are identified in 36 C.F.R. 800 (for implementing § 106 processes.) The administering agency is the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the federal lead agency. Through the NEPA process, the Army Corps of

Engineers would consult with the SHPO to determine the federal project's compliance with Section 106.

Section 1601 Permit. The California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) requires notification for any project or activity that will take place in or in the vicinity of a river, stream, lake, or its tributaries. Section 1601 (1603 for private entities) of the Fish and Game Code requires that State or local governmental agencies notify CDFG before they begin any construction project that will (1) divert, obstruct, or change the natural flow or the bed, channel, or bank of any river, stream, or lake; (2) use materials from a streambed; or (3) result in the disposal or disposition of debris, waste, or other material containing crumbled, flaked, or ground pavement where it can pass into any river, stream, or lake. The proposed LRDP would result in alterations to the bed and bank of Cottonwood Creek and would require a Streambed Alteration Agreement from the CDFG pursuant to Section 1601. The CDFG is required to base its decision with respect to a streambed alteration agreement on a CEQA compliance document. This EIR has been developed to provide the CDFG with an evaluation of likely impacts of the proposed project on Cottonwood Creek to facilitate the permitting process.

Section 2081 Compliance. Section 2081 of the California Endangered Species Act permits the "take" (hunt, pursue, catch, or kill) of endangered or threatened species, provided that the take is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, the impacts of the authorized take are minimized and fully mitigated, the take permit is consistent with the CDFG recovery programs, the applicant ensures adequate funding to implement the mitigation and monitoring program, and the action will not jeopardize the continued existence of the species. The University would be required to obtain a take permit from the CDFG prior to conducting activities that result in the potential take of state listed species or obtain authorization for incidental take through the Natural Community Conservation Planning (NCCP) process for eastern Merced County.

NPDES Permits. The Clean Water Act (CWA) requires a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for any discharge of pollutants from a point source to waters of the United States. This law and its regulations also apply to storm water. In 1987, Congress amended the CWA to require implementation, in two phases, of a comprehensive national program for addressing storm water discharges. Phase I required NPDES permits for storm water discharge from a large number of priority sources, including medium and large municipal separate storm sewer systems (MS4s), and several categories of industrial activity, including construction activity that disturbs 5 or more acres of land. Phase II of the storm water program requires permits for storm water discharges from certain small municipal separate storm sewer systems and construction activity generally disturbing between 1 and 5 acres. The proposed campus would be subject to these Phase II requirements. The construction of Phase 1 of the proposed campus would be subject to Phase I NPDES requirements for construction projects.

Authority to Construct and Permit to Operate. San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District Authority (SJVUAPCD) Rule 2010 regulates the construction, alteration, replacement, and operation of stationary sources of air contaminant emission through the issuance of air permits (i.e., Authority to Construct (ATC) and Permit to Operate (PTO)). This permitting process allows the SJVUAPCD to adequately review new and modified air pollution sources to ensure compliance with all applicable rules and to ensure that emission controls are used. An ATC allows for the construction of the air pollution source and remains in effect until the PTO

application is granted, denied, or cancelled. The ATC includes construction standards and emission limits that must be achieved before an issuance of a PTO. Once the project commences operation and demonstrates compliance with the ATC conditions, the SJVUAPCD will issue a PTO. The PTO specifies conditions that the air pollution source must meet to continue to comply with other air quality standards. Potential stationary sources that could require an air permit include a cogeneration plant and large boilers.

Approval for Conversion of Parkland. The proposed project involves the conversion of 260 acres of undeveloped park land at Lake Yosemite Regional Park to campus uses. Because these lands were acquired using federal and state monies, approvals for conversion would be necessary from the California State Department of Parks and Recreation, the National Park Service, and by a specific act of the state legislature.

Other Permits and Approvals. A variety of other permits and approvals from federal, state, and local agencies may be needed for aspects of the project, or for implementation of project mitigation. These may include formation of special districts or changes in urban services boundaries by the Local Agency Formation Commission, encroachment permits, and approvals for wastewater, water, electricity, and other infrastructure providers for service and extension of facilities to the campus.

1.6 LEVELS OF SIGNIFICANCE

This EIR uses a variety of terms to describe the level of significance of adverse impacts identified during the course of the environmental analysis. The following are definitions of terms used in this EIR:

Significant and Unavoidable Impact—Impacts that exceed the defined standards of significance and that cannot be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

Significant Impact—Impacts that exceed the defined standards of significance and that can be eliminated or reduced to a less-than-significant level through the implementation of feasible mitigation measures.

Potentially Significant Impact—Significant impacts that may ultimately be determined to be less than significant; the level of significance may be reduced in the future through implementation of policies or guidelines (that are not required by statute or ordinance), or through further definition of the project detail in the future. Potentially significant impacts may also be impacts about which there is not enough information to draw a final conclusion; however, for the purpose of this EIR, they are considered significant. Such impacts are equivalent to significant impacts and require the identification of feasible mitigation measures.

Less-Than-Significant Impact—Impacts that are adverse but that do not exceed the defined standards of significance.

1.7 ORGANIZATION OF THE EIR

This multipurpose EIR is organized in two volumes. Volume 1 addresses the impacts of the physical development of the full LRDP. The Supplement to the Site Selection EIR is included

within this volume. The more specific impacts of the first phase of the UC Merced campus are presented separately in Volume 2.

Volume 1 is organized into the following sections:

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Summarizes environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the LRDP, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation.

Section 1, Introduction. Provides an introduction and overview describing the intended use of the EIR and the review and certification process.

Section 2, Project Description. Provides a detailed description of the LRDP, including its location, background information, major objectives, and structural and technical characteristics.

Section 3, Demographic Characteristics. Describes the anticipated changes in population and employment that could result from implementation of the LRDP.

Section 4, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. Contains the individual and cumulative analysis of environmental-issue areas. The subsection for each environmental issue contains an introduction and description of the existing setting, standards of significance, methodology used to evaluate impacts, identifies impacts, recommends appropriate mitigation measures, and identifies cumulative impacts.

Section 5, Alternatives to the Proposed Project. Describes the alternatives to the location and size of the campus and compares the alternatives to the proposed project.

Section 6, Growth Inducement. Provides discussions required by CEQA regarding potential growth-inducing impacts that would result from the LRDP.

Section 7, Other CEQA Considerations. Provides discussions required by CEQA regarding impacts that would result from the LRDP including a summary of cumulative impacts and unavoidable significant impacts.

Section 8, Consultation and Coordination. Provides a list of persons and agencies contacted.

Section 9, List of Preparers and Contributors. Identifies the persons who prepared the EIR and those who were consulted during its preparation.

Volume 2 is organized into the following sections:

Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures. Summarizes environmental impacts that would result from construction of Phase 1 of the UC Merced campus, describes proposed mitigation measures, and indicates the level of significance of impacts after mitigation.

Section 1, Introduction. Provides an introduction and overview describing the impact analysis for Phase 1 Campus and its relationship to the LRDP EIR.

Section 2, Project Description. Provides a detailed description of Phase 1 Campus, including its location, background information, major objectives, and structural and technical characteristics.

Section 3, Environmental Setting, Impacts, and Mitigation Measures. Contains the project-level analysis of environmental-issue areas. Provides a summary discussion of impacts adequately analyzed in Volume 1. Subsections for aesthetics, air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geology, seismicity and soils, hazards and hazardous materials, hydrology and water quality, noise, recreation, and traffic circulation and parking include an introduction and description of the existing setting specific to the Phase 1 Campus, standards of significance, methodology used to evaluate impacts, and recommendations for appropriate mitigation measures.

Section 4, Alternatives. Summarizes the alternatives considered in Volume 1 and analyzes alternatives to the Phase 1 Campus.

Section 5, Other CEQA Considerations. Provides a summary of unavoidable significant impacts, significant irreversible changes, and growth-inducing impacts.

Appendix A, Project Scoping. Contains the Notice of Preparation and letters received during the scoping process.

Appendix B, Air Quality Model Runs.

Appendix C, Additional Biological Resources Information.

REFERENCES

California Department of Finance, 2001. California Demographics, 2000 Census.

<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/2000Cover.htm>.

Employment Development Department, 2001. California's Unemployment Rate Increases.

News Release No. 01-41. <http://www.edd.ca.gov/nwsre107tx.htm>.

Johnson, Hans P., October 1999. How many Californians? A review of population projections for the state. California counts: population trends and profiles, Volume 1, Number 1, Public Policy Institute of California, p. 8.

Johnson, Hans P., Correspondence with URS by e-mail, July 12, 2001.