

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 1:30 p.m., Tuesday, May 9, 2000  
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
Debra S. Farar  
Harold Goldwhite  
Frederick W. Pierce IV  
Anthony M. Vitti

#### Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of March 14, 2000

1. Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded, *Action*

#### Discussion Items

2. Status Report on the 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, *Information*
3. Concur with the Findings in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve Initial Campus Master Plan, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for Phase I Development of California State University, San Bernardino, Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center in Palm Desert, *Action*
4. Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Center for Musical Arts at Sonoma State University, *Action*
5. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF  
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Trustees of The California State University  
San Jose State University  
Student Union  
One Washington Square  
San Jose, California**

**March 14, 2000**

**Members Present**

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
Debra S. Farar  
Harold Goldwhite  
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Frederick W. Pierce IV  
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio  
Michael D. Stennis  
Anthony M. Vitti

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Academic Officer  
Richard P. West, Executive Vice Chancellor and Chief Financial Officer  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 4:51 p.m.

**Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of January 25, 2000, were approved as submitted.

Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Razi presented Agenda Item 1 as a consent action item.

**The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-05-00).**

Status Report on the 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

**At Chair Razi's request, Patrick Drohan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction, made reference to this item's handout that represented the action of the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) with regard to the trustees' proposal. He stated that the LAO is recommending**

**that the legislature not support the CSU Monterey Bay, Science/Academic Center and CSU San Marcos, Library Information Center projects. Capital Planning, Design and Construction has responded to the LAO's recommendations, and pre-budget hearing meetings are scheduled to attempt to resolve these issues.**

Categories and Criteria for the 2001/02 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

**Assistant Vice Chancellor Patrick Drohan briefly reviewed the item as printed in the agenda.**

**Trustee Pierce stated that reference is made under the general criteria to the master plan enrollment ceilings. In the context of year-round operations, Trustee Pierce asked how the master plan caps are being considered, as that may impact our ability to accommodate capacity.**

**Mr. Drohan answered that the physical master plan ceilings, expressed in FTES, that are represented by the referenced figures were derived around capacity growth documents that the trustees passed many years ago and updated in the mid-1980s. The figures refer to a maximum physical capacity to accommodate instruction in a given term, not an annual figure. Year-round operation allows for more enrollment to be accommodated but on a throughput capacity basis rather than the physical capacity constraints around a single term.**

**The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-06-00).**

Approval of Schematic Plans

**With the use of a computerized presentation, Mr. Drohan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. This item proposed the approval of schematic plans for California State University, Monterey Bay – Science Academic Center; San Diego State University – Chemistry, Geology, Business Administration and Math Buildings Renovation; and California State University, San Marcos – Field House/Student Union Offices.**

**President Smith noted that the Science Academic Center is the first new structure at CSU Monterey Bay (CSUMB). The funding is a direct result of Prop 1A for new and small start-up operations at institutions like CSUMB.**

**President Weber stated that he is very pleased that the renovation plan at San Diego State is going to turn an ugly and inefficient building into a more energy efficient as well as a better-used facility by both faculty and students.**

**President Gonzalez stated that the proposed project at California State University, San Marcos will meet needs for recreational and student offices.**

**Trustee Wang noted that CSU Monterey Bay's public/private project cost estimate is \$22 million, but the trustees' request on the status report shows \$14+ million; and he inquired if this difference will impact the plan.**

**Mr. Drohan replied that it is the CSU's intent to be successful in gaining approval for the \$14+ million in state funding and that the campus is committed to having the remaining nonstate funds in place when we are ready to use the construction funds for this project.**

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 1  
May 9-10, 2000

**COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

**Summary**

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 1999/2000 state funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

- |   |      |              |
|---|------|--------------|
| 1. California State University, Fullerton<br>Energy Management System Upgrade | PWCE | \$ 1,202,000 |
| 2. San Diego State University<br>Cogeneration Facility                        | PWCE | \$17,325,000 |

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

**ITEM**

2

Agenda Item 1  
May 9-10, 2000

**COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Amend the 1999/2000 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded**

This item amends the 1999/2000 state funded capital outlay program to include the following project:

- |  |             |                     |
|--|-------------|---------------------|
| <b>1. California State University, Fullerton</b> | <b>PWCE</b> | <b>\$ 1,202,000</b> |
| <b>Energy Management System Upgrade</b>          |             |                     |

CSU Fullerton wishes to proceed with the design and installation of a new energy management system. A large portion of the existing energy management system was designed and installed in the early 1980s, and the legacy system manufacturer no longer supports or produces the product line for the system. The proposed project will phase out a degrading network, replace all legacy system components and integrate existing compatible components with the new system. The new system will also include hardware and software necessary to shut off fan equipment and lighting during hours of non-occupancy. This will allow the campus to more effectively manage energy consumption and costs. The project will be financed through the use of tax-exempt lease financing with the annual energy cost savings utilized to make the required lease payments.

- |                                      |             |                     |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|
| <b>2. San Diego State University</b> | <b>PWCE</b> | <b>\$17,325,000</b> |
| <b>Cogeneration Facility</b>         |             |                     |

San Diego State University (SDSU) wishes to proceed with a design/build project to upgrade and expand its existing cogeneration facility. The proposed project includes a 14-megawatt cogeneration facility and two new waste heat boilers that will replace an existing 3-megawatt cogeneration unit, one waste heat boiler, and a primary boiler. The university's increased electrical and heat requirements have grown far beyond what the existing campus-owned and operated 3-megawatt cogeneration facility can provide. The existing cogenerator and waste heat boiler are at the end of their useful lifecycle and will need to be replaced within the next five years. The 14-megawatt unit will be housed within the existing cogeneration plant plus an adjacent 5,000 gross square foot structure. The project will provide electricity for SDSU and its additional heat byproduct will provide supplemental heat to campus buildings. The scope of the project also includes a reinforcement of the electrical system.

The capital and operational costs of upgrading the cogeneration facility have been balanced against procuring electricity from the utility, replacing the existing generator, procuring additional new boilers, and the need to increase the electrical reliability of the campus. The net present value of recurring cost avoided for the "business as usual" case with no installation of the proposed generation facility is \$150 million over 30 years. The net present value of cost including debt of implementing this project is \$138 million over 30 years. A resulting net present value savings of executing this project over the business as usual case including capital cost and debt is \$12 million over the same

30-year period. In addition to the positive cash flow, the project serves as a risk management tool against electric commodity price volatility, increases in electric distribution rates, and electric grid reliability exposure. The project will be financed by a CSU pre-approved finance vendor using tax-exempt lease financing with the annual energy cost savings applied to make the required lease payments.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include (1) \$1,202,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Fullerton, Energy Management System Upgrade project; and (2) \$17,325,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the San Diego State University, Cogeneration Facility.

## BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 2  
May 9-10, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### Status Report on the 2000/01 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

##### Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

##### Summary

The California State University's proposed 2000/01 Capital Outlay Program and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2000/01 through 2004/05 were presented at the September 1999 Board of Trustees' meeting. The trustees approved a 2000/01 priority list totaling \$153.3 million based on the anticipated funding level from the 1998 four-year general obligation bond measure. The governor's proposed 2000/01 budget maintained the CSU \$153.3 million request with some adjustments to the program.

The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) published the *Analysis of the 2000/01 Budget Bill* on February 17, 2000. The analyst recommended approval of \$100,190,000 of the CSU request and identified potential actions and concerns on projects that were reported to the Board of Trustees at the March meeting. Capital Planning, Design and Construction staff continues to consult with the LAO to resolve its concerns.

Legislative hearings are in progress, and a status report will be distributed at the meeting comparing the trustees' requested program, the governor's budget proposal, the legislative analyst's recommendations, and the results of the legislative hearings to date.

## BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 3  
May 9-10, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Concur with the Findings in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve Initial Campus Master Plan, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for Phase I Development of California State University, San Bernardino, Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center in Palm Desert

#### Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

#### Summary

**This item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees for the CSU San Bernardino (CSUSB) Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center (CVC) in the City of Palm Desert:**

Concurrence with the Findings in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared by the City of Palm Desert for the 200-acre Educational Site

Conditional Approval of the Initial Campus Master Plan for the 40-acre Site

Approval of an Amendment to the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Phase I Development

A conditional approval is being requested for the initial campus master plan for the 40-acre site contingent upon the following:

- The close of escrow transferring the property to the CSU Board of Trustees.
- Receipt of a revised Disposition and Development Agreement that reflects UC Riverside's (UCR) use of approximately 20 acres of the 160 acres being held in reserve for potential expansion of the CSU site. UCR proposes to construct an International Center for Entrepreneurial Management on the site that would be mutually beneficial with CSUSB programs.

Attachment A illustrates the Initial Campus Master Plan for the proposed development of the CVC on 40 acres donated by the City of Palm Desert. Also included for information is the potential future development of the adjacent parcel to be held for ten years should CSU require the additional land to add more buildings to serve additional students. The Phase I Development consists of 36,580 gross square feet (GSF) of lecture, laboratory, student union, bookstore and administrative support space that will provide professional and continuing education for local and

2  
CP&G  
Agenda Item 3  
May 9-10, 2000

Attachment B identifies the mitigation measures that CSU will be responsible for as part of this approval for the 40-acre site and Phase I Development.

The FEIR is in the agenda mailout.

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

3  
Agenda Item 3  
May 9-10, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Concur with the Findings in the Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve Initial Campus Master Plan, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for Phase I Development of California State University, San Bernardino, Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center in Palm Desert**

#### **Background**

In 1984, the College of the Desert's Board of Trustees began exploring how a CSU presence might be brought to the Coachella Valley area. Subsequent negotiations between the Chancellor's Office, CSUSB, the California Postsecondary Education Commission, and the College of the Desert led to establishing the temporary CSUSB Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center. The center began offering external degree programs in fall 1986 on land leased from the College of the Desert. The center currently enrolls 364 full-time equivalent students (FTES) and is projected to grow to 770 FTES by 2005.

In 1992, the Palm Desert City Council approached the university about donating city land for a permanent off-campus center.

In 1994, the CSU Board of Trustees authorized the chancellor to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the City of Palm Desert and its Redevelopment Agency to accept and acquire the land. The MOU between the City of Palm Desert, its Redevelopment Agency, and the CSU Board of Trustees was approved in November 1994. It designated 40 acres for the site of the initial permanent off-campus center and an additional 160 acres to be held in reserve for ten years for potential CSU use.

Staff from the Chancellor's Office, university, and city drafted a Disposition and Development Agreement that was approved by the City of Palm Desert Redevelopment Agency on October 14, 1999. The agreement was presented to the Board of Trustees' Ad Hoc Committee on Off-Campus Facilities and was signed by Chancellor Charles Reed and Mayor Robert Spiegel of the city of Palm Desert on November 16, 1999.

#### **Initial Campus Master Plan**

The proposed initial campus master plan includes recommendations made by the CVC Master Plan Advisory Committee concerning future development of the 40 acres donated by the City of Palm Desert to the CSU for the CVC. As reflected in the FEIR, planning assumptions relative to the adjacent parcel are shown to demonstrate compatible use should the potential expansion of the CSU site occur. The proposed master plan for the 40 acres at the corner of Cook Street and Frank Sinatra Drive in Palm Desert provides for an on-campus enrollment of 2,500 FTES.

**Amend the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program**

The university wishes to amend the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program to proceed with the design and construction of the CVC Phase I Development on the 40-acre site. Construction will be funded through a capital campaign sponsored by the university and campus auxiliaries. Following is a cost breakdown of the nonstate funded components:

Classrooms/Labs/Faculty Offices	PWC	\$ 9,000,000
Parking	PWC	500,000
Student Union	PWC	322,500
Book/Convenience Store	PWC	<u>322,500</u>
<i>Total</i>	<i>PWC</i>	<i>\$10,145,000</i>

Construction for Phases II and III is proposed to be included in the 2001/02 nonstate capital outlay program.

**Schematic Plans**

**Project Architect: Lee, Burkhart, Liu, Inc. Architecture, Planning, Interiors**

**Scope**

**The Phase I Development will be the first building constructed on the 40-acre parcel. The 36,580 GSF project will provide 8 FTES of upper division teaching laboratories, 781 FTES of lecture space, 6 faculty offices, a 120-seat theater/classroom, 2 self-instructional computer laboratories, a teleconference and distance learning center, an information resource center, a student union, a bookstore, and additional administrative office space. A total of 150 surface parking spaces will also be provided. The design includes a central courtyard to encourage social interaction, and all building openings are oriented to mitigate the adverse impact of the strong northwestern winds during the winter months. Exterior sunshades will minimize the solar heat gains during the hot summer months in the Coachella Valley.**

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	May 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	July 2000
Construction Start	September 2000
Occupancy	August 2001

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	36,580 square feet
Assignable Building Area	22,680 square feet
Efficiency	62 percent

**Cost Estimate – California Construction Cost Index 3847**

Building Cost (\$178 per gross square foot)	\$ 6,511,000
<i>Systems Breakdown (\$ per GSF)</i>	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 7.04
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$71.56
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$28.36
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$71.04
 Site Development (includes landscaping)	 \$ 1,540,000
Group I Equipment	<u>299,000</u>
 Construction Cost	 \$ 8,350,000
Fees & Contingency	<u>1,795,000</u>
 Total Project Cost (\$277 per gross square foot)	 \$10,145,000
Group II Equipment (funding to be determined)	<u>881,000</u>
 Grand Total	 <u>\$11,026,000</u>

**Funding Data**

Funding for the construction of the project is planned to be from a university-sponsored capital campaign and from CSUSB Foundation, student union, and parking program funds. Construction will proceed subsequent to funds becoming available from component programs.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action (CEQA)**

The City of Palm Desert, as Lead Agency and at its expense, prepared a Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) pursuant to the provisions of CEQA. The DEIR was distributed on July 30, 1998, for a 45-day public review period, which ended on September 14, 1998. The DEIR addressed the CVC master plan and construction level analysis of schematic plans for the Phase I Development as near-term implementation actions. Comments were received from seven (7) public agencies and three (3) private companies. The comments generally addressed the following primary issues:

- Traffic and Circulation
- Transportation Uniform Mitigation Fee (TUMF) Program
- Soils and Geology
- Flood and Hydrology
- Regulation of Development

The City of Palm Desert determined that implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in its final EIR will assure that the project will not result in any significant unmitigated adverse environmental impacts. The Palm Desert City Council approved the Certification of the FEIR on March 16, 1999. A copy of the certified FEIR, which includes all written and oral comments received by the City of Palm Desert on the Draft EIR, is included in the agenda mailout.

6  
CPB&G  
Agenda Item 3  
May 9-10, 2000

The Board of Trustees is a responsible agency for the project and is required to consider the FEIR in the board's planning process for the project.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The FEIR was prepared to include the conceptual master plan for 200 acres, and more specifically the Phase I Development, and this Board of Trustees concurs with the findings identified in the FEIR pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
2. Based on the information contained in the subject FEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.
3. The Board of Trustees adopts the mitigation measures identified as its responsibility and set forth in Attachment B to this agenda item. No additional mitigation measures by the Board of Trustees as the Responsible Agency are necessary.
4. The project will benefit The California State University.
5. The California State University, San Bernardino, Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center Initial Campus Master Plan, dated May 2000, is conditionally approved at a physical master plan ceiling of 2,500 FTES.
6. The 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include \$10,145,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the Phase I Development of the California State University, San Bernardino, Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center.
7. The schematic plans for the Phase I Development of the California State University, San Bernardino Permanent Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center are approved at a project cost of \$11,026,000 at CCCI 3847.

ATTACHMENT A  
CPB&G—Item 3  
May 9-10, 2000

PLEASE SEE  
PRINTED  
COPY

**CSU San Bernardino  
Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center/Phase I**

**Summary of Environmental Mitigation Measures**

The CSU Board of Trustees acknowledges responsibility for the mitigation measures summarized below in the development of the CSU San Bernardino, Coachella Valley Off-Campus Center Phase I project.

**Air Quality Mitigation**

1. Compliance with state and federal regulations limiting PM<sub>10</sub> emissions during and after construction. Implementation of the mitigation measures and strategies set forth in the project EIR are expected to maintain PM<sub>10</sub> emission levels below levels of significance. The university shall incorporate applicable South Coast Air Quality Management District regulations in future construction contract general conditions for on-site construction.
2. Potential emissions from project development, which may contribute to ozone formation, shall also be addressed through compliance with the certified campus Program EIR. Specific measures to be taken include:
  - Coordinate with the City of Palm Desert (city) in the construction of sidewalks and bike lanes within the parkway of that portion of the Cook Street frontage to be constructed with Phase I.
  - Coordinate with the city and Sunline Transit Authority the design and construction of a bus stop to be located within the Cook Street right-of-way to service the Phase I project.

**Biological Resources**

1. Impacts to the Coachella Valley milk vetch, fringe-toed lizard, flat-tailed horned lizard, and other biological resources associated with the Phase I project shall, in part, be mitigated through the payment of a \$600 per acre fee for any and all lands disturbed in the course of this development.
2. Additional mitigation required to offset impacts to the Coachella Valley fringe-toed lizard include that, prior to the initiation of development, the university shall enter into a California Endangered Species Act Memorandum of Understanding and, if required by the California Department of Fish and Game, an Incidental Take Permit under Section 2081 of the California Fish and Game Code.
3. Prior to the initiation of construction, a landscape plan and plant palette shall be developed that precludes invasive exotic plants. The landscape palette shall extensively rely upon drought-resistant native plants associated to provide enhanced wildlife habitat for permanent and seasonal birds and animals. The landscape palette and plan shall also integrate large trees such as

cottonwood, elm and fan palms, and native and habitat-enhancing shrubs and groundcovers that may provide foraging and nesting habitat for resident and migratory species.

### **Soils and Geotechnical**

1. Prior to the initiation of Phase I grading activities, the university shall provide the city with a dust control plan to mitigate potential high wind erosion.
2. In the event hydromulch or other vegetation-based soil stabilizer is used on the Phase I site, the university shall assure that an appropriate mix of annuals and perennials is used to prevent the accidental introduction of potentially invasive non-native materials.
3. The project structural and civil engineers shall comply with the Conclusions and Recommendations (as amended) set forth in the Sladden Engineering geotechnical investigation report prepared for the Phase I project. In addition, the project structural engineer shall consider peak horizontal ground acceleration potentials at the site in the design of the Phase I building, retaining walls, and other structures subject to seismic forces as identified in the geotechnical report.

### **Hydrology and Water Quality**

1. The university shall coordinate with the city the implementation of necessary storm-water retention facilities.
2. The university shall confer, under process established by Government Code Section 54999, with the city engineer and determine whether the payment of drainage impact fees is required to fund construction of the nearby Mid-Valley Stormwater Channel.
3. The university shall cooperate, as appropriate, in the construction of the city's planned drainage Line 8-1, as set forth in the Palm Desert 1991 Master Drainage Plan, which includes the construction of a 24 inch RCP storm drain to be located in the Cook Street right-of-way and extending north from Frank Sinatra Drive to the future Mid-Valley Stormwater Channel.
4. The Phase I landscape plan and stormwater retention facilities shall be designed to implement pollution control requirements of the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System.

## Traffic and Circulation

1. The university shall confer and cooperate with the city public works department on the precise location of the main access drive, cuts to the median island, construction of turning lanes, acceleration and/or deceleration lanes, and other necessary improvements.
2. The university and city traffic engineer shall coordinate the design and construction of traffic control improvements at the intersection of Cook Street/ Main Access Drive.
3. The university shall make every effort to expedite Sunbus service to the campus, and bicycle racks shall be provided on campus.

## **BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 4  
May 9-10, 2000

### **COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Center for Musical Arts at Sonoma State University**

##### **Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

##### **Brief and Executive Summary**

###### **Brief**

This item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees for the Sonoma State University campus master plan revision and Center for Musical Arts:

- Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
- Approval of a Campus Master Plan Revision
- Approval of an Amendment to the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Center for Musical Arts

The campus master plan revision provides for a university center (including bookstore), a 400-bed expansion to the student residence halls, a soccer stadium, relocation of three instructional expansion buildings and a soccer field, and the reduction in size of a future parking garage. The revision also includes a site for the development of a 117,000 gross square foot (GSF) music center, 1,100 parking spaces, a north entrance road, improved protection of Copeland Creek, and landscaping. This proposed project would be constructed on 55 acres of recently acquired undeveloped land north of the existing central campus.

The EIR also considers the impacts of the development of university-related housing on an adjacent 35-acre site that Sonoma State University wishes to purchase in the future.

The FEIR is in the agenda mailout. The following attachments are included in this item:

Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan dated May 2000.

Attachment B is the existing campus master plan dated March 1993.

Attachment C is the Finding of Fact & Statement of Overriding Considerations.

Attachment D is the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan.

##### **Executive Summary**

This executive summary identifies remaining potential contested issues raised through public participation, with CSU responses.

**Mitigation of Impacts to Biological Resources.** Comments were received expressing concern that the biological resources of the Copeland Creek environment be protected. After mitigation, the effects are less than significant.

**CSU Response:** The FEIR includes a Copeland Creek Ecological Resource Protection Plan that addresses the concerns expressed by the public. The FEIR includes a plan for avoidance and replacement of any wetlands existing on the site to be developed north of Copeland Creek.

The FEIR proposes a number of modifications to the master plan north of Copeland Creek designed to improve the relationship between proposed development and existing natural resources on the site and to reduce potential environmental effects to a less-than-significant level. These modifications include: moving development as far away from the creek as possible; creating a suitable upland mitigation area serving as a buffer between development and the natural preserve; a reduced number of bridge crossings and identification of a clear-span construction to reduce impact to the creek; dividing the parking area into four quadrants to improve drainage; and vegetation to include native plantings and grasslands.

**Traffic and Circulation.** Traffic-related impacts include the concern that project-generated vehicle trips would contribute to delays at intersections immediately around the university during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours. Another concern is that the project could exacerbate existing safety concerns related to parked vehicles on Petaluma Hill Road and East Cotati Avenue adjacent to the campus. Additionally, special events at the proposed Center for Musical Arts would result in traffic delays at one or more campus entrance intersections before and following events. Coupled with the concern about traffic impacts is the comment that the university should pay for off-site mitigation related to university development.

**CSU Response:** Although the FEIR identifies mitigation measures for all traffic impacts, the FEIR designates the impacts significant after mitigation because the impacted intersections are currently located within the jurisdiction of either Rohnert Park or Sonoma County. Accordingly, the implementing agency for mitigation would be either the City of Rohnert Park or Sonoma County. Although the Draft City of Rohnert Park General Plan Update includes these transportation improvements, they are not currently approved or funded by the city. Therefore, CSU cannot guarantee that these recommended improvements would be built. It should be noted that the peak-hour impacts to intersections would be experienced with or without this master plan revision since they are tied to campus growth within the existing approved 10,000 FTES enrollment ceiling. It should also be noted that, since the proposed master plan revision includes more on-campus housing than the existing approved master plan, it would generate less off-site weekday traffic volumes compared to the existing approved plan. Therefore, the impacts would be less than those that would occur under the existing approved plan.

In the case of the impacts related to special events at the Center for Musical Arts, concerts would typically disperse in the evening when background traffic volumes have dropped from their peak

levels. Unacceptable delays at the campus intersections would only be experienced for vehicles exiting the university. Mitigation identified in the Draft EIR would serve to minimize delays. Impacts beyond the campus become less perceptible with increasing distance from the campus. Such special event-generated volumes are inherent with special activities with large attendance. This is a normal and episodic condition connected with events of high public participation.

The university has encouraged, without effect, local governments to restrict parking on the public streets adjacent to the campus.

The FEIR explains the legal responsibilities and the limitation of jurisdiction as it relates to off-site mitigation, including the university's limited powers and responsibility to mitigate effects that occur outside the project site.

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

4

Agenda Item 4  
May 9-10, 2000

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report, Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision, Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Center for Musical Arts at Sonoma State University**

##### **Background and Project Summary**

The proposed campus master plan revision for Sonoma State University maintains a maximum student population of 10,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES). The revision adds new facilities, relocates/changes future buildings and proposes new development on approximately 55 acres recently acquired by the campus. The site is north of the main campus across Copeland Creek. The new development includes the Center for Musical Arts, a restaurant/meeting facility, 1,100 parking spaces, and a north entrance road. The continued development of the university's performing arts programs is a vital component of the university's goals under the master plan revision. The full array of choral and instrumental programs would be located in the proposed Center for Musical Arts as well as new university programs being developed in partnership with local school districts and the Santa Rosa Symphony. The symphony's presence would provide an opportunity to broaden and enrich the musical education program at Sonoma State University, and to foster recruitment potential. The Santa Rosa Symphony's five youth orchestras and music academy would occupy the center's halls and studios on weekends during the regular season and weekdays during the early summer. Collaborative possibilities also include joint fund raising campaigns, combined community outreach programs, new teaching partnerships, and innovative concert presentations. During the proposed project's assessment and planning phases, the university held public discussions, meetings, and open forums to receive input and to develop project goals and objectives. Continuing discussions are being held with students, faculty, staff, and campus neighbors addressing environmental issues and improvements that can be incorporated into the design of the Center for Musical Arts and related site development.

##### **Campus Master Plan Revision**

The proposed campus master plan revision refines and expands the development of the campus. The proposal sites a 117,000 GSF music center. The center includes a concert hall, a recital hall, and public/performer/support spaces. The main building would be surrounded by outdoor public spaces, dining facilities and landscape features. The project includes parking to accommodate 1,100 spaces and a north entrance road to provide access to the center during events and the total campus population during regular session.

The proposed revision also includes the following:

- Relocation of three instructional expansion buildings proposed for new classrooms, laboratories and faculty offices. The proposed instructional expansion would be three new 2-story buildings totaling 265,000 GSF for an added campus capacity of 2,900 FTES.
- Relocation of a soccer field.

- A soccer stadium to accommodate 5,000 patrons.
- Reduced sizing of a parking garage from 886 to 550 spaces.
- A 200,000 GSF university center consisting of a student center that includes space for a bookstore, student organizations, a retail center and food court, and a recreation center.
- A 400-bed expansion of the student residence halls.

Attachment A identifies the proposed revisions with a hexagon numbering system as indicated below:

Hexagon 1: North Entrance Road  
Hexagon 2: Center for Musical Arts #50  
Hexagon 3: Parking Lots including 1,100 spaces  
Hexagon 4: Instructional Building #30  
Hexagon 5: Instructional Building #33  
Hexagon 6: Instructional Building #31  
Hexagon 7: Soccer Stadium #41  
Hexagon 8: Parking Garage  
Hexagon 9: University Center #35  
Hexagon 10: Residence Halls Addition #38

Implementation of the proposed campus master plan revision adds nonstate funded projects at a total estimated cost of \$120 million in current dollars.

### **Amend the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program**

The university wishes to amend the 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program to include \$54 million for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the Sonoma State University Center for Musical Arts. This incorporates the music center building, site development/landscaping, and a restaurant/meeting facility. Schematic plans for the restaurant/meeting facility will be presented to the Board of Trustees for approval at a future meeting. Funding will be provided through donor funds, parking funds and the Sonoma State University Enterprises.

### **Approval of Schematic Plans—Center for Musical Arts Building Project Architect: AC Martin Partners**

#### **Scope**

The proposed 117,000 GSF music center includes a concert hall, recital hall, and various public/performer/support spaces. Outdoor public spaces and landscape features will surround the main building. The site development/landscaping adjacent to the center includes landscape buffers, wetland mitigation, parking areas for approximately 1,100 vehicles, access and main entry roads, a vehicular bridge, a pedestrian bridge, site lighting, and an extension of campus utility services to the proposed facility. As part of this project, the proposed campus north entrance road will bridge Copeland Creek and intersect with the central campus circulation roads, thereby completing the master planned campus access plan and landscape features.

6  
 CPB&G  
 Agenda Item 4  
 May 9-10, 2000

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	July 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	February 2001
Construction Start	May 2001
Occupancy	October 2002

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	117,000 square feet
Assignable Building Area	74,337 square feet
Efficiency	63 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847**

Building Cost (\$276 per gross square foot)	\$32,253,000
---	--------------

<i>System Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$11.04
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$107.51
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$48.24
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical)	\$97.87
e. Other Building Construction	\$11.03

Site Development (includes parking, north entrance road, landscaping)	<u>8,657,000</u>
---	------------------

Construction Cost	\$40,910,000
Fees & Contingency	<u>8,697,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$424 per gross square foot)	\$49,607,000
Group II Equipment	<u>1,640,000</u>

Grand Total	<u><u>\$51,247,000</u></u>
-------------	----------------------------

**Funding Data**

Project funding is from donor and parking funds. Construction will not proceed until funds are secured.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. This item also requests approval of a revised campus master plan and schematic plans for construction of the Center for Musical Arts. To determine

the scope of the environmental review, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared in July 1999 for the proposed project. Local jurisdictions, along with other interested agencies and individuals, were provided a copy of the NOP. A copy of the NOP is included in Appendix A of the Draft EIR. An Initial Study was prepared as an appendix of the Draft EIR.

The Draft EIR addressed the following issue areas:

- Land Use and Planning
- Geology, Soils and Seismicity
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Transportation, Parking and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Visual Quality
- Biological Services
- Hazardous Materials
- Public Services
- Utilities and Service Systems
- Energy
- Cultural Resources

Additionally, the Draft EIR included a description of the project; an alternatives section that describes and analyzes alternative plans to reduce identified significant impacts; and the cumulative, growth-inducing, and significant and irreversible effects of project implementation. The Draft EIR was made available for public and agency comments for a 45-day review period. During this period, written comments concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR were submitted to the campus. Jurisdictions, interested agencies and individuals were provided a copy of the Draft EIR along with a notice of a public meeting to be held on the project. Finally, a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was also published in the newspaper pursuant to state law. Public meetings on the Draft EIR were held on November 29, 1999, and December 2, 1999, and the public review period closed on February 15, 2000.

### **Issues Identified Through Public Participation**

Comments were received in response to the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study and the Draft EIR for the proposed student housing project. The comments included concerns about:

- Air Quality
- Noise
- Biological Resources
- Traffic and Circulation
- Utilities
- Hydrology

The FEIR includes written responses to all comments received. The following is a summary of the comments and responses.

**1. Air Quality.** Development under the project would increase criteria air pollutant emissions associated with the university relative to existing conditions.

*CSU Response:* As a mitigation measure, the university should offset expected increases by increasing the energy efficiency of future buildings. The university should implement measures to encourage the use of public transit and, if development of future university-related housing is undertaken, should select the mixed use or higher density housing scenarios in order to generate fewer off-campus vehicle trips. These measures would reduce the number of days during which emissions in the future would be significantly greater than under existing conditions. When a large special event at the Center for Musical Arts is held the emissions would exceed the limits; but the number of these occurrences throughout the year would be infrequent.

**2. Noise.** The increase in traffic due to university and area-wide growth and development would result in cumulative increases in roadside noise levels.

*CSU Response:* As a mitigation measure, the university will encourage the use of public transit and, if development of future university-related housing is undertaken, should select the mixed use or higher density housing scenarios in order to generate fewer off-campus vehicle trips. The university should also encourage the City of Rohnert Park to address future cumulative noise levels along Rohnert Park Expressway during annexation and subsequent development

**3. Mitigation of Impacts to Biological Resources.** Comments were received expressing concern that the biological resources of the Copeland Creek environment be protected.

*CSU Response:* The FEIR includes a Copeland Creek Ecological Resource Protection Plan that addresses the concerns expressed by the public. This plan creates a preservation area that corresponds with the “dripline” of the trees in the riparian woodland and a buffer zone originating at the top of bank and extending laterally for 150 feet average from the creek to avoid adverse ecological effects to the creek. The FEIR includes a plan for avoidance and replacement of any wetlands existing on the site to be developed north of Copeland Creek. In response to comments, the FEIR proposes a number of modifications to the elements of the master plan revision north of Copeland Creek designed to improve the relationship between proposed development and existing natural resources on the site and to reduce potential environmental effects to a less-than-significant level.

**4. Traffic and Circulation.** Traffic related impacts include the concern that project-generated vehicle trips would contribute to delays at study intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under cumulative (future with project) conditions and that the project could exacerbate existing safety concerns related to off-site parked vehicles on Petaluma Hill Road and East Cotati Avenue adjacent to campus. Additionally, an impact identified included that special events at the proposed Center

for Musical Arts would generate surges of traffic prior to and/or following the events, resulting in traffic delays at one or more campus entrance intersections before and/or following the event.

**CSU Response:** Although the FEIR identifies mitigation measures for the traffic impacts, the FEIR designates the impact significant after mitigation because the impacted intersections are currently located within the jurisdiction of either Rohnert Park or Sonoma County. Accordingly, the implementing agency for mitigation would be either the City of Rohnert Park or Sonoma County. Although the Draft City of Rohnert Park General Plan Update includes these transportation improvements, they are not currently approved or funded by the city. Therefore the Draft EIR designates the impacts significant after mitigation. It should be noted that the peak-hour impacts to intersections would be experienced with or without this master plan revision since they are tied to the campus growth within the existing approved enrollment ceiling of 10,000 FTES. It should also be noted that, since the proposed master plan revision includes more on-campus housing than the existing approved master plan, it would generate less off-site weekday traffic volumes compared to the existing approved plan, and, therefore, the impacts would be less than those that would occur under the existing approved plan.

In the case of the impacts related to special events at the Center for Musical Arts, concerts would typically disperse in the evening when background traffic volumes have dropped from their peak levels. Unacceptable delays at the campus intersections would only be experienced for vehicles exiting the university entrances. Mitigation identified in the Draft EIR would serve to maximize the capacity of the campus entrances for the vehicles exiting the university. Impacts beyond the campus become less perceptible with increasing distance from the campus. Such special event-generated volumes are inherent with special activities having large attendance. This is a normal and inescapable condition, which is not a significant environmental impact. It is episodic and connected with events of higher public interest.

**5. Utilities.** With the proposed project, the university would increase its current wastewater treatment allocation and could exceed its future wastewater treatment allocation designated by the subregional wastewater treatment system, unless an increase in treatment capacity allocation is received.

**CSU Response:** The university shall arrange with the City of Rohnert Park to be included in its application for its share of the increase in treatment capacity.

**6. Hydrology.** The increase of storm flows to Copeland Creek and the development within the 100-year floodplain were expressed concerns should the campus develop the property north of Copeland Creek.

**CSU Response:** Mitigation measures identify the installation of on-site detention ponds, which would ensure peak flow rate from the area of development into the Copeland Creek, would not occur. The 100-year flood zone is in the 35-acre parcel not yet owned by the university but considered for university-related housing in the EIR because it is a goal of the university to develop that property. Should the university purchase and develop that property, consistent with Sonoma County Water

Agency design criteria, all newly constructed building finished floors would be set at an elevation of not less than one foot above the predicted 100-year water surface elevation.

The FEIR includes all the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. Significant issues derived from these comments were discussed earlier in this item under issues identified through the public review process. A complete listing and discussion of significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project and the proposed mitigation measures are summarized in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR and analyzed in detail in Chapter 4 of the Draft EIR. The Mitigation Monitoring Plan, describing the procedures the university and others will use to implement the mitigation measures to be adopted in the event that the Board of Trustees approves the proposed project as recommended, is attached to this agenda item (Attachment D).

### **Analysis of Significant Environmental Impacts**

**Air Quality:** Development under the project would increase air pollutant emissions associated with the university relative to existing conditions and contribute to cumulative increases in regional emissions of criteria air pollutants.

**Noise.** The increase in traffic due to university and area-wide growth and development would result in cumulative increases in roadside noise levels.

**Traffic and Circulation.** Project-generated vehicle trips would contribute to delays at study intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under cumulative (future with project) conditions. The project could also exacerbate existing safety concerns related to off-site vehicles parked on Petaluma Hill Road and East Cotati Avenue adjacent to campus. These impacts are due to the projected increase in campus enrollment from the existing 6,000 FTES to the approved 10,000 FTES enrollment ceiling. This impact will be experienced under the existing approved master plan as well as the proposed revision.

Additionally, special events at the proposed Center for Musical Arts would generate additional traffic prior to and following major events, resulting in traffic delays.

**Utilities.** With the proposed project, the university would increase its current wastewater treatment allocation and could exceed its future wastewater treatment allocation designated by the subregional wastewater treatment system, unless an increase in treatment capacity allocation is received from the provider, the City of Rohnert Park.

In connection with this agenda item, the Board of Trustees will be asked to balance the benefits of the proposed project against the unavoidable effects listed above. The board will also be asked to adopt Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations in Attachment C to the effect that the remaining significant and unavoidable effects associated with the project are acceptable due to the overriding benefits associated with the proposed project.

## **Alternatives**

The alternatives section of the Draft EIR has been prepared in accordance with the state CEQA Guidelines. The alternatives shown below were analyzed and compared to the proposed project. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts identified under the proposed project was also identified.

**Alternative 1, No Project**—This alternative, required by CEQA {CEQA Guidelines 15126 (d)(2)}, examines the campus under the existing approved master plan without construction of the Center for Musical Arts, the adjacent parking nor the north entrance road. This alternative would not meet the project objectives.

**Alternative 2**—This alternative considers no development in the northwest acquisition area, which the campus does not yet own but has analysis in the EIR because it constitutes a university goal to own the property and develop university-related housing.

**Alternative 3**—This alternative involves no development in the northwest acquisition area and the construction of increased student housing density on the main campus.

A detailed description and analysis of alternatives considered is found in Section 5 of the Draft EIR.

## **Resolution and Final Environmental Impact Report**

A proposed resolution is presented below with respect to the Board of Trustees' certification of the FEIR, approval of a campus master plan revision, amendment to the nonstate funded capital outlay program, and approval of schematic plans for the Center for Musical Arts and related site development. Referenced in and adopted as part of this resolution are the attachments, which are the required CEQA Findings of Fact and the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment C), and the identification of adopted mitigation measures with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan (Attachment D).

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The FEIR for the Sonoma State University campus master plan revision and construction of the Center for Musical Arts project (State Clearinghouse No. 93013045) was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects, mitigation measures, and project alternatives associated with approval of the proposed master plan revision and center for musical arts project and all discretionary actions related thereto.
2. The FEIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the CEQA Guidelines.

3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines, which require that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to approval of a project (along with statements of facts supporting each finding).
4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact in Attachment C and related mitigation measures in Attachment D, Agenda Item 4 of the May 9-10, 2000, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures which are hereby incorporated by reference.
5. The findings in Attachment C and the related mitigation measures in Attachment D, are hereby incorporated by reference and adopted by this board, and said findings include specific overriding considerations that outweigh certain remaining significant impacts.
6. The Board of Trustees of The California State University has considered the information provided in the FEIR in making its findings.
7. Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR and finds that the FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the proposed project as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the record of the proceedings for the project is comprised of the following:
  - A. The Draft EIR for the Sonoma State University master plan revision and the Center for Musical Arts project;
  - B. The FEIR including all comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to comments;
  - C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at such proceedings; and
  - D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (A) through (C) above.

The above information is on file with The California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long

Beach, California 90802, and Sonoma State University, Office of Facilities Services (Building 10), Rohnert Park, CA 94928.

8. The Board of Trustees of The California State University adopts the findings set forth in Attachment C, Agenda Item 4 of the May 9-10, 2000, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, including the minor modification of mitigation measures and the other findings presented in Attachment C. The board specifically finds that the modified mitigation measures are feasible and will further mitigate adverse impacts from the project.
9. The Board of Trustees of The California State University hereby certifies the FEIR for the Sonoma State University master plan revision and Center for Musical Arts project, and directs that the FEIR be considered in any further actions on the project.
10. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is Attachment D, Agenda Item 4, of the May 9-10, 2000, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, and which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).
11. The Sonoma State University campus master plan revision dated May 2000 is hereby approved.
12. The 1999/2000 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include \$54 million for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the Center for Musical Arts, restaurant/meeting facility, and related site development/landscaping project.
13. The schematic plans for the Sonoma State University Center for Musical Arts are approved at a project cost of \$51,247,000 at CCCI 3847.
14. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the Sonoma State University master plan revision and the Center for Musical Arts project.

ATTACHMENT A  
CPB&G —Item 4  
May 9-10, 2000

PLEASE SEE  
PRINTED COPY

ATTACHMENT B  
CPB&G —Item 4  
May 9-10, 2000

PLEASE SEE  
PRINTED COPY

**Sonoma State University  
Master Plan Revision and Center for Musical Arts**

**Findings of Fact and Statement  
of Overriding Considerations**

Pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093  
of the State CEQA Guidelines and  
Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code

Final Program Environmental Impact Report  
State Clearinghouse Number 93013045

*Project Files May Be Reviewed at:*

Sonoma State University  
Office of Facilities Services, Building 10  
Rohnert Park, CA 94928

## **CEQA Findings, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations Regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision and the Center for Musical Arts and Related Site Development**

Pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines and Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code Final Environmental Impact Report (State Clearinghouse Number 93013045). Project files may be reviewed at: Sonoma State University Facilities Services, Building 10, Rohnert Park, CA 94928.

### **SECTION 1: INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1 Statutory Requirements for Findings**

The California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code Section 21081) and the CEQA Guidelines (the Guidelines) (14 Cal. Code Regulations, Section 15091) require that:

*“No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:*

- a. Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project, which mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.*
- b. Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.*
- c. Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or project alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.”*

For those significant effects that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level, the public agency is required to find that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment (see Pub. Res. Code Section 21081(b)).

The Final Program Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) for the Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision and the Center for Musical Arts and related Site Development (“the project”) identified significant environmental impacts that will result from the implementation of the project. However, the Board of Trustees of the California State University (“Board of Trustees”) finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those potential significant effects to a less-than-significant level. Those impacts which are not reduced to a less-than-significant level are identified and overridden due to specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other feasibility considerations. As required by CEQA, the Board of Trustees, in

adopting these findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the project. The Board of Trustees finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings as Attachment C, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

In accordance with CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees adopts these findings as part of the certification of the FEIR for the project. Pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21082.1(c)(3), the Board of Trustees also finds that the FEIR reflects the Board of Trustees' independent judgment as the lead agency for the project.

## **1.2 Organization/Format of Findings**

Section 2.0 of these findings contains a summary description of the project and related background facts. Section 3.0 identifies the significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level even though all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project. Section 4.0 identifies the potentially significant effects of the project, which were determined to be mitigated to a less-than-significant level. Section 5.0 identifies the project's potential environmental effects that were determined not to be significant, and, therefore, no mitigation is required. Section 6.0 discusses significant cumulative effects and mitigation measures. Section 7.0 discusses the feasibility of project alternatives and mitigation measures. Section 8.0 includes the Board of Trustees' Statement of Overriding Considerations.

**NOTE:** ALL NUMBERED REFERENCES IDENTIFYING SPECIFIC MITIGATION MEASURES REFER TO NUMBERED MITIGATION MEASURES FOUND IN THE FEIR.

## **SECTION 2: THE PROJECT**

The project analyzed in the EIR consists of campus master plan revision to accommodate the siting and construction of a Center for Musical Arts as well as a new location for the university center and bookstore, a new location of instruction expansion buildings, a 400-bed expansion of the student residence halls, a soccer stadium, a relocation of the soccer field and a future parking garage. The EIR also considers the impacts of the development of university-related housing on an adjacent 35-acre site that the university proposes to purchase in the future.

**2.1 Project Objectives.** The Board of Trustees has considered the statement of objectives sought by the project as found in Chapter 3.0 of the EIR. The Board of Trustees hereby adopts those objectives as part of the project.

The university's objectives for the master plan revision include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Reinforce campus identity and image, reflecting its place and culture.
- Provide facilities to effectively support the university's academic programs.

- Provide more on-campus housing opportunities, to reduce local traffic and housing demand off-campus.
- Use existing campus resources to the fullest extent, by appropriate use of currently underutilized developed space. Develop additional space only as needed.
- Plan for optimal utilization of existing and new infrastructure, roads, and parking.
- Promote a comprehensible campus development pattern for pedestrians, bicycles and vehicles, which emphasizes accessibility.
- Strengthen the pedestrian orientation of the campus.
- Create links to off-campus pedestrian and bicycle circulation.
- Protect and enhance existing sensitive riparian habitat.
- Avoid or minimize potential adverse ecological effects to the Copeland Creek preservation area.

For a detailed discussion of the proposed project, the Board of Trustees incorporates by reference Chapter 3.0 of the EIR.

### **SECTION 3: SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVEL**

The FEIR identified the following significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less-than-significant level even though the Board of Trustees finds that all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project:

- a. Cumulative air quality impacts.
- b. Increased criteria air pollutant emissions relative to existing conditions.
- c. Increase in roadside noise levels due to increase in traffic.
- d. Shortage of wastewater treatment allocation designated by the subregional treatment system.
- e. Traffic delays at intersections in vicinity of campus due to enrollment growth.
- f. Increased safety impact related to off-site parking around university
- g. Special event traffic impact at campus intersections after and before an event.

#### **3.1 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts**

*3.1.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact:* Development and occupancy of the proposed project would result in the generation of motor vehicle emissions that will hinder efforts to achieve and maintain state and federal air quality standards on a local and regional basis.

*3.1.2 Mitigation Measures:* Mitigation is proposed for the increase in air pollutants in the project area (see EIR Mitigation Measures E.2a, E.2b, E2c).

*3.1.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified will reduce the above-described significant effects on air quality, but not to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures would improve the project's impact on air quality, but measures to fully offset vehicle emissions are not technically or economically feasible.

Therefore, the impact would remain significant and unavoidable. However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found herein in Section 8 below.

### **3.2 Increase in Roadside Noise Levels Due to Increase in Traffic**

*3.2.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact:* The increase in traffic due to university and area-wide growth and development would result in cumulative increases in roadside noise levels.

*3.2.2 Mitigation Measures:* Section 4 of the Draft EIR recommends mitigation measures (measures F.5a and F.5b) which will reduce potential impacts to noise levels, but not to a level of insignificance with regard to the increase in noise along Rohnert Park Expressway.

*3.2.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified will reduce the above-described significant effects noise levels, but not to a less-than-significant level with regard to existing and future development north of the university by Rohnert Park. Mitigation Measures F.5a and F.5b would reduce the project's impact on noise quality, but measures to fully offset noise impacts are not technically or economically feasible. However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found herein in Section 8 below.

### **3.3 Impact on Utilities**

*3.3.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact:* With the proposed project, the university would increase its need for wastewater treatment allocation beyond its existing allocation unless an increase in treatment capacity allocation is received.

*3.3.2 Mitigation Measures:* Mitigation proposed for the increase in wastewater capacity (Measures K.4a and K.4b) will reduce the wastewater impact if negotiations with the City of Rohnert Park are successful. The impact remains significant only if negotiations are unsuccessful.

*3.3.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds based on substantial evidence in the record that the mitigation measure identified will reduce the above-described significant effects on utilities, but not to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation Measures K.4a and K.4b cannot be guaranteed successful until negotiations are concluded. Therefore, the impact could remain significant and unavoidable. However, pursuant to Section 21081 (a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found herein in Section 8 below.

### **3.4 Traffic Impacts**

*3.4.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact:* Development and occupancy of the proposed project would result in project-generated vehicle trips contributing to delays at study intersections during the a.m.

and p.m. peak hours under cumulative conditions and would exacerbate existing safety concerns related to off-site parked vehicles on roads adjacent to campus. Development and occupancy of the Center for Musical Arts would generate surges in traffic prior to and or following the events, resulting in traffic delays at one or more campus entrance intersections.

*3.4.2 Mitigation Measures:* Section IV.D of the Draft EIR recommends a number of mitigation measures (measures D.1a, D.1b, D.1c, D.1d, D.1e, D.3a, D.3b, D.4a, D.4b, D.4c, D.4d, D.4e), which will reduce potential impacts to traffic impact, but not to a level of insignificance with regard to the CSU's limited ability to mitigate off-campus impacts in the jurisdiction of other agencies. The responsibility of funding these specific mitigation measures currently lies within the jurisdiction of the County of Sonoma, as identified in Section IV.D of the Draft EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

If certain properties are annexed by the City of Rohnert Park, then the city will be the responsible agency.

*3.4.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the mitigation measures identified will reduce the above-described significant effects on traffic and parking impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Mitigation measures described above which are within the jurisdiction and responsibility of the County of Sonoma to implement are listed as significant after mitigation because the CSU cannot guarantee mitigation by Sonoma County. It is up to the local agencies which receive funds for roadway improvements, to allocate these funds within their jurisdiction to meet recognized needs.

However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that this impact is acceptable based on specific overriding considerations found herein in Section 8 below.

## **SECTION 4: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT LEVELS**

The EIR identified certain potentially significant effects that could result from the project. However, the Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, adoption of the mitigation measures set forth below will reduce those potential significant effects to less-than-significant levels.

### **4.1 Geology**

*4.1.1* In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic groundshaking could potentially injure persons at the project site due to resulting structural damage. Additionally, proposed construction under the project could be subjected to the geologic hazards related to expansive soils, differential settlement, and corrosivity.

*4.1.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with geologic hazards will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

The project shall comply with site-specific recommendations and standards for seismic design as provided by the project geotechnical engineer; the seismic design requirements of the California Code of Regulations, Title 24; and as recommended by the CSU Seismic Review Board.

*4.1.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with geologic hazards to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the impacts as identified in the EIR, Section 4.B.

## **4.2 Hydrology and Water Quality**

*4.2.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* The project would increase stormflows to Copeland Creek, increasing the potential for flooding of the natural channel portion of Copeland Creek during a 100-year event.

The project would introduce new development, including proposed university housing, within a designated 100-year flood zone.

The project would increase the load on the existing drainage systems on the main campus.

Operation of the project could result in increased non-point source pollution entering the stormwater runoff to Copeland Creek and the regional stormwater drainage system, creating the potential for degradation of water quality.

Construction of the proposed project could result in increased erosion and sedimentation with impacts to water quality during construction.

The project could contribute to cumulative changes in runoff characteristics and water quality.

*4.2.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with hydrology and water quality will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

The project shall include a suitable drainage infrastructure system in the northern acquisition area that will discharge stormwater runoff. The project drainage system shall include an on-site detention system that will limit the 100-year peak flow into Copeland Creek.

The project in the northwestern area shall be designed with grades and landforms sufficient to prevent stormwater breakout from a 100-year flood flow.

On-site storm drain infrastructure for the main campus shall be upgraded per the 1995 Utility System Master Plan.

New drainage structures shall be equipped with filters that have the ability to separate out oil and grease from stormwater runoff prior to its entering the drainage system.

The university will expand its pesticide and fertilizer manager plans and practices to include the proposed landscape areas.

To help minimize the amount of runoff containing non-point source pollutants, project roadways and parking areas should be frequently cleaned.

The university will develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan as required by the State Water Resources Control Board.

*4.2.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with hydrology and water quality to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the hydrology and water quality impacts as identified in the EIR, Section 4.C.

### **4.3 Traffic and Parking**

*4.3.1 Potentially Significant Impact:* Parking demand for special events of greater than 7,400 attendees at the proposed Center for Musical Arts may exceed the university's interim on-site parking.

The project would accommodate an increase in vehicular traffic, bicyclists, and pedestrians within the campus roadways over existing conditions, which would increase the potential for conflicts between the travel modes.

*4.3.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with traffic and parking will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

For special events at the Center for Musical Arts with greater than 3,500 attendees, provide on-site shuttle service between parking Lots "F and "J" and the Center.

For special events with greater than 7,400 attendees that occur prior to the ultimate "F" lot expansion, provide off-site parking locations and shuttle services.

Provide proper advance notification to alert non-event related university traffic of potential alternate parking lots.

Provide traffic control personnel to direct patrons to other on-site facilities.

Install pedestrian crossing improvements at locations on Redwood Circle where heavy pedestrian volumes would occur in order to enhance pedestrian safety.

Construct pedestrian paths within the campus with an adequate width to accommodate the pedestrian volumes.

Monitor pedestrian and bicycle interaction in high volume areas as enrollment increases and, if necessary, prohibit bicyclists from riding in heavy traffic areas.

Install a single-lane roundabout in the intersection of Redwood Circle/Sequoia Way to maximize pedestrian and vehicular safety at this intersection.

*4.3.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with traffic and parking to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the parking and impacts as identified in the EIR, Section 4.D.

#### **4.4 Air Quality**

*4.4.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* Construction activities under the project would generate substantial amounts of dust, which would result in potential health and visibility impacts.

*4.4.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with air quality will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

If asbestos was used in construction of the Ruben Salazar Building and if applicable, the university shall comply with the requirements of BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2.

The university will require construction contractors to implement a dust abatement program.

*4.4.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with air quality to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the air quality related impacts as identified in the EIR, Section 4. D.

## **4.5 Noise**

*4.5.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* Development under the project would result in temporary and localized noise impacts during individual construction projects.

Growth and development under the project would result in a long-term increase in noise levels.

The project would introduce new noise-sensitive uses into an area where noise levels are relatively high from traffic using the Rohnert Park Expressway.

Outdoor sound amplification systems at the Center for Musical Arts could result in noise level impacts if residential uses were to be developed north of Rohnert Park.

*4.5.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with noise resources will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

Construction activities should be limited to a schedule that minimizes disruption, and contractors should muffle or otherwise control noise from construction equipment through implementation of best available noise control techniques; impact tools should be hydraulically or electrically powered wherever possible; where use of pneumatic tools is unavoidable, an exhaust muffler should be used; external jackets on the tools themselves should be used where feasible; quieter procedures should be used, such as drilling rather than impact equipment, wherever feasible; and stationary noise sources should be located as far from sensitive receptors as possible.

The university should require that construction contractors schedule loading and unloading so as to minimize disruption to on-campus activities where feasible.

The university should ensure that mechanical equipment noise associated with new buildings would not conflict with adjacent uses. The university should orient sound amplification systems at the new soccer stadium to the north. The university should not allow special events at the soccer stadium or at the Center for Musical Arts to extend past 10:00 p.m. on weekdays or 11:00 p.m. on weekends if such events produce excessive noise levels producing reasonable complaints from local residents.

The university should extend Title 24 Noise Insulation Standards to all new university housing developments under the project.

*4.5.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with noise to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the impacts to noise resources as identified in the EIR, Section 4.F.

## **4.6 Biological Resources**

*4.6.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* Development of the project could result in impacts to potentially jurisdictional wetlands/waters of the U.S. and streambeds under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the California Department of Fish and Game.

Development of facilities under the project could result in the loss of natural communities, such as riparian forest and wetland/marsh habitat.

Development of project facilities could adversely impact habitat for sensitive animal species.

The proposed project may result in the removal of, or root damage to, significant trees.

*4.6.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with biological resources will be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

A verified wetland delineation for the portion of the project site north of Copeland Creek will be completed prior to any final site planning and construction. Facilities will be planned and sited to avoid wetland and waters of the U.S. to the extent possible. Where impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. cannot be avoided, such losses will be compensated for, on-site if feasible, according to ratios established by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the project.

Avoid any temporary or permanent impact to the wetland/marsh habitat, and, as much as possible, avoid impacts to Copeland Creek. Where bridges are proposed to be constructed across Copeland Creek, minimize the extent of construction impacts. All proposed utilities crossing Copeland Creek shall either be supported by bridge structures or constructed using directional bore methods to avoid disturbance of Copeland Creek. All plantings within the proposed Creek Buffer Zone shall consist of locally indigenous native species. Elsewhere within the northern acquisition area, at least 50 percent of the upland areas proposed as “Sonoma landscaping” shall be vegetated with locally indigenous plant species.

To avoid potential impacts to migrating nesting birds near Copeland Creek, construction within the Preservation and Buffer Zones shall be limited to the period between August 1 and October 31, or conduct preconstruction nesting surveys and restrict construction activities within 500 feet of any active nests until after the young have fledged. To protect sensitive fish, amphibians, reptiles, or insects that may be present, preconstruction surveys in areas of suitable habitat for these species shall be carried out; and if such species are found, they shall be relocated out of the construction zone.

Implement Mitigation Measures C.4 and C.5 discussed in Section 4.C, Hydrology and Water Quality.

The University will avoid all significant trees to the extent feasible. The university will adhere to the following limitations for construction within and around significant trees (trees greater than

12-inch diameter at breast height): For all development that will encroach into the feeder root zone, special techniques to allow roots to breathe and obtain water shall be required, use hand equipment for trenching, protect natural resources with fencing, allow only one pass through an area with protected trees. The existing ground surface within the drip-line of any significant tree will not be cut. There will be no parking or storing vehicles, equipment, machinery, or construction materials, mechanical excavation, construction of buildings, or dumping of oils or chemicals within the drip-lines of any significant trees. Prior to the start of any clearing, trenching grading, paving, or change in ground elevation on a site with significant trees, install fencing at the dripline. Tree removal shall not occur during March through June without a bird survey to determine that the tree is unused during breeding season for birds that are protected under California Fish and Game Codes.

*4.6.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with biological resources to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the impacts to biological resources as identified in the EIR, Section 4.H.

## **4.7 Hazardous Materials**

*4.7.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* Disturbance of any remaining contaminated areas during building demolition, site grading, and construction on the undeveloped university property north of the campus could expose construction workers or the environment to residual hazardous waste or health and safety concerns.

Development and Expansion of on-campus facilities will necessitate an increase in the quantities of hazardous chemicals used, stored, and disposed of by university facility operations.

*4.7.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with hazardous materials will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

As recommended in the Environmental Assessment Report, prior to construction, remove petroleum-impacted soils on the northern parcels and investigate the groundwater well and abandon it.

*4.7.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with hazardous materials to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the impacts to hazardous materials as identified in the EIR, Section 4.I.

## **4.8 Utilities and Service Systems**

*4.8.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* The proposed project would increase potable water demands that would exceed the university's existing potable water storage capacity.

*4.8.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with utilities and service systems will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

Add additional potable water storage capacity of at least 305,800 gallons. The university's two wells are 475 gpm and are thus capable of accommodating the university's projected total maximum daily demand and flows under the project. However, additional water storage capacity would be required to meet peak demands as well as meeting water storage design criteria for maximum day plus fire flow. The timing and design for additional storage capacity should be consistent with the development of the proposed building.

*4.8.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with utilities and service systems to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the impacts to utilities service systems as identified in the EIR, Section 4.K.

## **4.9 Energy**

*4.9.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* Development under the project would increase peak demands on the electricity and natural gas infrastructure.

*4.9.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with energy resources will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

The university shall coordinate with PG&E for all required infrastructure improvements.

*4.9.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with energy resources to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the impacts to energy resources as identified in the EIR, Section 4.L.

## **4.10 Cultural Resources**

*4.10.1 Potentially Significant Impacts:* Project construction could affect previously undiscovered historic or archaeological resources.

*4.10.2 Mitigation Measures:* The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, impacts of the project associated with cultural resources will be reduced to a less-than-significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

For any project construction on the project site either (1) within 300 feet of Copeland Creek or (2) on the site of the four buildings in the northern acquisition area or the building on the main campus indicated in historical maps: A qualified archaeologist will be on-site during earthwork activities. If materials are encountered, the archaeologist will be authorized to direct construction to other areas or shall meet with the university to determine the appropriate course of action. Should any undiscovered evidence of historic or prehistoric materials be encountered, construction in the vicinity of the find will be halted until an appropriate course of action is identified. If human remains are encountered during construction, the Sonoma County Coroner will be notified immediately.

*4.10.3 Findings:* The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the potential impacts of the project associated with cultural resources to a less-than-significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the impacts to cultural resources as identified in the EIR, Section 4.M.

## **SECTION 5: EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT**

The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, as discussed below, the following impacts associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required.

### **5.1 Land Use and Planning**

The project would result in the conversion of existing agricultural land to non-agricultural use, increase the residential population on the project site and the local community, and could be incompatible with existing or approved development in the project vicinity. However, the conversion of the project site to non-agricultural use would account for a loss of 0.1 percent of total Farmland of Local Importance within the County and is not considered a significant environmental impact as there is no designated Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide Importance on the project site. The project-generated increase in population in the local area would not be considered substantial nor result in significant environmental impacts, since the City of Rohnert Park General Plan proposes the area as a mix of intermediate and high density residential uses as well, and the project would not conflict with adjacent uses. The site is on or immediately adjacent to the existing master plan area of Sonoma State University. The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the impacts to the above-referenced land use and planning associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

## **5.2 Visual Resources**

The project would alter the existing visual character of the site and result in a change to the scenic vistas of which the proposed project site is a part, and the project would result in an increase in the production of light and glare at the project site. This would not result in a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista and would not create a significant impact, as the university will assure that the design be consistent with the aesthetic guidelines of the university and the visual character of the local community. The Board of Trustees finds that, based on substantial evidence in the record, the impacts to visual resources associated with the project are less than significant and no further mitigation is required or recommended.

## **SECTION 6: SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE EFFECTS**

*6.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts:* Based on the information in the EIR, the cumulative effects to which the project would contribute include: changes in runoff characteristics and water quality, increases in traffic, increases in regional emissions of criteria air pollutant, noise impacts from outdoor sound amplification system to potential cumulative residential development north of Rohnert Park Expressway, cumulative increases in public roadside noise levels due to university traffic increase combined with area-wide growth and development, and potential exceedance of future wastewater treatment allocation designated by the subregional wastewater treatment provider, the City of Rohnert Park.

### **6.1.2 Mitigation Measures**

*Hydrology:* With implementation of mitigation measures for the project's impact to hydrology and water quality, the project's contribution to cumulative hydrology would not be cumulatively significant after mitigation.

*Traffic:* Impacts from project-generated vehicle trips at off-campus intersections remains a significant cumulative impact since the jurisdiction for mitigation lies with the City of Rohnert Park and Sonoma County.

*Air Quality:* After mitigation, emissions will contribute to significant cumulative air quality impacts.

*Noise:* The Center for Musical Arts has been designed to avoid noise impacts on adjacent uses. If, however, residential uses were to be developed north of Rohnert Park Expressway in the future, as anticipated under the Rohnert Park General Plan Update, then noise impact from the use of outdoor sound amplification systems could have potentially significant cumulative effect. The City of Rohnert Park has identified mitigation measures in its Draft General Plans that are intended to reduce impacts to future development from traffic noise on the Expressway. If the university limits special events not to extend past 10:00 p.m. on weekdays or 11:00 p.m. on weekends, this impact would be less than significant.

*Traffic Noise:* The university should coordinate with Sonoma County Transit to provide for potential public transit and should encourage the City of Rohnert Park to address future cumulative noise

levels along Rohnert Park Expressway during annexation and subsequent development as identified in the city's Draft General Plan. This would ensure land use compatibility for future residential land uses but would not reduce the effect for existing residences to a less-than-significant level.

*Waste Water:* The university shall arrange with the City of Rohnert Park to be included in application for its share of an increase in wastewater treatment capacity. Since the university does not at this time have an approved increase in capacity, the project's potential exceedance of future wastewater treatment allocation is considered a significant cumulative impact.

*6.1.3 Findings:* Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant cumulative impacts as identified in the EIR. However, cumulative impacts in the areas of traffic, air quality, and wastewater treatment capacity of the project in conjunction with related development in the region must be considered unavoidably significant. However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that these impacts as listed above are acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see Section 8.0 below).

## **SECTION 7: FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION MEASURES**

### **7.1 Project Alternatives**

The EIR, Chapter 5, Alternatives, contains an analysis of the alternatives to the project, including the "No Project" alternative. The following alternatives were considered and analyzed in the EIR:

#### **Alternative 1, No Project**

The No Project alternative is required by Section 15126.6 (e) of the CEQA Guidelines and refers to the potential environmental consequences should the master plan revision not occur, but rather that the project site would be developed under the existing approved master plan. The facilities that would not be developed under this alternative would be the Center for Musical Arts, the university center, the residence halls addition on the central campus, additional university housing in the northwest acquisition parcel, and the soccer stadium. The vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian improvements proposed throughout the campus under the project would not occur under this alternative and would not provide for the designation of the Copeland Creek Preservation and Buffer Zones or preparation of the Copeland Creek Ecological Resource Protection Plan proposed under the project.

Although the existing approved master plan would maintain a maximum student population of 10,000 FTES similar to the project, it would involve a smaller on-site residential population; therefore, seismic groundshaking impacts on on-site residents would be less than the project (but the risk to individuals located elsewhere locally would not be materially improved since no special seismic risk is associated with the campus).

This alternative would not result in a change in drainage patterns from the northern acquisition area; it would result in a smaller increase in stormflows to Copeland Creek during a 100-year event compared to the project. However, since the No Project Alternative would continue to contribute stormwater flows from the northern acquisition area to Hinebaugh Creek, it would continue to negatively impact the theoretical capacity of that drainage as under existing conditions.

Since the No Project Alternative does not propose any additional on-campus housing, this alternative would generate more off-site weekday traffic volumes. The significant impacts to weekday peak-hour levels of service at the study intersections would be greater than those under the project. However, the temporary but significant traffic impacts associated with large special events at the Center for Musical Arts would not occur. Since the proposed bicycle and pedestrian network under the No Project Alternative would not be as refined, it would pose the potential for more safety pedestrian/bicycle conflicts. As under the project, the safety concerns related to off-site parked vehicles along Petaluma Hill Road and East Cotati Avenue would remain.

Over the long term, and on a day-to-day basis during the school year, motor vehicle emissions associated with the university would be higher under this alternative than under the project because traffic volumes would be increased with fewer housing additions. However, the No Project Alternative would avoid the significant increase in vehicular emissions during the summer when large summertime festivals would be held at the Center for Musical Arts.

Since the No Project Alternative would not develop housing in an area where noise levels currently exceed 60 DNL (on Rohnert Park Expressway), this alternative would avoid this potentially significant impact. The No Project Alternative would result in less new development than the proposed project; therefore, significant but mitigable noise impacts from new on-site mechanical equipment would be less. Traffic volumes associated with the university would be higher under the No Project Alternative; therefore, overall traffic noise effects would be greater than with the project.

Since the No Project Alternative would not result in development in the northern acquisition area and result in only one vehicular/pedestrian crossing of Copeland Creek, it would avoid or result in less filling of on-site wetlands and result in less potential alteration to Copeland Creek, as well as less potential loss of riparian forest and marsh as well as potential habitat for sensitive animal species than the project. However, the No Project Alternative would not provide for designation of Creek Preservation and Buffer Zones or preparation of the Ecological Resource Protection Plan that are proposed under the project.

Since the No Project Alternative would generate an on-site potable water demand for roughly one-third that of the proposed project's worst-case scenario, the impact to increases in well water extraction rates over existing conditions would be less than the project. Although this alternative would require less wastewater treatment capacity than the project, it would still result in the potential for the university to exceed its future wastewater treatment allocation.

## **Alternative Site 2—No Development in Northwest Acquisition Area**

Under this alternative, the university would not acquire the northwest acquisition area and would not develop housing or any other university use within the northwest acquisition area. As under the proposed project, the total student capacity of the university would remain at 10,000 FTES. All other proposed university facilities elsewhere on the project site would be developed as proposed under the master plan revision, including the Center for Musical Arts, instructional expansion, university center, physical education addition, the residence halls addition, and the soccer stadium.

*Geologic Impacts.* Although this alternative would maintain a maximum student population of 10,000 FTES similar to the project, it would involve a smaller on-site residential population and, therefore, the potential residential population on the project site that could be affected by groundshaking would be less than the project. As under the project, all potential hazards under this alternative would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

*Hydrology and Water.* Since the change in drainage patterns from the northern acquisition area under this alternative would not include the northwest portion, it would result in a smaller increase in stormflows to Copeland Creek during a 100-year event compared to the proposed project. This alternative would not introduce new development including housing within a designated 100-year flood zone and would therefore avoid this significant (although mitigable) impact that would occur under the project. However, since this alternative would continue to contribute stormwater flows from the northwest area to Hinebaugh Creek, it would continue to negatively impact the capacity of that drainage.

*Transportation.* Since this alternative would accommodate a smaller on-site residential population than the project, it would generate more off-site weekday traffic volumes. Therefore, the significant impacts would be greater than those which would occur under the proposed project. The potential exacerbation of existing safety concerns related to off-site parked vehicles along Petaluma Hill Road and East Cotati Avenue would occur as under the project.

*Air Quality.* This alternative would involve less overall new on-site construction; therefore, the significant, albeit temporary, impacts from construction activities would be less. Over the long-term basis during the school year, motor vehicle emissions would be higher under this alternative because less on-campus housing would increase traffic impact. Like the project, this alternative would result in significant increases in emissions during the summer when large summertime festivals would be held at the music center.

*Noise.* This alternative would involve less overall new on-site construction; therefore, the significant, albeit temporary, impacts from construction activities would be less. Over the long-term basis during the school year, motor vehicle noise would be higher under this alternative because less on-campus housing would increase traffic impact. The significant project and/or cumulative noise impacts resulting from outdoor sound amplification systems associated with the soccer stadium and the proposed Center for Musical Arts would be similar to the project.

*Biological Resources.* Since this alternative would not result in development in the northwest acquisition area, it would avoid or result in less potential filling of on-site jurisdictional wetlands. Furthermore, this alternative would result in less potential loss of riparian forest and marsh habitat as well as potential habitat for sensitive animal species than the proposed project. This alternative would provide for designation of Creek Preservation and Buffer Zones and the Copeland Creek Ecological Resource Protection Plan.

*Utilities.* Since this alternative would generate an on-site potable water demand for 60 percent of the proposed project's worst-case scenario, the impact to increase in well water extraction rates over existing conditions would be less than the project and continue to be less than significant. Although this alternative would require less wastewater treatment capacity than the proposed project, it would still result in the potential for the university to exceed its future wastewater treatment allocation.

### **Alternative Site 3—No Development in Northwest Acquisition Area and Increase in Housing Density on Main Central Campus**

As with Alternative 2, this alternative assumes the university would not acquire the northwest acquisition area and would not develop housing or other university use within the northwest acquisition area. Unlike Alternative 2, however, this alternative assumes the university would accommodate university housing population on the main central campus instead. All other proposed facilities elsewhere on the project site would be developed as proposed under the master plan revision, including the Center for Musical Arts, instructional expansion, university center, and the soccer stadium.

*Geologic Impacts.* Although this alternative would maintain a maximum student population of 10,000 FTES similar to the project, it would involve a smaller on-site residential population and, therefore, the potential residential population on the project site that could be affected by groundshaking would be less than the project. As under the project, all potential hazards under this alternative would be mitigated to a less-than-significant level.

*Hydrology and Water.* Since the change in drainage patterns from the northern acquisition area under this alternative would not include the northwest portion, it would result in a smaller increase in stormflows to Copeland Creek during a 100-year event compared to the proposed project. This alternative would not introduce new development including housing within a designated 100-year flood zone and would therefore avoid this significant (although mitigable) impact that would occur under the project. However, since this alternative would continue to contribute stormwater flows from the northwest area to Hinebaugh Creek, it would continue to negatively impact the capacity of that drainage.

*Transportation.* Since this alternative would accommodate a smaller on-site residential population than the project, it would generate more off-site weekday traffic volumes. Therefore, the significant impacts would be greater than those which would occur under the proposed project. The potential

exacerbation of existing safety concerns related to off-site parked vehicles along Petaluma Hill Road and East Cotati Avenue would occur as under the project.

*Air Quality.* This alternative would involve less overall new on-site construction; therefore, the significant, albeit temporary, impacts from construction activities would be less. Over the long-term basis during the school year, motor vehicle emissions would be higher under this alternative because less on-campus housing would increase traffic impact. Like the project, this alternative would result in significant increases in emissions during the summer when large summertime festivals would be held at the music center.

*Noise.* This alternative would involve incrementally less overall new on-site construction; therefore, the significant, albeit temporary, noise from construction activities would be less. This alternative would affect the ambient noise environment through operating additional building mechanical devices with new on-site development on the central campus. Over the long-term basis during the school year, motor vehicle noise would be higher under this alternative because less on-campus housing would increase traffic impact. The significant project and/or cumulative noise impacts resulting from outdoor sound amplification systems associated with the soccer stadium and the proposed Center for Musical Arts would be similar to the project.

*Biological Resources.* Since this alternative would not result in development in the northwest acquisition area, it would avoid or result in less potential filling of on-site jurisdictional wetlands. Furthermore, this alternative would result in less potential loss of riparian forest and marsh habitat as well as potential habitat for sensitive animal species than the proposed project. This alternative would provide for designation of Creek Preservation and Buffer Zones and the preparation of the Copeland Creek Ecological Resource Protection Plan.

*Utilities.* Since this alternative would generate an on-site potable water demand for 85 percent of the proposed project's worst-case scenario, the impact to increase in well water extraction rates over existing conditions would be less than the project and continue to be less than significant. Although this alternative would require less wastewater treatment capacity than the proposed project, it would still result in the potential for the university to exceed its future wastewater treatment allocation.

This alternative would introduce a potentially new significant visual impact associated with the seven-story residential building on the main campus which would not occur under the proposed project or Alternative 2.

### **Mitigated Project**

The term Mitigated Project refers to the project as modified by the mitigation measures identified in the topical sections of this EIR. The conclusion of this EIR is that the recommended mitigation measures reduce the potential environmental impacts associated with the project to a less-than-significant level, with the exception of air quality impacts, noise impacts, utilities impacts and

traffic impacts. The board adopts the Mitigated Project and finds that the other alternatives to the Mitigated Project are rejected because they will not provide the benefits of the Mitigated Project. The project benefits are described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations. The decisive factors are that the No Project Alternative would not provide the needed music center. Alternative 2 would not provide the student housing of the selected project. Alternative 3 would provide high-rise housing. This would introduce an intensity of development which is deemed undesirable when compared to the current layout of the campus. Also, student high-rise residential living is susceptible to greater operational risk than the currently designed housing. The proposed project would employ a form of housing which has proven successful. The design for the music center on the northwest acquisition site is also deemed aesthetically, popularly, and programmatically highly desirable. Consequently, the Mitigated Project is selected for adoption.

## 7.2 Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees has considered all of the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR for the project. None of these recommended measures that are within the university's jurisdiction have been rejected by the Board of Trustees. In addition, mitigation measures were either added (in response to public comment) or modified. The added mitigation measures are contained in the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan. The Board of Trustees finds that modifications to the mitigation measures are minor clarifications that do not substantially and negatively affect any environmental issues associated with the project. The following mitigation measures contained in the Draft EIR, Section 4.C-9, Hydrology and Water Quality, Section 4.D-29 Traffic, Section 4.H-10 and 4.H-12 Biological Resources, were revised in the FEIR as shown below:

4.C-9 Hydrology and Water Quality. Add the following underlined text to Measure C.4a:

New drainage structures, curb inlets and drop inlets shall be equipped with filters that have the ability to separate out oil and grease from storm water runoff prior to entering the drainage system, and/or the drainage system shall be equipped with a device capable of intercepting and trapping such pollutants offline along the storm drain system. Periodic maintenance of these filters and/or offline debris traps would be incorporated into the maintenance routine normally associated with the university facilities.

4.D-29 Traffic. Add the following measure D.5:

For events projected to draw more attendance than can be accommodated by parking in the northern acquisition area (approximately 2,600 attendees), provide adequate traffic control personnel to direct event patrons to other available on-campus parking facilities.

4.H-10 to 11. Biological Resources. Add the following underlined text to measure H.1a:

A verified wetland delineation for the portion of the project site north of Copeland Creek will be completed and made available prior to any final site planning and construction of facilities within or adjacent to potential jurisdictional wetlands, which includes seasonal ponding areas, permanent ponded areas, drainage ditches, and streams and creeks.

4.H-12. Biological Resources. Add the following measure H.2c:

All plantings within the proposed Creek Buffer Zone shall consist of locally indigenous native species. Elsewhere within the northern acquisition area, at least 50 percent of the upland areas proposed as “Sonoma landscaping” shall be vegetated with locally indigenous plant species in assemblages resembling natural communities, such as oak woodland, oak savanna, and grassland. Non-native species, such as wine grapes, may be used elsewhere in the areas proposed as “Sonoma landscaping.” Invasive non-native species (including tree-of-heaven, mayten tree, broom, giant reed, and pampas grass) will not be used in the landscaping of the proposed project (an exception would be eucalyptus, which could be planted in the courtyard of proposed Center for Musical Arts).

4.H-12. Biological Resources. Combine measures H.3 and H.4 by adding the following measures H.3a, H3b and H3c and eliminating measures H.4, H4a, H4b:

*Measure H.3a:* To avoid potential impacts to migrating nesting birds near Copeland Creek, construction within the Copeland Creek Preservation and Buffer Zones shall be limited to the period between August 1 and October 31. Alternatively, the applicant could (1) remove potential nesting trees within the construction disturbance zone prior to the nesting period (February-August) or (2) conduct preconstruction nesting surveys of the project area and restrict construction-related activities within 500 feet of any active nests until after the young have fledged.

*Measure H.3b:* To protect sensitive fish (including steelhead), amphibians, reptiles, or insects that may be present, preconstruction surveys in areas of suitable habitat for these species shall be carried out, and if such species are found they shall be relocated out of the construction zone.

*Measure H.3c:* Implement Mitigation Measures C.4 and C.5 discussed in Section IV.C, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the DEIR.

## **SECTION 8: STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS**

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered acceptable (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(a)). CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the FEIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines Section 15093(b)). In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees finds that the mitigation measures identified in the FEIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, when implemented, avoid or

substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the FEIR. Nonetheless, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are:

Development under the project would increase air pollutant emissions associated with the university operation relative to existing conditions and the project would contribute to cumulative increases in regional emissions of air pollutants.

The increase in traffic due to university and area-wide growth and development would result in cumulative increases in roadside noise levels.

With the proposed project, the university would exceed its current wastewater treatment allocation designated by the subregional wastewater treatment system unless an increase in capacity allocation is received. Public policy favors provision of public utility service, including wastewater treatment, to public service agencies including the state university. Support for such efforts is provided under Government Code Section 54999 procedures.

Project-generated vehicle trips would contribute to delays at nearby intersections during a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

The project could exacerbate existing safety concerns related to off-site parked vehicles adjacent to campus.

Special events at the proposed Center for Musical Arts would generate surges in traffic prior to and/or following the events, resulting in traffic delays at campus entrances.

The Board of Trustees finds that the economic, education, social, and other considerations of the project outweigh the significant unavoidable impacts identified above. These considerations are described below, followed by an indication of the specific benefits of the project.

*Cumulative Air Quality Impacts.* Although the project will reduce motor vehicle trips as compared to No Project under the existing approved master plan, any increase in emissions from an existing conditions standpoint will be an unavoidable adverse impact to air quality. University-related emissions under the project would be affected by expected increases in enrollment and employment primarily due to the related increases in motor vehicle trips. These impacts cannot be reduced to a level of insignificance, even after the implementation of mitigation measures recommended by the Draft EIR.

*Noise Impacts.* Although the project will reduce motor vehicle trips as compared to No Project under the existing approved master plan, any increase in noise from an existing conditions standpoint will be an unavoidable adverse impact in roadside noise levels along Rohnert Park Expressway. University-related impact in roadside noise levels under the project would be affected by expected increases in enrollment and employment primarily due to the related increases in motor vehicle

trips. These impacts are being reduced to non-significant levels for the university site, but there is uncertainty on cumulative impacts connected with the unknown nature of any non-university development offsite.

*Utilities.* The City of Rohnert Park maintains an agreement with the university allowing the university wastewater treatment capacity, which reflects the needs of the university at the current enrollment level of approximately 6,000 FTES. It does not accommodate additional treatment capacity required for development identified under the existing approved university master plan with an enrollment ceiling of 10,000 FTES, nor for the proposed master plan, which maintains the current enrollment ceiling. The university must arrange with the city to be included in its application for its share of the increase in wastewater treatment capacity in order for this impact to be mitigated to less than significant. Until that time this impact is considered significant. The City of Rohnert Park is the agency responsible for allocating capacity to the university. The FEIR identifies that there are no engineering impediments to the allocation and that unallocated capacity exists. The city should provide the allocation to the university. A failure to do so would contravene public policy and, to the extent any discretion lies with the city, be an abuse of such discretion.

*Traffic.* Mitigation measures identified necessary to decrease the traffic and parking impact are off-site and, therefore, not within the CSU jurisdiction to implement. These impacts are listed as significant after mitigation because the CSU cannot guarantee mitigation by agencies outside their jurisdiction. Although necessary mitigation measures for these impacts are included in the Rohnert Park Draft General Plan, those mitigation measures are not funded at this time and impacts remain significant.

The Board of Trustees specifically finds that there are specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, and other reasons for approving this project, notwithstanding the disclosure of the significant unavoidable impacts referred to above. Those reasons are as follows:

- a. The proposed project would provide instruction expansion space to accommodate the approved enrollment ceiling of 10,000 FTES and thereby fulfill the CSU and the state mission for higher education.
- b. The proposed project would support Sonoma State University's educational mission by accommodating additional residential students on campus, a university center to enhance student life, and a Center for Musical Arts, which will enhance the University Performing Arts program as well as new university programs being developed in partnership with local school districts and the Santa Rosa Symphony.
- c. The proposed project uses campus land resources efficiently.
- d. The project maximizes the use of existing campus resources and infrastructure, thereby providing the most cost-effective opportunities for meeting existing and future higher education needs.

- e. The project minimizes project costs and, at the same time, improves overall campus design, architectural character, image, and identity.
- f. The proposed project would support the university's educational mission by providing modern, technologically appropriate academic facilities on campus.
- g. The proposed project would provide much-needed on-campus housing for students in a setting comparable to or more attractive than that enjoyed by residents living off-campus.
- h. The project will reduce motor vehicle trips and have beneficial impacts on traffic and air quality.
- i. The project improves the vehicular and pedestrian circulation at gateways into the campus.
- j. The project maintains and enhances campus open space and biotic habitat resources space and, at the same time, enhances athletic facilities.
- k. The proposed project would provide a state-of-the-art multipurpose cultural activities venue at Sonoma State University to serve the campus, the residents of the Rohnert Park/Cotati community, San Francisco Bay Metropolitan Area, and the Northern California Region, with a valuable cultural facility currently not available in the region.
- l. The proposed project would provide an on-campus venue for academic, cultural, and entertainment events that are easily accessible to students, faculty, staff, the local and metropolitan community, and regional and statewide patrons.
- m. The proposed project would provide a university campus landmark and a catalyst for fine arts academic programs and cultural activities for the university and the surrounding region.
- n. The sports stadium and upgraded soccer field will provide additional opportunities for women's sports programs and will further support the university's Title IX compliance efforts.
- o. The improved sports facilities will provide greater opportunity for both inter-collegiate and community sports programs, particularly soccer, which is growing in participation at all levels.
- p. The future stadium will provide an on-campus facility for sports activities and other events that will be more readily accessible to the university community as well as the local community and regional population.
- q. The project is the result of input from both the campus and surrounding communities, and responds to their concerns and desires for the university, particularly the development of a performing arts venue that provides for enhanced cultural activities, which benefit both the campus community and the surrounding non-university population.

- r. The proposed project would provide economic benefits to the cities of Rohnert Park and Cotati by providing temporary construction jobs, permanent service-sector and other jobs, hospitality services commercial sales, sales tax and other revenue, and other economic activity associated with cultural and other events to be held at the Center for Musical Arts. The economic benefits will offset identified adverse impacts and support funding of needed local infrastructure improvements.

On balance, the Board of Trustees finds that there are specific economic, legal, social, technological, and other considerations associated with the project that serve to override and outweigh the project's significant unavoidable effects and, thus, the adverse effects are considered acceptable.

## **SECTION 9: RESPONSIBLE AGENCIES**

The Board of Trustees finds that the following public agencies are responsible for the identified mitigation measures. This information is also provided in the record, including the matrix of mitigations and monitoring responsibilities displayed in Attachment D.

Transportation Mitigation Measure D.1 is improvements to local roads and the responsibility for the county roads is the County of Sonoma's and the responsibility for the city streets is the City of Rohnert Park's. Mitigation Measure D.1a is the responsibility of the City of Rohnert Park. Mitigation Measures D.1b, D.1c, D.1d, and D.1e are the responsibility of the County of Sonoma. The board finds that the county and city will meet their responsibilities for road and street improvements to maintain adequate levels of service. This obligation has been reflected in the county's general plan and the general plan for the City of Rohnert Park.

Transportation Mitigation Measure D.3a, prohibition of parking on Petaluma Hill Road, is the responsibility of the County of Sonoma. The university has requested that the county prohibit parking at this location, but the county has not agreed. The university will continue to request this prohibition; but based on the county's previous lack of action, the board finds that this measure will not be implemented. A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been made.

Transportation Mitigation Measure D.3b, prohibition of parking on East Cotati Blvd., is the responsibility the City of Rohnert Park. The university has requested that the city prohibit parking at this location, but the city has not agreed. The university will continue to request this prohibition, but based on the city's previous lack of action, the board finds that this measure will not be implemented. A Statement of Overriding Considerations has been made.

Biological Resources Mitigation measure H.1 will involve obtaining permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Department of Fish and Game, and the North Coast Water Quality District. The University shall take the lead in applying for the permits. The university has been working with the Department of Fish and Game and has based its planning for the project on the assumption that it will comply with the normal requirements for the needed permits. On that basis the board finds that these agencies will grant the needed permits.

Utilities and Services Systems Mitigation Measure K.4: The City of Rohnert Park is responsible for increasing the wastewater treatment allocation to the university. The university as a major public service should have priority in the allocation of treatment capacity to meet its needs. The board finds that the City of Rohnert Park should and will provide adequate allocation to the university to meet its needs.

**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan for  
Sonoma State University—Campus Master Plan Revision and Center for Musical Arts**

1. The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation and any revisions to this plan.
2. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report based on the attached Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan shall be prepared for this project by campus staff until project completion or until compliance with the required mitigation measures is complete, whichever occurs first. The report shall be on file at the Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore Avenue, Long Beach, California 90802-4210 and at Sonoma State University, Office of Facilities Services, Building 10, Rohnert Park, California 94928.
3. Once significant construction is begun and under way at the site, monitoring of the mitigation measures associated with construction shall be included in the responsibilities of the designated university construction supervision staff, who shall prepare or cause to be prepared reports of such monitoring no less than once a year until the project is complete and occupied.
4. Any substantive change in the monitoring and reporting plan made by campus staff shall be reported in writing to the executive vice chancellor and chief financial officer. Reference to such changes shall be made in the annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

The Board of Trustees finds this plan adequate to meet the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 5  
May 9-10, 2000

**COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Approval of Schematic Plans**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor  
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

**Summary**

Schematic plans for the following projects will be presented for approval:

1. California State University, Fullerton—Student Housing Expansion
2. California State University, Los Angeles—Bookstore/Dining Services Building
3. San Diego State University—Athletics Administration/Hall of Fame
4. San Diego State University—Parking Structure 6

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolutions.

**ITEM**

2

Agenda Item 5  
May 9-10, 2000

**COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS**

**Approval of Schematic Plans**

**1. California State University, Fullerton—Student Housing Expansion**  
**Project Architect: The Steinberg Group Architects**

**Background and Scope**

In February 1999, CSU Fullerton commissioned a market study to explore the demand for additional housing on campus. The proposed student housing expansion project responds to the expressed preferences indicated in the market demand study and complements the current residence halls on campus.

The 139,130 gross square foot (GSF) project includes 110 units with four single-occupancy rooms for a total of 440 beds. The units will be arranged in five 4-story buildings consisting of 22 units (88 beds) in each building. A new one-story administration facility and maintenance facility will be centrally located providing the following amenities and services: administrative offices, service areas, mail room, laundry room, weight room, convenience store, public restrooms, custodial service room, study group areas, maintenance shop and storage spaces. The project also includes the redesign and reconfiguration of existing common space, office space and maintenance space. The project design features building elements that encourage social interaction, build community, and enhance security. Exterior finishes will primarily consist of plaster walls, pre-finished cement panels, pre-finished sheet metal panels, and flat roofs. The scope of work also includes miscellaneous on-site improvements.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	May 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	October 2000
Construction Start	March 2001
Occupancy	August 2002

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	139,130 square feet
Assignable Building Area	107,520 square feet
Efficiency	77 percent
Remodeled Area	3,360 square feet

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847**

New Building Cost (\$95 per gross square foot)	\$13,260,000
--	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$26.40
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$29.60
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$30.09

Remodel Existing Building Cost	\$ 200,000
Site Development (includes landscaping)	1,862,000
Group I Equipment	<u>928,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$16,250,000
Fees and Contingency	<u>3,401,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$138 per gross square foot)	\$19,651,000
Group II Equipment	<u>1,400,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$21,051,000</u>

**Funding Data**

Project financing will be through the issuance of Dormitory Revenue Fund Housing bonds. A request for approval of the financing will be presented to the Board of Trustees at a future meeting.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

An initial study has been completed and a Negative Declaration was prepared and filed with the State Clearinghouse on April 3, 2000. Pursuant to CEQA, the 30-day public review period will end on May 3, 2000. A copy of the Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting and any adverse public comments will be reported.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the Negative Declaration for the California State University, Fullerton, Student Housing Expansion project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. The project will benefit The California State University; and
4. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project; and
5. The schematic plans for the California State University, Fullerton, Student Housing Expansion project are approved at a project cost of \$21,051,000 at CCCCI 3847.

**2. California State University, Los Angeles—Bookstore/Dining Services Building  
Project Architect: Wou & Partners**

**Background and Scope**

CSU Los Angeles University Auxiliary Services, Inc. (UAS) is a recognized nonprofit auxiliary organization dedicated to providing services to students, faculty and staff. UAS supports the

university's educational mission by providing financial support to programs that traditionally cannot be funded with tax dollars. A new UAS building was conceived years ago for many reasons. The present cafeteria is a 50-year-old building with equipment maintenance costs increasing significantly over the years. Dining services have outgrown the capacity of the present 350-seat cafeteria with UAS serving approximately 1,500 students during peak hours. The lack of space in the bookstore prevents the UAS from providing students and faculty with all the books and materials required for their courses. It was determined that a new building would be more cost effective due to the inadequate size of the current facility and the need to replace major building systems. The new UAS bookstore/dining services building program has been developed in consultation with the project management committee, faculty, staff, students, and professional design consultants.

The 97,218 gross square foot (GSF) project will be located on the site of the existing UAS cafeteria, which will be demolished by January 2001. The 3-story building consists of a university bookstore, cafeteria, continuing education, conference center, and UAS administrative offices. Vehicular access and deliveries will be from Rancho Paseo Castilla to the west. The building design is architecturally sensitive to its surroundings, provides a signature image for the campus, and creates a physical setting where visitors and users can socialize and enjoy the environment.

#### **Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	June 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	December 2000
Construction Start	January 2001
Occupancy	July 2002

#### **Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	97,218 square feet
Assignable Building Area	73,460 square feet
Efficiency	75 percent

#### **Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847**

Building Cost (\$175 per gross square foot)	\$17,050,000
---	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$10.40
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$83.99
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$19.65
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$61.71

Site Development (includes landscaping)	650,000
Group I Equipment (included in building cost above)	<u>0</u>
Construction Cost	\$17,700,000
Fees & Contingency	<u>3,888,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$222 per gross square foot)	\$21,588,000
Group II Equipment	<u>912,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$22,500,000</u>

### **Funding Data**

Project funding will be secured from the issuance of tax-exempt revenue bonds to be supported by the auxiliary organization commercial operations and corporate revenues. The proposed financing will be presented to the Board of Trustees at a future meeting.

### **California Environmental Quality Act Action (CEQA)**

A Categorical Exemption has been completed pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The Categorical Exemption was filed with the State Clearinghouse on April 3, 2000.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Los Angeles, Bookstore/Dining Services Building has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
  2. The proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
  3. The project will benefit The California State University; and
  4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Los Angeles, Bookstore/Dining Services Building are approved at a project cost of \$22,500,000 at CCCI 3847.
- 3. San Diego State University—Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame**  
**Project Architect: Carrier Johnson**

### **Background and Scope**

The proposed Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame will consolidate all of the athletic functions on campus into one new facility. Once completed, the existing athletics building will be converted to academic uses.

The proposed 4-story facility includes weight rooms, locker rooms, physical therapy and equipment storage space, offices for coaches, administrative offices, meeting rooms, academic compliance study and tutoring space, a 200-seat auditorium, and Hall of Fame. The existing 26,000-square-foot locker rooms will be renovated and incorporated into the project providing 101,500 GSF of new construction. The design consists of a steel moment framed structure with a stucco and glass exterior skin. High volume spaces in the Hall of Fame, lobby, and weight rooms will accentuate the presence of the building, which is directly adjacent to 55th Street and Aztec Walk (a broad pedestrian east-west link to the core of the campus). The design adheres to the campus architectural vocabulary

with a focus on neutral colored stucco, accent tiles, and punched window openings, and relates directly to the neighboring campus buildings. The project will provide a signature building at the westernmost end of Aztec Walk.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	April 2000
Completion of Working Drawings	June 2000
Construction Start	August 2000
Occupancy	July 2001

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	127,500 square feet
Assignable Building Area	89,000 square feet
Efficiency	70 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847**

Building Cost (\$98 per gross square foot)	\$12,485,000
--	--------------

<i>Systems Breakdown</i>	<i>(\$ per GSF)</i>
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ 4.28
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$37.38
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$27.57
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$28.69

Site Development (includes landscaping)	1,163,000
Group I Equipment (included in building cost above)	<u>0</u>

Construction Cost	\$13,648,000
Fees & Contingency	<u>4,931,000</u>

Total Project Cost (\$146 per gross square foot)	\$18,579,000
Group II Equipment	<u>2,100,000</u>

Grand Total	<u>\$20,679,000</u>
-------------	---------------------

**Funding Data**

Funding for the project has been provided by private donations.

**California Environmental Quality Act**

An initial study has been completed and an EIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The public comment period ended on March 29, 1999. Comments were received and responded to in the FEIR, which was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 12, 1999. A copy of the previously approved FEIR, which includes all written and oral comments received by San Diego State University on the Draft EIR, will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the FEIR for the San Diego State University Master Plan, certified on May 12, 1999, was prepared to include the Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved FEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary, and the project will benefit The California State University; and
4. The schematic plans for the San Diego State University, Athletics Administration Building/Hall of Fame are approved at a project cost of \$20,679,000 at CCCI 3847.

**4. San Diego State University—Parking Structure 6  
Design/Build Contractor: Taylor Ball of California**

**Background and Scope**

The proposed design/build Parking Structure 6 project will be located adjacent to the existing Parking Structure 3 and southeast of the existing housing complex. The site complements the current eastside parking facilities and provides parking spaces to offset those displaced by the construction of the Light Rail Transit (LRT). The proposed project has been developed based upon the increased parking demand and the decrease in existing parking spaces caused by the LRT construction.

The 706,210 GSF 6-story parking structure provides 2,058 parking spaces. The project also includes two elevators, office space for the campus bus shuttle service, bicycle racks, and a minimal storage area. Lighting will be controlled through the campus energy management system and by daylight sensing devices. The poured-in-place concrete shear wall construction is an open design that will not require mechanical ventilation. Fire protection will be achieved through a dry standpipe system and fire department connection. The architecture is in keeping with the character of the San Diego State University campus and the existing adjacent parking structure.

**Timing (Estimated)**

RFP Document Bid Received	April 2000
Construction Starts	August 2000
Occupancy	July 2001

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	706,210 square feet
Assignable Building Area	N/A

8  
CPB&G  
Agenda Item 5  
May 9-10, 2000

Total Parking Spaces 2,023 standard  
35 handicapped

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 3847**

Parking Structure (\$6,945 per space)	\$14,293,000
<i>Systems Breakdown (\$ per GSF)</i>	
a. Substructure (Foundation)	\$ .77
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure)	\$17.61
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)	\$ .14
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire Protect)	\$ 1.65
East Campus Drive Improvements and Realignment	500,000
Telecommunications (Media and Instruments)	<u>128,000</u>
Construction Cost	\$14,921,000
Fees & Contingency	<u>2,159,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$8,299 per space)	\$17,080,000
Group II Equipment	<u>0</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$17,080,000</u>

**Funding Data**

The San Diego State University/Metropolitan Transit Development Board partnership and parking fees will fund the project.

**California Environmental Quality Act**

An initial study has been completed and an EIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The public comment period ended on March 29, 1999. Comments were received and responded to in the FEIR, which was approved by the Board of Trustees on May 12, 1999. A copy of the previously approved FEIR, which includes all written and oral comments received by San Diego State University on the Draft EIR, will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:

1. The board finds that the FEIR for the San Diego State University Master Plan, certified on May 12, 1999, was prepared to specifically include the Parking Structure 6 project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and

2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved FEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary, and the project will benefit The California State University; and
4. The schematic plans for the San Diego State University, Parking Structure 6 are approved at a project cost of \$17,080,000 at CCCI 3847.

**TABLE 1  
Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
--------	--------------------	-----------------	--------------------------------	------------------------------

**GEOLOGY, SOILS AND SEISMICITY**

B.1: In the event of a major earthquake in the region, seismic groundshaking could potentially injure persons at the project site due to resulting structural damage, structural collapse or falling of the existing facility structures.	B.1: The proposed construction under the project shall comply with site-specific recommendations and standards for seismic design as provided by the project geotechnical engineer; the seismic design requirements of the California Code of Regulations, Title 24; and as recommended by the CSU Seismic Review Board.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and approve geotechnical study, if acceptable.</li> <li>2. Review and approve design plans for compliance.</li> </ol>	During project engineering/design.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
B.2: Proposed construction under the project could be subjected to the geologic hazards related to expansive soils, differential settlement and corrosivity.	B.2: The proposed construction under the project shall comply with site-specific recommendations and standards for soils and foundation engineering as provided by the project geotechnical engineer; the California Code of Regulations, Title 24; and as recommended by the CSU Seismic Review Board.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and approve geotechnical study, if acceptable.</li> <li>2. Review and approve design plans to comply.</li> </ol>	During project engineering/design.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department

**HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY**

C.1: The proposed project could increase stormflows to Copeland Creek, increasing the potential for flooding of the natural channel portion of Copeland Creek during a 100-year event. This would be a significant impact.	<p>C.1a: The project shall include a suitable drainage infrastructure system in the northern acquisition area that will discharge stormwater runoff from this area by gravity to Copeland Creek.</p> <p>C.1b: The project drainage system shall include an on-site detention system that will limit the 100-year peak flow into Copeland Creek.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and approve drainage system plan, if acceptable.</li> <li>2. Review and approve university’s infrastructure maintenance program to ensure all new drainage facilities are incorporated.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During project engineering/design.</li> <li>2. Prior to operation of new storm drainage facilities.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</li> <li>2. Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</li> </ol>
C2: The project would introduce new development, including proposed University housing, within a designated 100-year flood zone.	C.2: The northern acquisition area, in particular the western portion proposed for university housing, shall be designed with grades and landforms sufficient to prevent stormwater breakout from a 100-year flood flow.	Review and approve grading plan, if acceptable.	During project engineering/design.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
C.3: The project would increase the load on the existing drainage systems on the main campus.	C.3: On-site storm drain infrastructure for the main campus shall be upgraded per the recommendations specified in the university’s 1995 Utility System Master Plan.	Review and approve design-level plans for identified storm drainage upgrades, and infrastructure maintenance.	During project engineering/design and prior to operation.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
<p>C.4: Operation of the project could result in increased nonpoint source pollution entering the stormwater runoff to Copeland Creek and the regional stormwater drainage system, creating the potential for degradation of water quality.</p>	<p>C.4a: New drainage structures, curb inlets and drop inlets shall be equipped with filters that have the ability to separate out oil and grease from storm water runoff prior to its entering the drainage system, and/or the drainage system shall be equipped with a device capable of intercepting and trapping such pollutants offline along the storm drain system. Periodic maintenance of these filters and/or offline debris traps would be incorporated into the maintenance routine normally associated with the university facilities.</p> <p>C.4b: The university would expand its pesticide and fertilizer management plans and practices to include the proposed landscaped areas.</p> <p>C.4c: Project roadways and parking areas should be frequently cleaned using street sweeping equipment, and the collected material properly disposed.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and approve drainage system plan, if acceptable.</li> <li>2. Review and approve university’s infrastructure maintenance program to ensure all new drainage facilities are incorporated.</li> </ol> <p>Review and approve university’s pesticide and fertilizer management plans.</p> <p>Review and approve street cleaning plans.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. During project engineering/ design.</li> <li>2. Prior to operation of new storm drainage facilities.</li> </ol> <p>Prior to operation of all new landscaped areas.</p> <p>Prior to operation of new on-campus roadways.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</li> <li>2. Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</li> </ol> <p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p> <p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<p>C.5: Construction of the proposed project buildings and parking areas could result in increased erosion and sedimentation.</p>	<p>C.5: The university would develop and implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP), as required by the State Water Resources Control Board.</p>	<p>Review construction contract and specifications to verify inclusion. Add review to administrative record.</p>	<p>Prior to approval and during construction.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
<p>D.1: Project-generated vehicle trips would contribute to delays at study intersections during the a.m. and p.m. peak hours under Cumulative (Future With Project) conditions. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>D.1a: Prior to project buildout, at the intersection of Rohnert City Park Expressway/Snyder Lane, add an additional through lane in the northbound and southbound directions, and change the existing north-south split-phase signal operation to protected left-turn phasing. (City of Rohnert Park)</p> <p>D.1b: Prior to project buildout, at the intersection of Rohnert City Park Expressway/Future University North Entrance, install either a traffic signal or a single-lane modern roundabout. (County of Sonoma)</p> <p>D.1c: Prior to project buildout, at the intersection of Rohnert Park Expressway/Petaluma Hill Road, add an additional through lane in both the northbound and southbound directions on Petaluma Hill Road, install separate right and left turn lanes on the eastbound approach of Rohnert Park Expressway, and change phasing to include a right turn overlap between the northbound left turn and eastbound right turn. (Sonoma County)</p> <p>D.1d: Prior to project buildout, at the intersection of East Cotati Avenue/Petaluma Hill Road, install an additional through lane in the northbound and southbound directions on Petaluma Hill Road, and install separate right and left turn lanes on the eastbound approach of East Cotati Avenue. (Sonoma County)</p> <p>D.1e: Prior to project buildout, at the intersection of East Cotati Avenue/Sequoia Way, install either a traffic signal or single-lane modern roundabout. (Sonoma County)</p>	<p>The university is prohibited by law from committing project funds for off-site transportation (including intersection) improvements.</p> <p>The five significantly impacted intersections are currently located within the jurisdiction of either Rohnert Park or Sonoma County, as noted.</p>	<p>Prior to buildout of the master plan revision.</p>	<p>Implementation would be the responsibility of the City of Rohnert Park or the County of Sonoma, consistent with the respective jurisdictional boundaries.</p>
<p>D.3: The project could exacerbate existing safety concerns related to off-site parked vehicles on Petaluma Hill Road and East Cotati Avenue adjacent to campus. This would be a potentially significant impact.</p>	<p>D.3a: Prohibit parking on Petaluma Hill Road. There is sufficient capacity on campus to accommodate the parking demand.</p> <p>D.3b: Either prohibit parking on East Cotati Avenue or provide frontage improvements.</p>	<p>The university is prohibited by law from committing project funds for off-site transportation improvements.</p> <p>The roadway segments requiring mitigation are currently located within Sonoma County. The Draft City of Rohnert Park General Plan Update includes the roadway segments in its recommended sphere of influence, and thus identifies the roadways segments for ultimate annexation to the city.</p>	<p>Prior to buildout of the master plan revision.</p>	<p>On East Cotati Avenue, the implementing agency would be Sonoma County or Rohnert Park, unless and until these roadways are annexed to the City of Rohnert Park, at which time it would become the responsibility of Rohnert Park.</p>

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
<p>D.4: Special events at the proposed Center for Musical Arts would generate surges of traffic prior to and/or following the events, resulting in traffic delays at one or more campus entrance intersections before and/or following the event.</p>	<p>D.4a: Events proposed on weekdays at the Center for Musical Arts that are projected to draw more than 400 attendees should start no earlier than 7:00 p.m.</p> <p>D.4b, c &amp; e: Provide adequate traffic control.</p> <p>D.4d: Remove median for left turn with traffic control.</p>	<p>Verify and, if acceptable, approve time schedule and traffic control plans.</p>	<p>Periodically during operation of Center for Musical Arts.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<p>D.5: Parking demand for special events of greater than 7,400 attendees at the proposed Center for Musical Arts may exceed the University’s interim on-site parking supply (until the planned University parking Lot F expansion is completed).</p>	<p>D.5a: For special events at the proposed Center for Musical Arts of greater than 3,500 attendees, provide on-site shuttle service between parking Lots “F” and “J” and the Center.</p> <p>D.5b: For special events at the proposed Center for Musical Arts of greater than 7,400 attendees that occur prior to the ultimate “F” lot expansion, provide off-site parking locations.</p> <p>D.5c: Provide proper advance notification to alert non-event related university traffic of potential alternate on-campus parking lots to use during the times the special events at the Center for Musical Arts are proposed.</p> <p>D.5d: Provide adequate traffic control personnel to direct event patrons to other available on-campus parking facilities.</p>	<p>Review and, if acceptable, approve traffic control and parking plans.</p>	<p>Periodically during operation of Center for Musical Arts.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Police and Safety Services</p>
<p>D.7: The project would accommodate an increase in vehicular traffic, bicyclists and pedestrians within the campus roadways, which would increase the potential for conflicts between these travel modes.</p>	<p>D.7a: Install pedestrian crossing improvements on Redwood Circle where heavy volumes occur.</p> <p>D.7b: Construct pedestrian paths within the campus with an adequate width to accommodate the high pedestrian volumes present between classes.</p> <p>D.7c: Prohibit bicyclists from riding in heavy traffic areas within the campus.</p> <p>D.7d: Install a single-lane roundabout at the intersection of Redwood Circle/Sequoia Way to maximize pedestrian and vehicular safety at this location.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Approve master plan revision with identified bicycle and pedestrian improvements.</li> <li>2. Review monitoring results of pedestrian and bicycle interaction, and approve recommended safety improvements.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With approval of master plan revision.</li> <li>2. Periodically during implementation of the master plan revision</li> </ol>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
E.1: Construction activities would generate substantial amounts of dust, which would result in potential health and visibility impacts.	E.1a: The university should determine whether asbestos was used in the construction of the Ruben Salazar Building and, if applicable, shall comply with the requirements of BAAQMD.  E.1b: The university should require construction contractors to implement a dust abatement program, as part of the contract general conditions.	1. Review construction specifications and compliance with BAAQMD Regulation 11, Rule 2.  2. Include dust abatement program in specifications.	Prior to approval of renovation construction contract.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
E.2 Increase air pollutant emissions.	E.2a: The university should select the mixed use or higher density housing scenarios in the northwest acquisition area.  E.2b: The university should offset expected increases in emissions from vehicular traffic by increasing the energy efficiency of future buildings.  E.2c: The university should coordinate with the Sonoma County Transit (SCT) to provide for a potential public transit stop and encourage the continuance of SCT's free transit ride program to the university's students, faculty, and staff.	Approve mixed use or higher density scenario.  Review and, if acceptable, approve design-level plans that incorporate CSU energy efficient design standards.  Submit letter to SCT requesting coordination.	Prior to preparation of site plan for northwest acquisition area.  During project engineering/design.  Prior to new construction.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department  Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department  Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
E.3: The project would contribute to cumulative increases in regional emissions of air pollutants.	E.3: Implement Mitigation Measures E.2a-c.	See monitoring and reporting actions for Mitigation Measures E.2a-c.	See monitoring schedule for Mitigation Measures E.2a-c.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department

**NOISE**

F.1: Development under the project would result in temporary and localized noise impacts during individual construction projects.	F.1a: Construction activities should be limited to a schedule that minimizes disruption due to noise-sensitive uses on the university and in the vicinity. F.1b.: Muffle construction equipment. F.1c: Schedule loading so as to minimize disruption.	1. Review construction specifications to verify acceptable noise limitations.  2. Add inspection report to administrative record.	Prior to approval of construction contract.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
F.2: Growth and development under the project would result in a long-term increase in noise levels.	F.2a: The university should ensure that mechanical equipment noise associated with new buildings would not conflict with adjacent uses.	Review and approve design-level plans, if acceptable.	During project engineering/ design for individual developments.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
	<p>F.2b: The university should orient sound amplification systems at the new soccer stadium to the north.</p> <p>F.2c: The university should not allow special events at the soccer stadium to extend past 10:00 p.m. on weekdays (Sunday through Thursday) or 11:00 p.m. on Friday or Saturday if such events prove to be clearly audible at the nearest noise-sensitive uses.</p>	<p>Review and approve design-level plans, if acceptable.</p> <p>Review monitoring results and, if necessary, approve time restrictions on events at soccer stadium.</p>	<p>During project engineering/design for soccer stadium.</p> <p>During operation of soccer stadium.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p> <p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<p>F.3: The project would introduce new noise-sensitive uses.</p>	<p>F.3: The university should extend Title 24 Noise Insulation Standards to all new residential development under the project.</p>	<p>Review and, if acceptable, approve design-level plans that incorporate Title 24 Noise Insulation Standards.</p>	<p>During project engineering/design.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<p>F.4: Outdoor sound amplification systems at the Center for Musical Arts could result in noise level impacts if residential uses were to be developed north of Rohnert Park Expressway.</p>	<p>F.4: The university should not allow special events at the Center for Musical Arts to extend past 10:00 p.m. on weekdays (Sunday through Thursday) or 11:00 p.m. on Friday or Saturday if such events prove to be clearly audible at the nearest noise-sensitive uses.</p>	<p>Review monitoring results and, if necessary, approve time restrictions on events at the Center for Musical Arts.</p>	<p>During operation of Center for Musical Arts.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<p>F.5: The increase in traffic due to university and area-wide growth and development would result in cumulative increases in roadside noise levels.</p>	<p>F.5a: Implement Mitigation Measure E.2c in Section IV.E., Air Quality, of this EIR.</p> <p>F.5b: Encourage Rohnert Park to address future noise levels along Rohnert Park Expressway.</p>	<p>See monitoring and reporting actions for Mitigation Measure E2c.</p> <p>Submit a letter to Rohnert Park.</p>	<p>1. See monitoring schedule for Mitigation Measure E.2c.2.</p> <p>2. Prior to annexation.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

<p>H.1: Development of the project could result in impacts to potentially jurisdictional wetlands.</p>	<p>H.1a: A verified wetland delineation will be completed along with a COE permit and a Stream Alteration Agreement.</p>	<p>1. Submit to USACOE for verification.</p> <p>2. Add permit documents to administrative records.</p>	<p>1. Prior to any final site planning.</p> <p>2. Prior to construction.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
--	--	--	--	---

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
	H.1b: Facilities will be planned and sited to avoid wetland and waters of the U.S. to the extent possible.	Review construction specifications to verify buffer area avoidance. Report to administrative record when fencing is complete.	Document buffer area protection as part of weekly monitoring reports (see Mitigation Measure H.1a).	Biological Monitor for Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
	H.1c: Where impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. cannot be avoided, such losses will be compensated for, on-site if feasible, according to ratios established by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for the project.	Submit program plan to USACOE, RWQCB and CDFG as part of permit application.	Develop and submit prior to any final site planning; report to agencies yearly on compensation habitat status and performance for five years.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
H.2: Development of facilities under the project could result in the loss of natural communities, such as riparian forest and wetland/marsh habitat.	H.2a: Avoid any temporary or permanent impact to the wetland/marsh habitat, and, as much as possible, avoid impacts to Copeland Creek. Where bridges are proposed to be constructed across Copeland Creek, minimize the extent of construction impacts within the Copeland Creek protection area.	See monitoring and reporting actions for Mitigation Measure H.1c.	See monitoring schedule for Mitigation Measure H.1c.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
	H.2b: All proposed utilities crossing Copeland Creek shall either be supported by bridge structures or constructed using directional bore methods to avoid disturbance of Copeland Creek.	Review construction specifications to verify use of bridges or directional bores for utility crossings. Report to administrative record.	Prior to construction.	Biological Monitor for Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
	H.2c: All plantings within the proposed Creek Buffer Zone shall consist of locally indigenous native species. Elsewhere within the northern acquisition area, at least 50 percent of the upland areas proposed as “Sonoma landscaping” shall be vegetated with locally indigenous plant species.	Integrate plan with project design.	Prior to approval of design-level plans.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
<p>H.3: Development of project facilities could adversely impact habitat for sensitive animal species. This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>H.3a: To avoid potential impacts to migrating nesting birds near Copeland Creek, construction within the Copeland Creek Preservation and Buffer Zones shall be limited to the period between August 1 and October 31. Alternatively, the applicant could (1) remove potential nesting trees within the construction disturbance zone prior to the nesting period (February-August) or (2) conduct preconstruction nesting surveys of the project area and restrict construction-related activities within 500 feet of any active nests until after the young have fledged.</p>	<p>Retain record of completed pre-construction nesting surveys on file.</p>	<p>Document surveys as part of weekly monitoring reports (see Mitigation Measure H.1a).</p>	<p>Biological Monitor for Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
	<p>H.3b: To protect sensitive fish (including steelhead), amphibians, reptiles, or insects that may be present, preconstruction surveys in areas of suitable habitat for these species shall be carried out, and if such species are found they shall be relocated out of the construction zone.</p>	<p>Retain record of completed pre-construction surveys, training sessions, photo documentation, animal relocations, etc., on file.</p>	<p>Document Biological Monitor’s activities</p>	<p>Biological Monitor for Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
	<p>H.3c: Implement Mitigation Measures C.4 and C.5 discussed in Section IV.C, Hydrology and Water Quality, of the DEIR.</p>	<p>See monitoring and reporting actions for Mitigation Measures C.4 and C.5.</p>	<p>See monitoring schedule for Mitigation Measures C.4 and C.5.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<p>H.4: The proposed project may result in the removal of, or root damage to, significant trees (i.e., trees greater than 12-inch diameter at breast height). This would be a significant impact.</p>	<p>H.4: The university will avoid all significant trees within the proposed project area to the extent feasible. If infeasible, placing new buildings or sidewalks outside the drip-line and away from tree roots would reduce or avoid damage to significant trees within the proposed project area.</p> <p>Tree removal shall not occur during March through June without a bird survey to determine that the tree is unused during the breeding season by avian species.</p>	<p>Retain record of fencing installation and numbers of trees adversely impacted (if any) on file.</p>	<p>Document Biological Monitor’s activities as part of weekly monitoring reports (see Mitigation Measure H.1a).</p>	<p>Biological Monitor for Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<p><b>HAZARDOUS MATERIALS</b></p>				
<p>I.1: Disturbance of any remaining contaminated areas during building construction on the property north of the campus could expose construction workers or the environment to residual hazardous waste or health and safety concerns.</p>	<p>I.1a: As identified in the Phase II investigation, prior to construction, remove petroleum-impacted soils on APN 047-131-08, APN 047-131-20 and APN 047-131-23.</p> <p>I.1b: As recommended in Phase II investigation work, the “dug” groundwater well on APN 047-131-20 should be abandoned.</p>	<p>Retain record of completed remediation activities on file.</p> <p>Retain record of completed well investigation activities on file.</p>	<p>Prior to construction of new development on affected parcels.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
<b>UTILITIES AND SERVICES SYSTEMS</b>				
K.1: The proposed project would increase potable water demands that would exceed the university's existing potable water storage capacity.	K.1: Add additional potable water storage capacity of at least 305,800 gallons.	Review and approve additional water storage plan, if acceptable.	During project engineering/design.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department
K.4: With the proposed project, the university would increase its exceedance of its current wastewater treatment allocation, and could exceed its future wastewater treatment allocation designated by the subregional wastewater treatment system, unless an increase in treatment capacity allocation is received	<p>K.4a: The university shall arrange with the City of Rohnert Park to be included in its application for its share of the increase in treatment capacity provided by the Brown Pond Expansion project and Geysers Pipeline projects.</p> <p>K.4b: The university shall arrange with other members of the subregional system to temporarily borrow capacity equivalent to the projected Average Dry Weather Flows in excess of its designated allocation until such time as an increase in allocation directly to the university becomes available.</p>	<p>Submit letter to City of Rohnert Park requesting university's share of increase in treatment capacity provided by the Brown Pond Expansion project and Geysers Pipeline projects.</p> <p>Submit letter to members of the subregional system with additional capacity to request temporary borrowing of treatment capacity.</p>	<p>Prior to completion of Brown Pond Expansion and Geysers Pipeline projects.</p> <p>Prior to any new development under the Master Plan revision.</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p> <p>The city of Rohnert Park is the agency responsible for allocating the needed wastewater treatment capacity.</p> <p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>
<b>ENERGY</b>				
L.2: Development under the project would increase peak demands on the electricity and natural gas infrastructure.	L.2: The university shall coordinate with PG&E for all required infrastructure improvements.	Contact PG&E and provide them with information as needed to determine what specific on-site and/or off-site improvements may be required to deliver electrical and natural gas service to the site.	During project engineering/design.	Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department

**TABLE 1 (Continued)**  
**MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM—Sonoma State University Master Plan Revision**

Impact	Mitigation Measure	Specific Action	Timeframe Monitoring Milestone	Responsible Monitoring Party
<p><b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b></p> <p>M.1: Project construction could affect previously undiscovered historic or archaeological resources.</p>	<p>M.1a: For any project construction on the project site either (1) within 300 feet of Copeland Creek, or (2) on the site of the four buildings in the northern acquisition area or the building on the main campus indicated in historical maps, qualified archaeologist will be on-site during earthwork activities and will meet with representatives of the university to determine the appropriate course of action.</p> <p>M.1b: During construction, should any undiscovered evidence of historic or prehistoric materials be encountered, construction in the vicinity of the find be halted, and the University shall consult a qualified archaeologist to assess the significance of the find.</p> <p>M.1c: For any project construction on project site: If human remains are encountered during project construction, the Sonoma County Coroner will be notified immediately.</p>	<p>Archaeologist will periodically prepare and submit monitoring reports to University.</p> <p>For any project construction outside of area identified in M.1a, if no undiscovered evidence of historic or prehistoric materials is encountered, the construction contractor will submit periodic written findings.</p> <p>If undiscovered evidence of cultural resources is encountered during construction, monitoring and reporting action for 1, above will apply.</p>	<p>Ongoing during project construction</p>	<p>Sonoma State University Facilities Services Department</p>