AGENDA

TRUSTEES OF THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY

Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California
May 13, 1998 • 10:00 a.m.

Presiding: Martha C. Fallgater

Call to Order and Roll Call

Chairman’s Report

Chancellor’s Report

Report of California Postsecondary Education Commission—Ralph R. Pesqueira

Approval of Minutes of Board of Trustees’ Meeting of March 18, 1998

Approval of Minutes of Committee of the Whole of March 18, 1998

Agenda Items for Board of Trustees’ Consideration
1. Conferral of the Title President Emeritus, Action
2. CSU Alumni Council Annual Report, Information

Report of Committees

Committee on Educational Policy: Vice Chair—Joan Otomo-Corgel
2. Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Admission to Teacher Preparation Programs

Ad Hoc Committee on Technology Utilization: Chair—Martha C. Fallgater

Committee on Finance: Chair—Joan Otomo-Corgel
2. Approval for the Issuance of the California State University Housing System Revenue Bonds, Sonoma State University, Student Housing
3. Approval for the Issuance of the California State University Housing Revenue Bonds, California State University, Chico Student Housing
4. 1998/99 Lottery Revenue Budget
5. Proposed Revision of Title 5 Regulations on Minority, Women, and Disabled Veteran Owned Business Participation in CSU Contracts

Committee on Governmental Relations: Chair—James H. Gray
1. 1997-98 Legislative Report No. 10

Ad Hoc Committee on Campus Development Ventures: Chair—Jim Considine

Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds: Chair—Michael D. Stennis
1. Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded
4. Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan for California State University, Monterey Bay
5. Certify a Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California State University, Northridge
6. Approval of Schematic Plans

Committee on Collective Bargaining: Chair—William Hauck

Committee on Audit: Chair—Ali C. Razi

Committee on Institutional Advancement: Chair—Jim Considine
1. Naming of Facility—California State University, Sacramento

Committee on Organization and Rules: Chair—Stanley T. Wang
1. Schedule of Board of Trustees’ Meetings, 1998-99

Communications and Correspondence

Old Business

New Business
1. Election of Chair and Vice Chair of the Board of Trustees for 1998/99
2. Election of Members to Standing Committees of the Board of Trustees for 1998/99
3. Election of Members to the California Postsecondary Education Commission

Public Comment

Adjournment
MINUTES OF MEETING OF
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
400 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

March 18, 1998

Trustees Present
Martha C. Fallgatter, Chairman of the Board
Jim Considine
Robert G. Foster
Bernard Goldstein
Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
James H. Gray
William Hauck
Eric C. Mitchell
Maridel Moulton
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Alice S. Petrossian
Ali C. Razi
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
Michael D. Stennis
Anthony M. Vitti
Stanley T. Wang

Trustees Absent
Roland E. Arnall
William D. Campbell
Ronald L. Cedillos
Gray Davis, Lt. Governor
Delaine Eastin, Superintendent of Public Instruction
Antonio Villaraigosa, Speaker of the Assembly
Pete Wilson, Governor

Chancellor’s Office Staff
June M. Cooper, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor and Chief of Staff
Richard P. West, Senior Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance
Charles W. Lindahl, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Bruce M. Richardson, Deputy General Counsel
Samuel A. Strafaci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources

Chairman Fallgatter called the meeting to order at 10:40 a.m.
Chairman’s Report
Chairman Fallgatter thanked the presidents for their work in organizing the Ambassadors for Higher Education programs on their campuses. She said the presidents had put together networks of very influential individuals that are capable, able and willing to help in convincing the legislature what is best for CSU.

Chairman Fallgatter reported that a recent poll showed that 61 percent of the citizens of California feel that the state’s education system needs an overhaul. She said the Ambassador program was an invaluable vehicle to help orchestrate the needed changes in education and to convince the legislature that higher standards for high school graduates are important.

Chairman Fallgatter and Chancellor Reed honored President James M. Rosser, CSU Los Angeles, and President Donald R. Gerth, CSU Sacramento, on their campuses’ 50th anniversaries.

(The complete text of the Chairman’s Report is attached marked Exhibit “A.”)

Chancellor’s Report
Chancellor Reed said that Barry Munitz left the CSU better than he found it and with a strong foundation on which to build. He said he was excited and looking forward to taking CSU to the next level.

Chancellor Reed told the trustees that during the next few months he would be increasing his knowledge concerning Sacramento. He said he intended to make weekly trips to learn who the players are, what the budget is, and how to provide for the cost to continue the current operations of CSU. He said he will focus on access, faculty and staff salaries, and teacher education.

Chancellor Reed reported that he would continue to work on CETI in an attempt to put something together that no one in American higher education has ever done.

Chancellor Reed also told the trustees that he hoped to visit nine or ten campuses between now and the middle of May. He said that the campuses he doesn’t get to before the middle of May will be on the top of the priority list to visit in the fall and he hopes to have visited all 23 campuses by the fall election.

(The complete text of the Chancellor’s Report is attached marked “Exhibit B.”)

Report from the California Postsecondary Education Commission
Trustee Pesqueira, CSU representative to CPEC, referred the trustees to the report contained in their packets and encouraged them to read carefully Joe Rodota’s comments on the California Virtual University and comments made by Senator Theresa Hughes.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the Board of Trustees’ meeting of January 28, 1998, were approved as submitted.
Agenda Items for Board of Trustees’ Consideration

Election of Five Members to Serve on Committee on Committees for 1998-99 (RBOT 03-98-03)
Chairman Fallgatter reminded the trustees that at the January meeting she had nominated five trustees to serve on this committee: Joan Otomo-Corgel as chair, Bernard Goldstein, Laurence K. Gould, Jr., Eric C. Mitchell and Ali C. Razi. She asked if there were any other nominations; there being none, Chairman Fallgatter moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the following trustees are elected to constitute the board’s Committee on Committees for the 1998-99 term:

- Joan Otomo-Corgel, Chair
- Bernard Goldstein
- Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
- Eric C. Mitchell
- Ali C. Razi

Appointment of Ad Hoc Committee on Board Operations (RBOT 03-98-04)
Chairman Fallgatter moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that there be an Ad Hoc Committee on Board Operations consisting of the current and past board chairs and the chancellor. The immediate past board chair will serve as the chair of the ad hoc committee. The committee shall consist of:

- Martha C. Fallgatter, Chair
- William D. Campbell
- Jim Considine
- Charles B. Reed, Chancellor
- Anthony M. Vitti

Report of Committees

Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Technology Utilization
Chairman Fallgatter reported for the committee.

Chairman Fallgatter reported that the committee heard a status report by Chancellor Reed on the efforts to establish the Technology Partnership. She said that progress had been made and the CSU constituencies seem to have a higher degree of comfort in the partnership than they did last fall. She said an agreement had been reached with the industry partners on 16 of 18 of the key negotiation points. She said that substantial concerns about revenue generation must still be resolved.
Chairman Fallgatter said that Chancellor Reed’s personal assessment at this point is that there is about a 50/50 chance that CSU will succeed in forming CETI with the current partners. She said that Chancellor Reed and members of the committee agreed that the partnership concept is the best option that the CSU has for meeting the technology needs of CSU campuses.

**Report from the Committee on University and Faculty Personnel**

Trustee Vitti, chair, reported for the committee.

**Executive Compensation (RUFP 03-98-01)**

Trustee Vitti said the committee heard one action item, salary setting for the incoming executive vice chancellor, Dr. David S. Spence.

Trustee Vitti moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that Dr. David S. Spence as executive vice chancellor of the California State University shall receive a salary set at the annual rate of $190,008, an automobile allowance set at the monthly rate of $750, and a supplemental retirement plan provided through the CSU Foundation, effective the date of his appointment as executive vice chancellor on or after April 20, 1998.

**Report from the Committee on Educational Policy**

In the absence of Trustee Campbell, chair, Trustee Otomo-Corgel, vice chair, reported for the committee.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel reported that the board acted in closed session on nominations for honorary degrees and that the committee later heard one information and one action item. The information item was the second annual report on the implementation of the trustees’ policy on precollegiate education.

**Academic Planning and Program Review (REP 03-98-01)**

Trustee Otomo-Corgel moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the amended projections on the Academic Plans for the California State University (as contained in Attachment A to Agenda Item 3 of the March 17-18, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Educational Policy), be approved and accepted as the basis for necessary facility planning; and, be it further

**RESOLVED,** That those degree programs included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation, at approximately the dates indicated, subject in each instance to the chancellor’s determination of need and feasibility, and provided that financial support, qualified faculty, facilities, and information resources sufficient to establish and maintain the programs will be available; and, be it further
RESOLVED, That degree programs not included in the Academic Plans are authorized for implementation only as pilot programs, subject in each instance to conformity with current procedures for establishing pilot programs.

Report from the Committee on Finance

Trustee Otomo-Corgel, chair, reported for the committee.

Trustee Otomo-Corgel reported the committee heard two information items and three action items. The information items consisted of a status report on the 1998/99 Governor’s Support Budget and the proposed 1998/99 lottery budget.

Approval of Tax-Exempt Refinancing for a California State University Auxiliary Organization at California State University, Long Beach (RFIN 03-98-03)

Trustee Otomo-Corgel moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The Forty Niner Shops, Inc. (the “Corporation”) has been formed for the purpose of promoting and assisting the educational program of the California State University, Long Beach (the “University”) as more fully described in the Articles of Incorporation of the Corporation; and

WHEREAS, The Corporation is an auxiliary organization of the California State University governed by California Education Code Section 89900 et seq. and the administrative regulations of the California State University as set forth in California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 42400 et seq., and

WHEREAS, In 1992, the Corporation issued its Bonds Series 1992 in the aggregate principal amount of $4,500,000 (the “Series 1992 Bonds”) on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the California State University (the “Board”); and

WHEREAS, Proceeds of the Series 1992 Bonds were used to finance the design and construction of the renovation and expansion of the Corporation’s main bookstore, the design, construction and equipping of several of the Corporation’s food service facilities and the acquisition of certain other food delivery and concession equipment (collectively, the “Project”) located on the campus of the California State University, Long Beach; and

WHEREAS, The Corporation has determined that it is also desirable to refund and defease the Series 1992 Bonds; and

WHEREAS, The Board has determined that it is desirable to approve the refunding of the Series 1992 Bonds and the refinancing of the Project through the issuance of new tax-exempt obligations by the Corporation and thereby comply with federal income tax laws; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University as follows:

Section 1. The Board of Trustees hereby approves the issuance of the Corporation’s bonds in an aggregate principal amount not to exceed $3,900,000 for the purpose of refinancing the Project in the manner described herein.
Section 2. The officers of the Board of Trustees, the chancellor, the senior vice chancellor, business and finance, and their designees are hereby authorized and directed, jointly and severally, to do any and all things and to execute and deliver any and all documents which they deem necessary or advisable in order to carry out, give effect to, and comply with the terms and intent of this resolution and the transactions approved hereby.

This resolution shall not constitute or authorize an indebtedness of the State of California, the Trustees of the California State University, the California State University, Long Beach, or any officers or employees of any such entities, and no lending or pledging of the credit of any of such entities is intended or authorized by this resolution.

Section 3. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon its adoption.

Authorization to Refinance Dormitory Revenue Fund Student Union Obligations of the Board of Trustees (RFIN 03-98-04)

Trustee Otomo-Corgel moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP as bond counsel is preparing resolutions to be presented at this meeting that will achieve the following:

1. Authorize the sale and issuance of refunding bonds to refinance the outstanding issues of Dormitory Revenue Fund Student Union Revenue Bonds, provided the chancellor determines that the refinancings are cost effective and reduce debt service cost at the time of the sale; and authorize certain actions relating thereto, including the approval of the form of the Notice of the Sale as presented to the trustees at this meeting.

2. Approve the form of the official statements prepared by Sutter Securities Incorporated, financial advisors, as presented to the trustees at this meeting.

3. Authorize and direct the chancellor, the senior vice chancellor, business and finance, and the director of financing and risk management to take any and all actions necessary or desirable to accomplish the issuance of the refunding bonds and to execute the documents for that sale and issuance.

The resolutions are being prepared by bond counsel and the form of the official statements will be distributed at this meeting and are recommended for approval.

Application for Financial Assistance for the 404 Hazard Mitigation Grant Program—Designation of the CSU Authorized Agents (RFIN 03-98-05)

Trustee Otomo-Corgel moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

WHEREAS, The California State University provides quality education for the people of California; and,

WHEREAS, Pursuant to the Federal Emergency Management Agency authority under Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Assistance and Emergency Relief Act, as
amended, 42 U.S.C. 5121, et seq., provision under the 404 Hazard Mitigation Grant Program application administered by the California Office of Emergency Services requires a governing board resolution to fully delegate hazard mitigation projects and to complete the application requirements; now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, a state educational entity established under California laws, that the presidents or their designees of the following California State University campuses have primary responsibility to act as the authorized agents on behalf of each campus as applicants for the hazard mitigation projects associated with the 404 Hazard Mitigation Grant Program and are hereby designated as the authorized agents to act for and on behalf of each campus respectively as the applicant in all matters associated with application for and receipt of federal financial assistance under Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Assistance and Emergency Relief Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 5121, et seq.:

- California State University, Bakersfield
- California State University, Chico
- California State University, Dominguez Hills
- California State University, Fresno
- California State University, Fullerton
- California State University, Hayward
- Humboldt State University
- California State University, Long Beach
- California State University, Los Angeles
- California Maritime Academy
- California State University, Monterey Bay
- California State University, Northridge
- California State Polytechnic University, Pomona
- California State University, Sacramento
- California State University, San Bernardino
- San Diego State University
- San Francisco State University
- San Jose State University
- California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo
- California State University, San Marcos
- Sonoma State University
- California State University, Stanislaus

Report from the Committee on Organization and Rules

Trustee Wang, chair, reported for the committee.

Trustee Wang reported that the committee heard one information item proposing the schedule of the Board of Trustees’ meetings for 1998/99. Trustee Wang informed the board the item would be voted on at the May meeting.

Report from the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds

Trustee Stennis, chair, reported for the committee.
Trustee Stennis reported that the committee heard two information items on professional appointments and the capital outlay budget and four action items.

Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded (RCPBG 03-98-03)

Trustee Stennis moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1997/98 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include: (1) $3,470,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the CSU Chico Food Services Renovation and Energy Improvements; (2) $1,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction for the CSU Fresno Alumni House; (3) $1,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the CSU Sacramento Hornet Stadium Track Improvements; (4) $545,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the San Diego State University Aztec Center Renovation; and (5) $25,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the Sonoma State University Student Apartments II.

Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded (RCPBG 03-98-04)

Trustee Stennis moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1997/98 State Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include $1,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction of the California State University, Sacramento Electrical Substation.

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve Parking Structure I—California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (RCPBG 03-98-05)

Trustee Stennis moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that upon consideration of the information provided in the Final Environmental Impact Report prepared for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I, the board finds that:

WHEREAS, The Final Environmental Impact Report for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with the approval of the Parking Structure I, and all discretionary actions related thereto; and

WHEREAS, The Final Environmental Impact Report for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I (State Clearinghouse No. 95051007) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (state CEQA Guidelines); and
WHEREAS, This board by this resolution will certify that the Final Environmental Impact Report is complete and adequate and that it fully complies with all requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines require that the Board of Trustees makes findings prior to approval of a project (along with statements of facts supporting each finding); now, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The California State University makes the following findings:

1. **Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report.**
   
   An FEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act;

2. **Review and Consideration by the Board of Trustees.**

   Prior to approval of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. For the purpose of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project is comprised of the following:

   A. DEIR for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I.
   B. Comments received on the DEIR and responses to these comments.
   C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at the meetings.
   D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents specified in the items (A) through (C) above.

   All of the above information has been and will be on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Physical Planning and Development, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720.

3. **Impacts and Mitigation Measures.**

   The FEIR identified a number of potentially significant effects that could result from the proposed project. However, the Board of Trustees finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the 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 social, economic and technical feasibility considerations.
A description of the potential significant effects and mitigation measures which are adopted follows:

A. **Land Use.** The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following possible significant effects on land use:

   **LU-4.** Land use conflicts with adjacent neighborhoods due to noise and visual impact of parking structure.

   The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effects on land use to a less than significant level:

   - **Mitigation Measures AQ-1(a), AQ-1(b), and AQ-1(c)** [described below]
   - **Mitigation Measures N-1(a through g)** [described below]
   - **Mitigation Measures VR-2(a) and VR-3(b)** [described below]

   For further details of these mitigation measures, please refer to air quality, noise, and visual impact discussions in this section below.

B. **Geology.** The Board of Trustees has determined that geologic conditions could cause the following possible significant effects on the proposed project:

   **Geo-1.** Ground acceleration due to potential major earthquake on Los Osos or San Andreas fault.

   **Geo-3.** Impacts due to liquefaction.

   The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant geologic effects on the project to a less than significant level:

   - **Mitigation Measure Geo-1(a).** Compliance with Uniform Building Code, Health and Safety Code, the County Seismic Safety Element, and other applicable ordinances including soils.
   - **Mitigation Measure Geo-1(b).** Incorporation of the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigations Report would ensure that after site preparation, the soil conditions would be adequately stable to support the parking structure.

   No further mitigation is required for Impact Geo-3 than that stated in this section because recommendations contained within geologic mitigation measures (see Geo-1(a) and Geo 1(b)) would reduce potential impacts.

C. **Traffic and Circulation.** The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following possible significant effects on traffic and circulation:

   **TC-3.** Short-term congestion in the parking structure following on-campus evening events due to maximum attendance.

   **TC-5.** Conflicts with pedestrians, bicycles, and automobiles due to construction activities and project operation.
The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effects on traffic and circulation to a less than significant level:

**Mitigation TC-3(a).** The university shall develop traffic management strategies for the parking structure as part of their Event Parking Traffic Management Plan to ensure that event-related traffic congestion at the parking structure is minimized to the extent feasible.

**Mitigation TC-5(a).** Roadway improvements including crosswalk markings and signs will facilitate the safe passage of pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicular traffic in the area of the proposed parking structure and the intersection of Hathway Avenue and Longview Lane.

**Mitigation TC-5(b).** Inclusion of a pedestrian overpass in the project design would ensure safe pedestrian access between the parking structure and surrounding uses including the performing arts center.

**Mitigation TC-5 (c).** Inclusion of visible signs for the parking structure interior will ensure clear travel lane direction and exits for vehicular and pedestrian traffic.

D. **Air Quality.** The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following significant effects on air quality:

**AQ-1.** Adverse impacts on ambient levels of NOx and PM$_{10}$ due to exceedance of Air Pollution Control District (APCD) significance thresholds during project construction.

**AQ-2.** Adverse impacts due to exceedance of the state 1-hour carbon monoxide (CO) standard.

**AQ-3.** Adverse impacts due to exceedance of the APCD significance thresholds for vehicle emissions associated with cumulative projects.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effects on air quality, but not to a less than significant level. Full implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce air quality related impacts, both emission and dust related, to the extent feasible. However, short-term site preparation emissions cannot be reduced below the significance thresholds established by the APCD. Additionally, CO concentrations related to the project operation may have a significant and unavoidable impact on regional air quality and impacts to air quality because of the proximity of project facilities to sensitive receptors. Relevant evidence, findings of fact, and a statement of overriding considerations are found in Section 5 below.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1(a).** Use of certified heavy equipment that meets the 1996 federal NOx standards would further avoid unhealthy air quality.

**Mitigation Measure AQ-1(b).** Implementation of dust control measures will reduce levels of fugitive dust around the project site to the extent feasible during construction activities.
Mitigation Measure AQ-2(a). Prepayment of parking fees would reduce excessive ambient CO concentrations from vehicle start-up emissions and vehicle queuing.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2(b). Reduction of Exit Time. The university shall incorporate the management strategies contained in Section 2 of the Cal Poly Parking & Commuter Services Event Parking Management Plan (Draft) event management for the structure (see DEIR Appendix 5.3).

Mitigation Measure AQ-2(c). Maintain Bus Fare Subsidy. The university should maintain the subsidy for bus fare at its current rate.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2(d). Manage Evening Event Parking. The university should monitor the air quality near the structure after evening events to determine if the state CO threshold is exceeded. The university should manage the parking in the structure to minimize CO impacts.

E. Noise. The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following possible significant effects on noise:

N-1. Increased temporary noise levels due to construction activities.

N-4. Adverse cumulative noise impacts due to increased traffic on Grand Avenue and California Boulevard.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effects on noise to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure N-1(a). Ensure all construction equipment is in proper operating condition including standard silencing features.

Mitigation Measure N-1(b). Orient hauling routes away from existing sensitive land uses. The primary hauling route shall be Grand Avenue to Slack Street.

Mitigation Measure N-1(c). Locate vehicle staging areas away from occupied structures.

Mitigation Measure N-1(d). Arrange noisiest construction operations during the same period of time to avoid excessive and continuous noise periods.

Mitigation Measure N-1(e). Erect temporary noise barriers between sensitive structures and construction areas for construction activities generating high levels of noise.

Mitigation Measure N-1(f). Limit hours of construction activities that generate noise in excess of 60dBA from 7:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m.

Mitigation Measure N-1(g). Minimize use of pile drivers during construction activities. Consider use of drilled or bore piles for project construction.

Mitigation Measure N-4(a). Use no-squealing paving materials to reduce tire squealing noise on external ingress and egress approaches.

F. Visual Impact. The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following possible significant effects on visual impact:
VR-2. Increased light and glare impacts to motorists and adjacent land uses including nearby residences.

VR-3. Aesthetic impacts including view obstruction and architectural incompatibility.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effects on visual impact to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure VR-2(a). Direct all interior lighting of the parking structure internally to reduce interference with vehicular traffic on any nearby surface street. Implement proper specifications for minimizing light and glare.

Mitigation Measure VR-3(a). The university and Chancellor’s Office shall approve the architectural design of the parking structure to ensure unity with natural and architectural character of the surrounding area.

Mitigation Measure VR-3(b). Landscape design measures shall be implemented to soften the effect of building and paving and to provide vegetative screening to minimize views of the structure by neighboring residences.

Mitigation Measure VR-3(c). Future construction of the fourth tennis court may be eliminated from the proposed project. Landscaping should occur in front of the three new courts.

G. Public Safety. The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following possible significant effects on public safety:

PS-1. Increased criminal activities in project area due to parking structure existence.

PS-2. Potential hazards due to surface materials containing asbestos.

The Board of Trustees finds, based on substantial evidence in the record, that the following mitigation measures will reduce the above-described potentially significant effects on public safety to a less than significant level:

Mitigation Measure PS-1(a). Interior lighting within the structure shall meet the standards of the Illuminating Engineering Society of North America.

Mitigation Measure PS-1(b). Parking structure design shall include interior stairways that are open with good visibility from other surrounding facilities to reduce criminal hiding spaces.

Mitigation Measure PS-1(c). Parking structure interior shall be stained or painted to maximize reflectivity.

Mitigation Measure PS-1(d). Parking structure design should include sufficient space for parking attendant booth at structure entrance.

Mitigation Measure PS-1(e). Place interior signs to provide orientation to patrons of the parking structure.

Mitigation Measure PS-1(f). Provide a security guard and closed circuit cameras for security.
As set forth above, changes or alterations have been, or can be incorporated into the project that avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental effects as identified in the FEIR. All feasible mitigation measures that can be applied to the project have been included in the FEIR. Residual significant impacts remain. The Board of Trustees has determined that these residual significant impacts are outweighed by the benefits of the proposed project.

4. Alternatives.

The DEIR also discussed the following project alternatives:

- **No Project Alternative (not building the parking structure facility).** The no project alternative includes continued utilization of the university’s traffic reduction programs. These programs include vanpools, carpools, and transit fare subsidies. Given that the university currently makes considerable use of these programs, it was determined that significant further reductions were not likely, and, therefore, the no project alternative would not meet the objectives of the university.

- **Grand Avenue Location Alternative.** This alternative site would be located within the boundaries of lot G1, adjacent to Grand Avenue, and would be similar in capacity to the proposed project.

- **Dormitory Location Alternative.** This alternative site would be located behind the campus dormitories where surface parking is currently located. This alternative would also be similar in capacity to the proposed project.

The no project alternative would result in the fewest overall impacts because no development would occur and is, therefore, considered the environmentally superior alternative. Although the no project alternative would be the environmentally superior alternative because it would eliminate the significant effects of the project, this alternative would not attain the basic objective of the project to meet current and anticipated parking demand on campus, as well as a more efficient parking program.

Among the remaining alternatives, the dormitory location would result in fewer impacts to the Alta Vista neighborhood, but greater impacts to dormitory residents. The dormitory location would result in greater impacts of noise and air quality to adjacent residents, i.e., dormitory residents, than the other two locations. Geologically, the proposed site is far superior to either of the other sites. While there are important individual differences, overall impacts are substantially similar between the proposed project and the Grand Avenue location alternative for the parking structure. With mitigation, including careful landscaping, the proposed site is superior to the Grand Avenue location because it avoids difficult site preparation and grading necessitated by geologic constraints.

No alternative location would resolve the potential carbon monoxide exceedance as the problem would simply move with the structure. Only reduction or elimination of the facility would remove this impact.

The campus land use plan anticipates the construction of two additional parking structures near the other major entrances to the campus. For this reason, locating the structure a considerable distance away would simply provide redundant facilities at these other locations, and would not meet the overall objective of the campus land...
5. **Statement of Overriding Considerations.**

Notwithstanding the disclosure of the significant effects and the mitigation measures described above, the Board of Trustees has determined that the benefits of the proposed project outweigh the adverse impacts and the project should be approved. With reference to the above findings and in recognition of those facts that are included in the record, the Board of Trustees has determined that the project will have significant environmental impacts.

The Board of Trustees specifically finds and makes this statement of overriding considerations that there are unique social and economic reasons for approving this project, notwithstanding the disclosure of substantial adverse impacts in the FEIR. The reasons are as follows:

A. The California State University (CSU) and the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) long-range studies have identified the need for growth at existing campuses beyond their current master planned capacities and/or additional campuses to serve the state’s population.

B. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo has chosen to improve its parking supply to replace the loss of spaces for projects developed on campus. In the last ten years, nearly 1,000 spaces have been lost with the construction of new projects, all of which are part of the approved campus master plan. The purpose of the structure is to replace those spaces that were lost mostly on the southern end of campus. The Parking Structure I project is consistent with the university’s land use plan which includes the development of three parking structures designed to concentrate parking toward the core of campus, reducing the need for developing large surface parking lots.

C. The project will serve the parking needs of the university, the student body, and the community. It will also facilitate public access to various venues on campus, including the performing arts center, Mott Gymnasium, Chumash Auditorium and others. All of these venues are on the southern side of campus where most of the parking spaces have been lost.

D. The project is seen as an efficient means of providing parking near the campus core without requiring a large expenditure of land. The structure will reduce overall miles driven on campus as students, faculty and staff will be able to determine quickly if spaces are available in the structure. The reduction of driving will result in an overall reduction of air emissions.

E. Cal Poly has endeavored to reduce the number of cars coming onto campus through a variety of programs, including but not limited to subsidy of local transit fares, vanpools, and ridership programs. The university is continuing its efforts to further reduce the number of automobile trips. Nevertheless, with the loss of nearly 1,000 spaces, the campus needs to accommodate the current needs of students, faculty and staff.

F. Air Quality. Construction of the proposed project would result in the emission of air pollutants exceeding the APCD significance thresholds for CO, Oxides
of Nitrogen (NOₓ) and Particulate Matter (PM₁₀). This impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant and is considered unavoidable. The various air quality issues are as follows:

Operational impacts. Vehicular and utility emissions associated with the proposed project would contribute to the lack of attainment of the state ozone and PM₁₀ standards and would exceed APCD significance thresholds for CO and NOₓ. The University’s trip reduction efforts will continue to improve this impact. Because the non-attainment is region-wide, this impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant; therefore, it is considered unavoidable.

Construction emissions. The university will take all reasonable mitigation measures designed to reduce dust and other particulate emissions as set forth below. The APCD has consistently recognized the mitigation measures as being the best practices for reducing these emissions to the most reasonable extent. Construction-related emissions are of short duration and it is recognized by APCD that the mitigation measures set forth below are the best available.

Carbon Monoxide. With regard to CO emissions, the threshold exceedance is the result of the concentration of vehicles in a parking structure. Air quality modeling showed that under certain conditions (3/4 of the cars starting simultaneously after an evening event) CO concentrations leaving the facility would exceed the state standard of 20 parts per million. This would be for a short duration and impact the sports facilities and residences immediately adjacent to campus. Farther, beyond this area, the CO would dissipate below the state standard.

One approach to mitigating this impact is through the use of mechanical ventilation. However, in a letter dated June 12, 1995, the APCD stated that they “prefer the ‘natural by design’ ventilation system as opposed to enclosing the lower floors of the structure and installing a mechanical ventilation system.” This was in order to avoid CO buildup in the event of a power failure. They suggested, in order to prevent further buildup of CO after an event, that parking fees be collected prior to the event and not at the parking structure exit. The structure has been designed with maximum openings in accordance with APCD recommendation.

Although there may be exceedances, these would typically not coincide with the use of the adjacent sports facilities. The exceedance is most likely after an evening event at one of the nearby venues. Conditions would be worst in the winter months. During these times, the sports facilities would not be in use. Furthermore, the nearby residents would most likely be inside their homes with most windows shut. Carbon monoxide exceedances are transient events lasting a relatively short time. Therefore, residents nearby would have a very low level of exposure prior to dissipation.

In order to further mitigate this impact, the university has agreed to participate in an air quality monitoring program designed to identify if and when the CO limit is exceeded. If exceedances do occur, the parking management plan will be amended to control the number of vehicles entering the structure for a single event, thus reducing the number of cars starting simultaneously in the structure.
It is anticipated that exceedance, based upon a review of similar structures, would be a rare event. The alternative of reducing the size of the structure is, therefore, not merited, when management can resolve air quality issues should they arise.

*Cumulative.* Further, emissions associated with cumulative projects would exceed the APCD significance threshold. This impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant; therefore, it is considered unavoidable. The cumulative emissions are part of air quality issues associated with the entire region, and reduction of these emissions to a level of less than significant is beyond the control of the university.

The Board of Trustees specifically finds, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the following impacts associated with air quality cannot be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the associated mitigation measures set forth below each impact statement and has set forth overriding considerations above.

A. **Air Quality:**

*Impact AQ-1 (Equipment).* Construction of the proposed project would result in the emission of air pollutants exceeding the APCD significance thresholds for NOx and PM\(_{10}\). Combustion emissions generated by construction would degrade local air quality and contribute to exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide (NO\(_2\)) 1-hour state air quality standard.

The FEIR recommends the following mitigation measures:

*AQ-1(a). Equipment Emission Control Measures.* The applicant shall use heavy equipment certified to meet the 1996 federal NOx standard of 6.9 grams per brake horsepower hour. At a minimum, one tracked tractor or one scraper used on the project site shall be certified to meet this federal standard. Certified heavy equipment shall be used as the primary equipment and non-certified equipment (such as a second scraper) shall be used only to supplement certified equipment when multiple units are required. These requirements are equivalent to California Best Available Control Technology (CBACT) and shall be noted on the grading plan and listed in the contractor and subcontractor contracts.

*AQ-1(b). Dust Control Measures.* Dust generated by construction activities shall be kept to a minimum by full implementation of the following measures.

- During clearing, grading, earth moving, excavation, or transportation of cut or fill materials, water trucks or sprinkler systems are to be used to prevent dust from leaving the site and to create a crust after each day’s activities cease;
- During construction, water trucks or sprinkler systems shall be used to keep all areas of vehicle movement damp enough to prevent dust from leaving the site. At a minimum, this would include wetting down such areas in the morning and after work is completed for the day and whenever wind exceeds 15 miles per hour;
- Stockpiled earth material shall be sprayed as needed to minimize dust generation.
- During construction, the amount of disturbed area shall be minimized, and on-site vehicle speeds should be reduced to 15 mph or less;
• Exposed ground areas that are planned to be reworked at dates more than one month after initial grading should be sown with a fast-germinating native grass seed and watered until vegetation is established;

• After clearing, grading, earth moving, or excavation is completed, the entire area of disturbed soil shall be treated immediately by watering or revegetating or spreading soil binders to minimize dust generation until the area is paved or otherwise developed so that dust generation will not occur;

• Grading and scraping operations shall be suspended when wind speeds exceed 20 mph (one hour average);

• All roadways, driveways, and sidewalks associated with construction activities should be paved as soon as possible. In addition, building and other pads shall be laid as soon as possible after grading unless seeding or soil binders are used.

**Impact AQ-2 (Carbon Monoxide).** The concentration of vehicle exhaust emissions within the proposed parking structure would result in the exceedance of the state 1-hour CO standard at adjacent athletic facilities. This impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant; therefore, it is considered Class I, significant and unavoidable.

The FEIR recommends the following mitigation measures:

**AQ-2(a). Parking Payment Options.** Prepayment of parking fees could be considered to prevent vehicle queuing when leaving, which would reduce vehicle startup emissions within the parking structure and associated ambient CO concentrations. Parking fees could be collected through long-term or special event passes.

**AQ-2(b). Reduction of Exit Time.** The university shall incorporate the management strategies contained in Section 2 of the Cal Poly Parking & Commuter Services Event Parking Management Plan (Draft) event management for the structure.

**AQ-2(c). Transit Subsidy.** The university should maintain the subsidy for bus fare at its current rate. Fare increases may require some cost on the part of the riders, but these could be kept to a minimum.

**AQ-2(d). Manage Evening Event Parking.** The university should monitor the air quality near the structure after evening events to determine if the state CO threshold is exceeded. If so, then the university should manage the parking in the structure such that threshold exceedance events are minimized.

**Impact AQ-3 (Cumulative).** Emissions associated with the cumulative projects would exceed the APCD significance thresholds. This impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant; therefore, it is considered significant and unavoidable.

**Mitigation.** All feasible mitigation measures have been recommended to reduce project impacts; no additional measures are available to further mitigate cumulative impacts. The proposed mitigation measures will ensure that impacts to air quality will be reduced to the greatest degree feasible. However, because the proposed project would exceed the APCD significance threshold, these impacts cannot be reduced to a level of insignificance. Regardless of the effort to provide mitigation for this impact, the project does not afford an opportunity to avoid impacts to air quality altogether.
And, be it further

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board certifies the Final Environmental Impact Report for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I, and directs that the report be considered in any further actions on the project; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the board to file the Notice of Determination for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures identified in Attachment B are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Table, incorporated in the Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan which is Attachment B, CPB&G Agenda Item 4, March 17-18, 1998, and which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Parking Structure I project for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is approved.

Categories and Criteria for the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program (RCPBG 03-98-06)
Trustee Stennis moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the Categories and Criteria for the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, as contained in Attachment A of the trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds Agenda Item 5, of the March 17-18, 1998, meeting of the Board of Trustees be approved; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is hereby directed to use these categories and criteria to prepare the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program for The California State University. If this results in an “action year” (1999/2000) request beyond reasonable expectation of available funding, the chancellor is delegated authority to adjust the number of campus projects submitted.

Report from the Committee on Institutional Advancement
Trustee Considine, chair, reported for the committee.

Trustee Considine reported the committee heard two action items and one information item. The information item was a report on university advancement, consisting of Trustee Razi’s report on the continuation of the Trustees’ Award for Outstanding Achievement and “Did You Know,” which profiles campus highlights.
Naming of Facility—California State University, Fresno (RIA 03-98-03)
Trustee Considine moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the alumni center at California State University, Fresno be designated the Smittcamp Alumni House.

Naming of Facility—California State University, San Bernardino (RIA 03-98-04)
Trustee Considine moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the former visual arts building at California State University, San Bernardino be designated the Chaparral Hall.

Report from the Committee on Governmental Relations
Trustee Gray, chair, reported for the committee.

1997-98 Legislative Report No. 9 (RGR 01-98-02)
Trustee Gray moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1997-98 Legislative Report No. 9 is adopted.

Report from the Committee on Audit
Trustee Razi, chair, reported for the committee.

Trustee Razi reported that the committee heard three information items: a status report of current and follow-up internal audit assignments, a report to management related to the combined audit of the financial statements in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles, and the single audit report of federal funds.

Report from the Committee on Collective Bargaining
In the absence of Trustee Hauck, chair, Trustee Considine, vice chair, reported for the committee.

Trustee Considine reported that the committee approved initial proposals for bargaining with representatives of the California State Employees’ Association, Units 2, 5, 7 and 9; the California Employees Trade Council, Unit 6; the Union of Physicians and Dentists, Unit 1; and the Statewide University Police Association, Unit 8. Trustee Considine also reported that the committee heard comments from the California Faculty Association, California State Employees’ Association and the Academic Professinals of California, all focusing on the status of current collective bargaining.
Report from the Committee of the Whole
Chairman Fallgatter reported for the committee.

Chairman Fallgatter reported that the committee heard one action item and one information item. The information item consisted of a status report of litigation affecting the CSU.

Private-Sector Participation in Development of North Campus Property at California State University, Northridge (RCOW 03-98-02)
Chairman Fallgatter moved the resolution; there was a second.

The Board of Trustees approved the following resolution:

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

1. Support the concept for the development of biotech (research and development) uses on the north campus property at California State University, Northridge through participation in a public/private partnership.

2. Will consider the following action items for approval at appropriate times during the development process:
   (a) Specific development program(s) negotiated by the campus and the specific developer, with the advice of the Office of the Chancellor;
   (b) Master Plan revisions, as needed;
   (c) Proposed schematic plans and environmental documentation for all facilities.

3. Confirm the chancellor’s authority to enter into such leasing and other associated agreements as necessary to implement the process for specific development programs approved by the trustees.

Communications and Correspondence

Old Business

New Business

Public Comments
The Board of Trustees heard comments from the following members of the California Faculty Association: Terry Jones, president, Hayward; Ed White, San Bernardino; Lee Ballot, Fullerton; Helene Dumon, Fullerton; G. Nanjundappa, Fullerton; Margo Kasdan, San Francisco; and, Nancy Baily, Bakersfield. The trustees also heard from Pauline Robinson, member, California State Employees’ Association.

Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 10:45 a.m.
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I’d like to take a moment to thank all of our presidents for organizing Ambassador programs on your campuses. When Superintendent of Schools Delaine Eastin was speaking yesterday, she was asking for our help in convincing the legislature that we needed higher standards for our high school graduates. As she was speaking, several times she said, “I need your help in convincing the legislature.” While she was doing that, I was basically looking at all you presidents, realizing that you have put in place on your campuses networks of very influential individuals who are both capable and willing to help us with convincing the legislature on what’s best for our universities.

I’ve been able to be out to the kickoffs for some of your Ambassador programs. When we were up in San Francisco with Bob Corrigan, Willie Brown was one of our speakers and an Ambassador for us. He viewed all the people in the audience, and said, “You are the most effective people to influence and to help this university because you are the individuals that when you make those phone calls, I will take the call.” He went further on to say that he was committed and dedicated to our universities and wanted to host, a year from now, an Ambassador’s event at City Hall in San Francisco. But there was a caveat to it, which was that each ambassador coming in had to let Willie Brown know what they had done for the university over that last year.

And then when I was down at Bob Suzuki’s campus at Cal Poly Pomona, Jim Brulte spoke to the Ambassadors. Senator Brulte looked out at the audience and said, “I am looking in the eyes of several individuals here who are instrumental in making sure I originally got into office, and you know I will take your phone calls, and you know when you ask me to help on this university, I will be there to help.”

Tomás Arciniega told me yesterday that one of his ambassadors in Bakersfield again this year is going to fly up Tomás and a couple of other Ambassadors to Legislative Days on Monday in Sacramento. And you know that when Tomás sits down with four legislators in Sacramento and they realize the influential individual who flew Tomás up there is committed to the university, that makes a statement. Again, when I was up at Peter Smith’s at Monterey Bay, I was at the Leon Panetta lecture series and sitting next to me was the former president of the National Restaurant Association, and I didn’t even bring it up, but he said to me, “I want you to know I’m an Ambassador and I just absolutely love being able to influence and help this university.”

In the newsletter that Bobbie Metzger sends out, there was poll that showed that 61 percent of the citizens in the state of California feel that our education system needs an overhaul. Ralph Pesqueira brought this up when he started the ball going on reducing the need for remediation, and Delaine Eastin brought it up as she was saying we really need to convince the Legislature that we need higher standards for our high school graduates, and all of us have mentioned it when we talk about K-12 reform. What’s very important is that you actively utilize these Ambassador organizations because these are the people who can help us to orchestrate the overhaul the way we want to do it and not have somebody else tell us. So, once again, I appreciate your help and want you to know that the chancellor has asked Douglas Patiño to put in place a five-year plan for the Ambassadors program.
Now I would like to move on and shed a little light on an interesting side of our new chancellor. All of you have had the opportunity to meet with Charlie Reed and to see how smart and political and quick and energetic he is, but Ali Razi alluded a little bit to the personal side of the chancellor when he mentioned how he had given the money for the scholarship. So I’d like to tell you about a phone conversation that I had with him on Friday. He called me, and he’s wonderful all the time, but in this phone conversation you could just tell he was so excited and so happy. He was telling me what he was doing with the system, and how he had just left the campus of Long Beach with Bob Maxson and how wonderful things were going there and he was just on a real high. I said, “Charlie, sounds to me like you’re having fun.” He said, “I love this job, it’s wonderful, the campuses are great.” And I thought, you know, we are the largest system of higher education in the whole United States and yet we are so dedicated and so committed to our individual campuses. I could tell from our new chancellor that he has that same dedication that all of us do.

So, with that, I would like him to join me in honoring a couple of our presidents whose campuses are now 50 years old, and that is Jim Rosser from Cal State L.A. and Don Gerth from Sacramento. I was thinking about this “50 years” and how with institutional advancement it takes you a while until you build your alumni and they start giving back. You feel like you’ve got to be an older campus and all that. Well, 50 years sounds like it and then I started thinking about my own age, and I thought 50 years is right when the fun starts. So if we could ask President Rosser and President Gerth to join me please. I would like to thank both presidents and all of our presidents. What you do for the state of California, our citizens, the community, the regions that you are in, is just absolutely fantastic. You’re making a better California for all of us, and this board is very proud of all of you. And now I will turn to Chancellor Reed.
Thank you, Chairman Fallgatter. This is exciting. I have attended two prior meetings of this board as an observer, but I can tell you that to be a participant is even more exciting. Also, Cathy joins me in again thanking all of you for giving this opportunity to both of us. Cathy, please stand up. You can’t introduce your wife enough.

I have been here most of the time since the first of January, but I have been here for the last three weeks full time. First of all, I can tell you that Barry Munitz left this university in very good shape. It has a good foundation for somebody to come in and to continue; and, as I said to Barry, if I can only do as much as you’ve done and take this university to the next level, that’s what I want to do. We all owe Barry a great debt in the sense that I don’t think you can get any better compliment than to say he left it better than he found it and he did a good job. I want all of you to know that.

Second, I want to thank everybody—the presidents, the trustees, faculty, and Chancellor’s Office staff. Everybody has been so helpful to me on a daily basis as I have tried to learn more and more about this university system. I can tell you this, it’s very complicated, but it’s a very exciting place to work and it’s a great system also. So, I will continue to do everything I can to be more knowledgeable every time we meet.

In addition to introducing Cathy, there’s somebody who has joined me. Barry did leave a hole when he left here: he took a couple of people out of his office, and I asked somebody who had worked with me for about 25 years if she would consider joining up in California. I was lucky in that she had gone to work for Florida a little longer than I had and had 30 years there and was able to say that she would make that kind of a commitment to move across the country. But for those of you who have not met her, I’d like to introduce Sandy George and tell you what a valuable person she is. I can also say this, if you can’t find me, even when my children and wife can’t find me, Sandy knows where I am. So, if you’ll get hold of her, she has my schedule and she knows where I am all the time and will get a message to me so I can get back to you.

Also, I appreciate this board’s confidence in the recommendation that you’ll approve, hopefully in a couple of minutes, to have David Spence be able to join the Chancellor’s Office team. David knows systems, he knows academic affairs, he knows what campuses need to do in order to improve quality and so I appreciate David, also, coming with us.

If I could just make a few points about how I’m spending my time in the first few months and weeks here.

First, I think it’s important that I learn as much as I can about Sacramento: who the players are, what the budget is, how the budget plays the most important part of what I’m going to be doing in the next several months, the focus on access, the focus on faculty and staff salaries, the focus on providing the funds to continue the current operations of CSU. So my goal is to try to get to Sacramento almost every week over the next several months to expand my knowledge about Sacramento. I’ve had some exciting times there, I’ve been there seven or eight times already since January. Trustee Vitti and I had a good time there a couple weeks ago and a good result came of that. But, I need the presidents’ and the trustees’ help in Sacramento.
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Next Monday and Tuesday I know that we will be there for Legislative Days. I know many of the trustees and most of the presidents will be joining us, and that is helpful, but not enough. So, it’s got to be done on a continuous sustained basis over the next few months if we’re going to be successful. I am optimistic about what the budget results can be—Richard West talked a little bit about that yesterday—optimistic from the sense that California’s economy is hot.

About three weeks ago, I don’t know if you saw New Yorker magazine, but the entire issue was dedicated to the state of California. It talked about this miracle, the miracle of the economy, and how California had rebounded and what California’s future was all about. And they said it was nothing short of a miracle as to what happened in California with its economy. But then there was another piece in there that said the future economy of California is based upon education and that the competitiveness had all to do with the knowledge-based industries and whether or not the people of California would come together with their political leadership to reinvest in education. This future need was going to be the turning point about whether this growth could be sustained or not. It talked about the public schools, it talked about the universities, it had a two-page spread with all the Nobel Prize winners from UC, and it’s a great piece, but it still comes back to will the people and the political leadership reinvest into the human capital in order to make this miracle continue. So, I want to be a part with you in delivering that message in Sacramento.

Bill Hauck and his colleagues have been working, Russ Gould and others, on a very important next step which is Compact II, so we will be bringing that back to this board. That is in the process of getting some focus and some work about sustaining the funding for California State University and the University of California so that with sustained effort, you can build quality in universities. Karen Yelverton mentioned the disappointment with the bond bill, but I am optimistic that some good will come out of that; it always does. With new leadership in Sacramento, it’s hard to put those kinds of things together, but in talking with Bill Hauck and others, I think that there are some plans to try to influence that.

In my visits in Sacramento, when we don’t talk about the budget, in every office, in every place I go, teacher education is the #1 issue—about what CSU, what our campuses are doing in teacher education. So I do believe that this must be a top priority for this board and for all of our presidents and campuses. Tomorrow I’m going to be meeting with about eight or ten superintendents in the L.A. Basin talking about what we can do to improve the schools of California. I believe it’s an all-university responsibility, it’s not just the colleges of education or the deans’ responsibility, it’s the entire university’s responsibility. If we can improve the public schools, we’ll improve those numbers on compensatory education. We’ll make our faculties’ lives better, easier, if we get smarter students to come. If we get smarter students to come, they’ll stay, our retention rates will increase, our graduation rates will increase, our flow through rates will increase. So, it behooves us to do that.

Second, you know that Martha Fallgatter is going to report just briefly on CETI. I will continue to work on that. I’ve spent a lot of time with Richard and Tom West and Maynard Robinson and others. I just want to say this. If no one has ever done it before, it’s probably going to be hard. So, that’s where we are with CETI, trying to put something together that no one in American higher education has ever done. One of the reasons I said it’s a 50/50 chance is because we’re down to the heavy lifting to get the financial pro formas to work. Everybody has really worked very hard, the campuses, our staff, the attorneys, our outside counsel, which was a wise recommendation that we do that.
Third, I’m going to try to visit nine or ten campuses between now and the middle of May. Those campuses that I don’t get to by the middle of May will be on the top priority list to get visited in the fall. By election time in the fall, I hope to have visited all 23 of our campuses. But it is great, I had just a fun day last Friday on the campus at Long Beach, talking to faculty members and students about what they were doing, when they were going to graduate, what their majors were, what is going on in the campus life.

The other thing that I’m going to try to do as I visit the campuses is to visit the editorial boards around the state. I think it’s important for me and for this board to stress what CSU stands for and what CSU is doing to build the California economy and workforce. So, I will be spending some time doing that. Again I would like to thank Trustee Razi and his colleagues. I know that they’ve all dedicated themselves and some of their generosity to fund scholarships for trustee students, so thank you and your colleagues for doing that because that’s what this system is all about. It’s giving another chance to people who have had a hard time. I can tell you that when they go back in their communities, they’ll continue to contribute to their communities. So Cathy and I are pleased to be here, and I look forward to working with all of you. Thank you.
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It is proposed that the title of President Emeritus be conferred on Robert C. Detweiler.
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BOARD OF TRUSTEES

Conferral of the Title President Emeritus

In 1971 the Board of Trustees adopted a policy governing the award of the title of *Emeritus* to executives who retire from regular service. The policy set three standards; these are:

1. Emeritus status may be granted to an executive upon retirement from regular service in the California State University.

2. Recommendations for emeritus status may be made by the board or by the chancellor to the board upon receipt of recommendation from constituent groups of the campus, such as the faculty, the student body, or the advisory board.

3. The granting of emeritus status carries the title *Emeritus* and courtesies, but no compensation.

Members of the Board of Trustees have recommended that Dr. Robert C. Detweiler be recognized both for his professional career with the California State University and for his service to the people of California.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Robert C. Detweiler has ably served as president of California State University, Dominguez Hills for nine years, guiding the growth of one of the most diverse universities in the state; and

**WHEREAS**, During his tenure, the university has seen the establishment and outstanding success of the California Academy of Mathematics and Science, and the Challenger Learning Center, tapping private industry support and bringing the highest caliber of education to long-underserved area students; and

**WHEREAS**, He has additionally served the California State University for two decades, first at San Diego State University, where he was dean of the College of Arts and Letters as well as professor of history, and later, at California State University, San Bernardino, where he was vice president for academic affairs; and

**WHEREAS**, Dr. Detweiler holds a bachelor’s degree in social science from Humboldt State University and a master’s degree in history from San Francisco State University, and is thus in all ways both a creation of and a productive contributor to the California State University; and

**WHEREAS**, the California State University is pleased to recognize and honor those educators who have made signal contributions to the California State University, now, therefore, be it

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that this board confer the title of President *Emeritus* of California State University, Dominguez Hills on Dr. Robert C. Detweiler with all the rights and privileges pertaining thereto.
CSU Alumni Council Annual Report

Presentation By
Gwynna Morris
CSU Alumni Council

Summary
A report on CSU Alumni Council activities and achievements during the 1997/98 year will be presented.