AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 4:00 p.m. Tuesday, November 16, 2004
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Kyriakos Tsakopoulous, Chair
Anthony M. Vitti, Vice Chair
Jeffrey L. Bleich
Moctesuma Esparza
George G. Gowgani
Raymond W. Holdsworth
Kathleen E. Kaiser
Shailesh J. Mehta

Consent Items
Approval of Minutes of Meeting of September 14, 2004

Discussion Items
1. Amend the 2004/2005 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, Action
2. Approval of Schematic Plans, Action
3. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision with Enrollment Ceiling Change at Humboldt State University, Action
4. Certify the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision Enrollment Ceiling Change at California State University, Monterey Bay Action
5. Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for the Villas Parkmerced Lot 42 Property Acquisition for San Francisco State University, Action
MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Trustees of The California State University
Office of the Chancellor
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California

September 14, 2004

Members Present

Kyriakos Tsakopoulos, Chair
Jeffrey L. Bleich
Moctesuma Esparza
Murray L. Galinson, Chair of the Board
George G. Gowgani
Raymond W. Holdsworth
Kathleen E. Kaiser
Shailesh J. Mehta
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of July 13, 2004, were approved as submitted.

Acceptance of Interest in Real Property

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-04-17).

Amend the 2004/2005 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Tsakopoulos presented Agenda Item 2 as a consent action item.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-04-18).

Final Report on the 2004/2005 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Chair Tsakopoulos presented Agenda Item 3 as a consent information item.
California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report

Elvyra San Juan, assistant vice chancellor, capital planning, design and construction presented the Seismic Review Board Annual Report. In 1993, the Board of Trustees adopted its seismic policy. In implementing the trustees’ policy, a CSU Seismic Review Board (SRB) and mitigation plan to address seismic hazards was established. The key to the mitigation plan is to identify and address the high hazard buildings, and prioritize them accordingly.

This year the SRB has been performing peer reviews on construction projects and suggested changes to our design guidelines. The board has revised the list of buildings with seismic hazards to incorporate some issues at the Pomona campus. The SRB has drafted requirements for temporary structures and lease space, and has begun the planning of campus visits to re-evaluate existing structures in light of code changes and lessons learned.

State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2005/2006 through 2009/2010

With the use of a slide presentation, Ms. San Juan presented Agenda Item 5. The proposed 2005/06 capital program has been revised since its approval by the trustees in March. The proposed priority list is the result of campus requested changes due to the significant escalation in material costs. One of the key drivers to the capital program is the proposed enrollment growth for the campus and its impact on specific disciplines. The Governor’s Compact supports an annual enrollment growth of 2.5% per year, which has been taken into account in setting priorities. Consistent with past practice, smaller campuses are being afforded faster growth than the average growth rates in order to achieve improved efficiencies and economies of scale in campus operations.

For capital planning purposes, we plan physical capacity needs around the academic year FTE in lecture and laboratory space. In addition, we have continued to include the summer enrollment goals as part of the program review process. Prior to the state fiscal crisis and the push to expand the summer sessions, we anticipated that in 2002/03 the systemwide physical capacity would not be sufficient to meet enrollment demands. Based on current projections, the critical year will be in 2009/10.

The 2005/06 program will be funded from Proposition 55 (the March 2004 bond). Based on the amount targeted for the CSU, we are proposing a $289 million program for 2005/06. This will leave $89 million for reserves and the cost of issuance, which is higher than normal due to increased costs of issuance and greater program reserves in light of the difficult bid climate. The nonstate funded program for 2005/06 is about $101 million, largely supported by donor funded projects and grants.

Trustee Kaiser asked Ms. San Juan to address the apparent significant volume of proposed housing of the previous five-years and the next five-years, inquiring whether these numbers reflect campuses planning to accommodate projected enrollment, or are these housing projects for staff and faculty.
Ms. San Juan responded that most of the projects are student housing. Very few faculty and staff housing projects are proposed within the five-year plan. Campuses are working on their financial plans, and bringing their program to the trustees as an amend nonstate project.

Trustee Kaiser directed a question to Ms. San Juan about the percentages of the buildings in different age cycles, 60% being 40 years or older that are in the five-year program. Are we being realistic about the number of buildings that might be required or are we being conservative.

Ms. San Juan responded that the campuses are prioritizing competing demands, and balancing the need between growth projects and renovations. The number of aging buildings is part of the driver for the proposed capital renewal program, which reinvests in those older facilities to extend their useful life.

Trustee Guerra asked Ms. San Juan how she plans to address capacity versus enrollment in 2009/2010 when enrollment is projected to go above the capacity of the campuses.

Ms. San Juan stated that we will have to watch how the growth in summer programs progresses. We work with each campus when they are programming their buildings to identify how their needs would be impacted with the increase of summer programs. We have also looked at the use of off-campus centers and at distance learning to provide students access.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-04-19).

**Approval of Schematic Plans**

This item proposed the approval of a schematic plan for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo—Engineering/Architecture Renovation & Replacement, Phase IIB Addition project. With the use of an audio-visual presentation, Ms. San Juan reviewed the item as printed in the agenda. The project was included in the physical master plan approved by the trustees in March 2001, and a Finding of Consistency was prepared which confirms that the project is consistent with the 2001 FEIR. Staff recommends approval.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 09-04-20).

Chair Tsakopoulos concluded the meeting.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2004/2005 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation by

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 2004/05 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following five projects:

1. California State University, Dominguez Hills
   California Academy of Mathematics and Science, Phase II   PWCE   $6,146,000

   California State University, Dominguez Hills wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the California Academy of Mathematics and Science (CAMS), Phase II project. CAMS is a successful magnet high school, which has been physically and academically integrated into the campus enabling its students to attend university classes. The first phase, completed in 2001, provides many of the classrooms, laboratories, and administrative space for CAMS, which allowed it to provide instruction at the master plan level of 611 students, its current enrollment. This project will construct 17,660 GSF providing 14 additional classrooms/labs, food service facilities, and a dance/art studio. Additionally, courtyard space, landscape, and activity fields are included in the project scope. The completion of this phase will significantly reduce the use of university facilities by CAMS students. This includes the university’s South Academic Complex, which they will vacate upon the completion of this project. This project is being built on university property that is leased to the Long Beach Unified School District. Funding for the project will be provided by the district and donor funds.

2. California State University, Dominguez Hills
   Tennis Pavilion   PWCE   $701,000

   CSU Dominguez Hills wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Tennis Pavilion. This project will construct 2,570 GSF to provide a service area for food and retail sales, offices, lounge space, locker rooms, and restrooms. The project will also include courtyard space and landscaping. The facility will support the ongoing tennis academy functions of the Home Depot Center and the development of new programs. This project will be built on university
property that is leased as part of the Home Depot Center sports complex. The Anschutz Southern California Sports Complex will provide funding for the project.

3. California State University, Los Angeles
   Student Union Replacement

   California State University, Los Angeles wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Student Union replacement project. The trustees approved the renovation of the building in 2001, however during the initial structural analysis, it was determined that the existing 120,000 GSF building would require a seismic retrofit to meet the code requirements of Division VI-R (of the California Building Code). The building has been rated a Division of State Architect (DSA) level 6, which is the highest category level for needed strengthening currently in the CSU. As the Needs Assessment and Programming Study determined that a seismic retrofit of the existing building would cost 55% of a new building the campus is proposing to replace the 1975 structure. This replacement project will construct a 90,000 GSF replacement building that will provide student union administration and support offices, computer labs, café, lounge, and a recreation center. This nonstate project will be funded through the Systemwide Revenue Bond program.

4. California State University, San Bernardino
   Real Property Acquisition and Purchase of Student Housing

   California State University, San Bernardino wishes to proceed with the real property acquisition of 11.28 acres adjacent to the campus. The property contains a housing complex with a variety of unit types designed to meet the demands of today’s students. There are 24 two-bedroom, one-bath units; 84 four-bedroom, two-bath units; and 24 four-bedroom, four-bath units. The total number of bed spaces for all units combined is 480. The five 3-story student housing buildings and a single-story community center consist of concrete slabs on grade with spread concrete reinforced footings, wooden frames, stucco exteriors, drywall interiors, and attractive and highly durable concrete tile roofs. The building design complements existing campus housing in style, design, and building materials. The facilities were constructed to the CSU’s construction standards and obtained approvals from all of the agencies required by the CSU, including the CSU Seismic Review Board. Parking is provided around the outer perimeter of the buildings: 429 spaces included within the wrought iron gated community, and 66 spaces provided for guest and overflow parking along the northern perimeter of the complex. There is a large swimming pool, a sand volleyball court, and a park-like central courtyard.

Due Diligence Review

A Due Diligence review was completed for the real property acquisition. The report contains required legal and construction related documentation, including an environmental assessment.
report, CEQA report, preliminary title report, and other related support documentation to satisfy CSU land acquisition requirements.

5. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo  
   Alex G. Spanos Stadium, West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvements  
   **PWCE**  $11,578,000

Cal Poly San Luis Obispo wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a project to improve the Alex G. Spanos Stadium (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium). The proposed project will replace the utility infrastructure of the 66 year-old stadium, and expand the west bleachers to 10,580 seats, including new restroom and support facilities. The project will add an upper concourse level that will include eight private boxes, press and coach boxes, restrooms, and a support space. The total project budget is $14,378,000 of which $2,800,000 is contingent upon the approval of 2005/06 state capital renewal funds and the balance of $11,578,000 will be provided from donor funds.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2004/05 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include: 1) $6,146,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University, Dominguez Hills, California Academy of Mathematics and Science, Phase II project; 2) $701,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University, Dominguez Hills, Tennis Pavilion project; 3) $39,500,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University, Los Angeles, Student Union Replacement project; 4) $30,335,000 for the acquisition of Real Property and purchase of a student housing facility project for the California State University, San Bernardino; and 5) $11,578,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Alex G. Spanos Stadium, West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvements project.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

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

1. California State University, Fullerton—Parking Structure 2
   
   *Project Architect: Langdon Wilson*

Background and Scope

The CSU Fullerton, Parking Structure 2 project will be constructed on a portion of the existing surface Parking Lot B, displacing 630 spaces while providing 1,601 new spaces. The project will also upgrade parts of surface Parking Lots B and K and a short-term surface lot adjacent to the Titan Student Union, providing a net increase of 971 parking spaces (1,513 spaces in the structure and 88 spaces in surface lots) to the campus inventory. This modified design/build project will be located immediately north of the Titan Student Union in the northwest area of the main campus. Vehicles will enter and exit the structure off State College Boulevard via a realignment of West Campus Drive.

The parking structure will be five-stories plus parking on the roof level for a total of six levels. The structure will be poured-in-place, post-tensioned concrete with a ductile moment frame. The parking structure will have three glass-backed elevators that will complement the Titan Student Union’s north façade. The project’s east elevation will abut the future Student Recreation Center. New lighting, landscaping, slurry coating, and re-striping of the remaining existing lots and the widening of Dorothy Lane within the campus will complete the site work.

This project promotes the principles of a sustainable environment in several respects. Sustainable building practices include the use of local structural concrete sources and the use of natural ventilation only. The lighting system will employ light-sensor switches for perimeter ambient light, and motion sensors and an energy management system to control lighting. Existing asphalt concrete paving will be recycled for re-use as base material. Specifications require the use of low VOC (volatile organic compound) paint products on the project. There are
approximately 20 mature trees on the site that will be removed and replanted in order to screen the structure along State College Boulevard.

**Timing (Estimated)**

- Completion of Preliminary Drawings: December 2004
- Completion of Working Drawings: February 2005
- Construction Start: March 2005
- Occupancy: May 2006

**Basic Statistics**

- Gross Building Area: 464,260 square feet
- Total Parking Spaces (1,513 in structure, 88 in surface lots): 1,601 spaces

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4100**

- Parking Structure Cost ($10,312 per space): $15,602,000

  "Systems Breakdown ($ per GSF)
  
  a. Substructure (Foundation): $3.47
  b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure): $20.74
  c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes): $1.06
  d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire): $3.17
  e. Equipment and Specialties: $.53
  f. General Conditions: $4.63

- Site Development (includes surface lot and landscaping): $1,556,000

- Construction Cost: $17,158,000

- Fees, Contingency and Services: $3,542,000

- Grand Total: $20,700,000

**Cost Comparison**

The parking structure construction cost of $10,312 per space is above the CSU construction cost guideline of $8,394 per space by $1,918 due to unique site conditions and industry-wide price increases in structural steel and rebar. The site conditions include a need for deep foundations (50 foot piles) and working in a restricted site.
Funding Data

The campus is seeking board approval at this November meeting to issue bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond Program to finance the design and construction of this project.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

An Initial Study was prepared and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on December 1, 2002 in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The 30-day public review period ended on January 1, 2003, and no adverse comments were received. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Mitigated Negative Declaration for the CSU Fullerton, Parking Structure 2 project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. With the implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the proposed project will not have the potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.

3. The board hereby concurs with the findings of fact and related mitigation measures of the Mitigated Negative Declaration that the proposed project will reduce the potential significant effects on the environment to less than significant.

4. The recommended mitigation measures are hereby approved and incorporated by reference, along with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan which is also approved and incorporated by reference, and which meets the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.

5. The chancellor is requested under Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.

6. The schematic plans for the CSU Fullerton, Parking Structure 2 project are approved at a project cost of $20,700,000 at CCCI 4100.
2. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo—Alex G. Spanos Stadium, West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvements

Summary

This item seeks the Board of Trustees’ approval on:

- Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) for the entire Stadium Expansion.
- Approval of schematic plans for the Alex G. Spanos Stadium, West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvements project. The project includes expansion of the west bleachers, related support space, and infrastructure and circulation improvements.

The FEIR and the Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program are available for review by the board and the public at [http://www.facilities.calpoly.edu/](http://www.facilities.calpoly.edu/).

Potential Contested Issues

Pursuant to the trustees’ request that potential contested issues be noted early in the agenda item, the following is provided:

1. Historic Preservation. Comments indicated concern with the demolition of Jespersen and Heron Halls.

   CSU Response. The university has analyzed the alternatives suggested in the received comments and has found all suggested alternatives infeasible due to the limited reuse of the structures, cost, aesthetics, and geologic constraints. The campus has proposed a mitigation measure that includes the memorialization of the historic nature of the area, however, the mitigation measures are not sufficient to reduce the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

2. Off-Site Mitigation Contributions. A number of comments received relate to financial contributions by Cal Poly San Luis Obispo toward off-site mitigations, which include infrastructure improvements, transportation improvements, and other local, off-site, mitigation measures.

   CSU Response: CSU is exempt and/or restricted from local land-use regulations and fee assessments, unless specified by the legislature. The California Legislature enacted Government Code Section 54999 to expressly allow state agencies to negotiate with public utility service providers for an appropriate capital facilities fee required to provide water, storm-drainage, wastewater disposal, and other utility capital improvements.
3. **Traffic.** Comments have been received about traffic and circulation impacts to local roadways.

   *CSU Response.* The FEIR outlines significant and unavoidable impacts to city intersections associated with new trips and trips diverted to the project area. CEQA provides that each public agency shall mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment of projects it approves or carries out whenever it is feasible to do so (Public Resources Code Section 21002.1[b]). In mitigating or avoiding a significant effect of a project on the environment, a public agency may exercise only those express or implied powers provided by law other than under CEQA (PRC Section 21004). The CSU has specific authority to mitigate effects that occur within its jurisdiction, namely within the campus, but no authority over those that occur outside of the project site. Since the CSU cannot implement mitigation measures that are under the jurisdiction and responsibility of another agency, the impact remains significant and unavoidable under CEQA. Per CEQA Guidelines, the CSU Board of Trustees, in their role as Lead Agency under CEQA, may approve a project with remaining significant environmental effects.

4. **Noise.** Comments have been received about the noise impact to the surrounding neighborhoods.

   *CSU Response.* The FEIR has completed a sound study with recommendations and mitigations specifically designed to reduce the impact of sound created by this project to a less than significant level.

**Background**

In March 2001, the Board of Trustees approved a comprehensive master plan update that provides a blueprint for the expansion and modernization of campus facilities to accommodate academic programs and services. The plan included the existing 8,500-seat stadium, playfield, and road improvements, as well as constructing a new parking garage on the site of two existing historical buildings. The trustees certified the program level master plan Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Since then, the campus has worked to better define the specific facility renovation and new construction needs for the stadium site. The campus has prepared a project-specific EIR consistent with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) that addresses the anticipated build-out of the stadium site to include not only the west bleachers to add a maximum 2,080 seating capacity, but also the future addition of another maximum 4,240 seats, Parking Structure II (1,000 spaces), and an office building. The project-specific EIR presented in this item also describes the proposed demolition of portions of the stadium to build the larger seating facilities, demolition of two structures designated as historic, as well as circulation improvements.
Stadium Expansion Project Description

- **Stadium Renovation**
  The existing 8,500-seat stadium will be renovated in several phases and seating capacity increased to an eventual maximum 15,000 seats. The first phase of the Stadium Expansion project (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium Renovation and Expansion) will be the expansion of the west bleachers, adding a net 2,080 seats to the current capacity. The second phase will include the demolition and replacement of the south end bleachers, with a net loss of approximately 1,034 seats. Phase three will construct the parking structure. Phase four will renovate the east side bleachers and could add 534 seats to that location. Phase five could add 2,520 seats to the north end bleachers. The final phase includes the northeast and southeast expansions, with 1,200 seats each, for a total of 2,400 seats.

- **Parking Structure II**
  The project will accommodate off-street parking needed for students, faculty and staff based on the parking structure identified in the master plan. The structure will be four levels, hold up to 1,000 vehicles, and will be accessed from Campus Way and California Boulevard.

- **Offices**
  An 11,500 square foot office building (not to exceed three stories) will be constructed adjacent to the southwest corner of the parking structure to replace a portion of the office space lost to building demolition.

- **Demolition**
  Portions of the stadium will be demolished in order to build the larger seating facilities. The playing field will be renovated. Two office structures, identified as historic resources, will be demolished to accommodate the parking structure.

**California Environmental Quality Act**

A FEIR has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed Stadium Expansion (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium Renovation and Expansion) in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. This document provides environmental information in sufficient detail to allow the Board of Trustees to approve schematic plans for the Alex G. Spanos Stadium, West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvements project, which is a component of the proposed stadium expansion.
The FEIR includes not only the West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvement project addressed in the proposed schematic plans, but also other facility construction (demolition, Parking Structure II, and additional stadium expansion), which is planned to proceed at a future time.

To determine the scope of environmental review, a Notice of Preparation and Initial Study was distributed on June 1, 2004 for the proposed project. Local jurisdictions, including the city and county of San Luis Obispo, along with other interested agencies and individuals, were provided a copy of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study. A copy of the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study is included in Appendix A of the Final EIR.

Based on the Notice of Preparation and Initial Study process, it was determined that implementation of the proposed project would result in either less-than-significant impacts or no impacts in the following issue areas and, therefore, these issue areas were not considered in the EIR:

- Agriculture
- Biological Resources
- Mineral Resources
- Population and Housing
- Recreation
- Recreation
- Recreation
- Recreation

The EIR addressed the following potentially significant issue areas:

- Aesthetics, Light and Glare
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Cultural/Historic Resources
- Public Services and Utilities
- Geology and Soils
- Traffic and Circulation
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Visual Resources

Additionally, the EIR included:

- Cumulative, growth-inducing, and significant and irreversible effects of the project, and
- An Alternatives section that describes and analyzes alternative plans to reduce identified significant impacts.

Alternatives

Section 6 of the FEIR analyzed the following three alternative development programs in accordance with CEQA and state CEQA Guidelines. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified. The preferred alternative is Cal Poly’s proposed Stadium Expansion.

No Project Alternative: Continuation with existing facilities
Alternative 1: Reduced structure; eliminate south future expansion area  
Alternative 2: Alternate site for parking structure; eliminate south future expansion area

The Draft EIR was made available for public and agency review for a 45-day review period. During the review period, written comments concerning the adequacy of the EIR were submitted to the campus. Jurisdictions, interested agencies and individuals were provided a copy of the EIR along with a notice of a public meeting to be held on the project.

A Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR was published in the newspaper in accordance with state law. The public review period closed October 2, 2004.

Issues Identified through Public Participation

Comments were received in response to the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study and the Draft EIR for the proposed Stadium Expansion (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium Renovation and Expansion). The comments included concerns about:

- Aesthetics, Light and Glare
- Hydrology and Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Cultural/Historic Resources
- Public Services and Utilities
- Geology and Soils
- Traffic and Circulation
- Hazards and Hazardous Materials
- Visual Resources

During the 45-day public comment period, nine letters were received. The following public agencies, interest groups or individuals submitted comments regarding the proposed project:

- Air Pollution Control District
- California Department of Transportation
- Office of Historic Preservation
- City of San Luis Obispo
- Neighborhoods North of Foothill
- Resident for Quality Neighborhoods
- Bishop Peak neighborhood residents
- Steven Marx
- Eugene Jud

The FEIR includes written responses to all comments received. For complete copies of the comments and written responses, please refer to the Responses to Comments, which is Attachment C. The following is a summary of the major comments and responses:
Comment: Three comments requested the implementation of the Jones and Stokes sound mitigation measures as outlined in the report completed for the previously approved and built Sports Complex.

Response: As part of this FEIR, a sound study was completed with recommendations and mitigation measures specifically designed to reduce the impact of sound created by activities related to this project to a less than significant level.

Comment: The FEIR fails to adequately mitigate the traffic impacts generated by this project.

Response: Government Code Section 54999 et seq., does expressly allow local entities to negotiate with the state for the imposition of “capital facilities fees” for the connection of specified utility services. Utilities covered under Section 54999 include water, power, solid waste, flood control, drainage, and sewage, treatment, and disposal. Among improvements not specified for contributions are street and other transportation improvements.

A variety of other comments were received and have been addressed in the Responses to Comments section of the FEIR.

The FEIR incorporates the results of the comments received on the Draft EIR. A complete listing and discussion of significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project and the proposed mitigation measures are analyzed in detail in Chapter 5 of the Draft EIR, and summarized in Chapter 2 of the Draft EIR. The FEIR includes all the comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments. The FEIR also includes 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.

The mitigation measures listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will reduce most of the environmental effects identified in the FEIR. However, certain significant environmental effects of the project are unavoidable even after the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. All feasible mitigation measures which are within the purview of the university will be implemented, and any remaining significant unavoidable environmental impacts will be weighed and considered to be acceptable due to specific education, economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits based on the facts set forth in the FEIR.

Thus, consistent with CEQA Guidelines, the CSU Board of Trustees, in its role as Lead Agency under CEQA, may approve a project with remaining significant environmental effects. The CSU Board of Trustees, as Lead Agency, must adopt Overriding Considerations where project
benefits will outweigh significant adverse impacts that remain unmitigated as a result of project implementation. The required findings are provided by reference in the proposed resolution.

**Schematic Plans**

As previously noted, the proposed West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvements project will increase the existing stadium seating capacity of 8,500 by 2,080 seats, provide concession areas, restrooms, and other support space. The lower concourse seating will be a combination of bleacher and chair back seats. The upper concourse will have ten private boxes, which includes the press box and coaches’ box. The project will improve the playing field, provide hardscape and landscape areas, and nine surface parking spaces, all of which are accessible.

The project is designed in the California mission style and has stucco exteriors. Two elevators will provide access to the upper concourse areas. The site is very limited to accommodate the expansion, so the upper concourse is being designed to accommodate vehicle traffic below. The bleachers are a steel-frame structure, utilizing recycled steel. Additionally, field lighting will be replaced with high-efficiency lights. Concrete will contain local content materials. The project will use low VOC (volatile organic compound) paint and the roadwork will utilize recycled asphalt.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Plans March 2005
Completion of Working Drawings July 2005
Start of Construction August 2005
Occupancy September 2006

**Basic Statistics**

West Bleacher Seating 2,080 seats
Gross Square Feet 37,380 square feet
Upper Box Area 9,880 square feet
Total Square Feet 47,260 square feet

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4100**

Building Cost ($3,639 per seat) $7,570,000

**Systems Breakdown**

a. Substructure (Foundation) $ 6.54
b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure) $100.97
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes) $ 12.15  
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire) $ 36.46  
e. Equipment and Furnishings $ 3.70  
g. Special Construction $ .36

Site Demolition and Development (includes landscaping)($5,146 per seat)  

3,134,000

Construction Cost $10,704,000  
Fees Contingency and Services 3,501,000

Total Project Cost $14,205,000  
Group II Equipment 173,000

Grand Total $14,378,000

Cost Comparison

The project’s building and site cost of $5,146 per seat is higher than the cost of $1,146 per seat for the CSU Fresno football stadium expansion in 1989 and the cost of $1,205 per seat for the CSU Fresno softball stadium expansion in 1994 [project costs were adjusted to CCCI 4100].

Funding Data

This project will be jointly funded with $11,578,000 in donor funds and $2,800,000 proposed from state funds (Proposition 55) in 2005/06.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The FEIR has been prepared to address the potential significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with approval of the Stadium Expansion (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium Renovation and Expansion), and all discretionary actions related thereto, as identified on table 2.0-1 of the FEIR.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2004061007) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the state CEQA Guidelines, and CSU CEQA Procedures.
3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines, which requires that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to the approval of a project (along with a statement of facts supporting each finding).

4. This board hereby adopts the Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations, and related mitigation measures provided under separate cover for Agenda Item 2 of the November 16-17, 2004 meeting of the Board of Trustees’ 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 board’s findings include specific overriding considerations that outweigh certain remaining significant impacts.

6. Prior to the certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the Stadium Expansion (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium Renovation and Expansion) 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 purposes of CEQA, the Administrative Record of the proceedings for the project comprise the following:

   A. The DEIR for the Stadium Expansion (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium Renovation and Expansion);

   B. The FEIR, including comments received on the DEIR and responses to comments;

   C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at the proceedings; and

   D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items A through C above.
All of 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 90802-4210, and California State Polytechnic University, San Luis Obispo, Department of Facilities Planning and Capital Projects, Building 70, Room 200, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93407.

7. The board certifies the FEIR for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Stadium Expansion project (formerly known as the Mustang Stadium Renovation and Expansion).

8. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for Agenda Item 2 of the November 16-17, 2004, Board of Trustees’ meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

9. The chancellor or his designee is requested under Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the project.

10. The schematic plans for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Alex G. Spanos Stadium, West Bleacher and Infrastructure Improvement project are approved at a total project cost of $14,378,000 at CCCI 4100.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision with Enrollment Ceiling Change at Humboldt State University

Presentation by

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees for Humboldt State University:

2. Approve an increase in the master plan enrollment ceiling from 8,000 Full Time Equivalent Students (FTE) to 12,000 FTE.
3. Approve the proposed campus master plan revision.

Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan and includes the following elements:

- Replacement of temporary facilities with efficient, new academic facilities.
- Future sites for new and replacement campus facilities.
- Open space and academic quadrangles for academic and recreational activities.
- Future acquisition of property adjacent to the campus.
- Creation of a campus perimeter road and closure of the campus core to automobiles.

Attachment B is the existing campus master plan approved by the board in May 1990.

The Board of Trustees must certify that the FEIR is adequate and complete under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in order to approve the campus master plan revision. The FEIR with Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations, and the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Program are available for review by the board and the public at: [www.humboldt.edu/masterplan](http://www.humboldt.edu/masterplan). The unavoidable significant impacts resulting from the master plan revision are in the areas of cultural/historic resources and traffic.

Potential Contested Issues

Pursuant to the trustees’ request that potential contested issues be noted early in the agenda item, the following is provided:
1. Traffic: The city of Arcata and Caltrans both noted that the addition of campus-generated vehicular traffic would result in a decline in the level of service at intersections off-site to the campus that in turn will require university funding to mitigate.

**CSU Response:** Funding of improvements for public roadways is specifically within the authority and responsibility of the respective public agencies, not the Board of Trustees of the California State University. Since the CSU cannot implement mitigation measures that are under the jurisdiction and responsibility of another agency, the impact remains significant and unavoidable under CEQA. Per CEQA Guidelines, the CSU Board of Trustees, in their role as Lead Agency under CEQA, may approve a project with remaining significant environmental effects.

2. Water and Sewer Capacity: The city of Arcata noted that the increased enrollment at the campus will exceed the existing capacity of sewer and water systems, and will require university funding to mitigate.

**CSU Response:** Between the 1970’s and the current day, the city’s water and sewer systems have been impacted by growth in the community, despite negligible enrollment growth at the campus. The analysis in the EIR shows that the increased enrollment would have a less than significant effect on the capacity of the city’s water and sewer systems. The campus will comply with state law and negotiate appropriate capacity fees with the city to support planned growth of required infrastructure capacity.

3. Fire Protection: The Arcata Fire Protection District noted that the campus represents the single largest fire safety response concern in the district, and that recent budget cuts have left the district unable to provide adequate levels of emergency response without additional support from the university.

**CSU Response:** All Humboldt State University projects meet or exceed the California Building Code requirements. Compliance with this code is monitored and verified by the California State Fire Marshal. HSU facilities are all monitored by fire detection systems that report to a 24-hour dispatch center. HSU is surveyed on an ongoing basis for code compliance and best practices in fire safety by the California State Fire Marshal, and routinely upgrades its facilities to improve life safety. Concerns relating to access by fire equipment across bridges that may be damaged in the event of an earthquake are being addressed by Caltrans as noted to the campus in a report.

4. Campus Growth: The city of Arcata disagreed with the Draft EIR that the “…projected population growth associated with the proposed master plan revision and the need for housing are not considered to be significant impacts in and of themselves.”

**CSU Response:** As noted in the city’s own comment letter, the university is statutorily prohibited from undertaking offsite mitigation. The university had originally proposed acquiring property south of the campus which would have enabled it to develop faculty and staff housing that would have mitigated the city’s concern about the impacts on housing. This component of the proposed master plan revision was deleted at the request of the city of Arcata.
Background

Humboldt State University was founded as the Humboldt Normal School in 1913. From its inception, the campus has been located in the midst of the city of Arcata. Over time this has led to a campus built around a century-old grid of city streets. A majority of campus buildings predate the university, and were absorbed into the existing campus footprint that now attempts to make productive use of structures poorly suited to the university’s academic needs.

Approximately eighty percent of HSU’s current enrollment comes from outside Humboldt County. HSU has always been a ‘destination’ campus that serves students attracted to the specialized programs in applied sciences as well as the more traditional liberal arts.

Humboldt State University has completed a master plan that will guide the physical development of the campus through 2030 and beyond. This plan was developed in a collaborative and public process including a series of public meetings, led by a master plan subcommittee of the campus Planning Committee that had formal voting representatives from various campus interest groups, the county of Humboldt, and the cities of Arcata and Eureka. The campus Academic Senate has voted to support the proposal.

Enrollment Ceiling Change

In 1983/84, HSU’s enrollment was 5,897 FTE or 2.44% of CSU’s total enrollment. Without the proposed increase in the master plan ceiling, HSU’s contribution to the CSU’s total enrollment drops to 1.75%. With the proposed master plan revision ceiling increase to 12,000 FTE, HSU increases its potential contribution to CSU’s enrollment to 2.62%. Within the proposed enrollment increase the academic master plan supports growth in natural resources, sciences, and arts and humanities.

Proposed Revisions

The key physical elements of the proposed master plan revision include:

- The creation of new academic quadrangles
- The restoration of two streams on campus
- Interconnecting pedestrian pathways and open space
- The removal of vehicles from the campus core
- The conversion of B St., 17th Street, and Laurel Streets to pedestrian malls
- Creation of a major campus entry at Harpst with an on-campus transit center

These changes provide a new vision for the campus to improve the instructional facilities in a coordinated manner with accessibility and site safety improvements. The following near term
projects, which are proposed revisions to the HSU master plan, have been analyzed in the EIR at a construction level:

**Hexagon 1:** The Forbes Physical Education Complex Renovation (#24) will upgrade indoor and outdoor instructional facilities and add faculty offices. The project is a previously approved state funded project.

**Hexagon 2:** East Campus Parking Structure. This project (#25) will provide 1,000 additional parking spaces.

**Hexagon 3:** Educational Services Replacement Building (#79) is a 161,000 GSF facility. This project will provide a “one stop” location for all HSU students’ needs and will replace temporary buildings.

**Hexagon 4:** The Theatre Arts Replacement Building (#23A) is a 108,000 GSF facility that will provide space for some of HSU’s fastest growing departments, including fine arts, graphic arts, ceramics, and painting. This will also eliminate ADA, seismic, and health and safety code violations in existing temporary facilities.

**Hexagon 5:** The Visual Arts Addition (#7A-B) is a 111,000 GSF facility that will support the growth of the visual arts programs, particularly theatre arts and music, which currently must restrict enrollment. The existing building 7 will be renovated when the addition is constructed.

**Hexagon 6:** The Transit Mall and Surface Parking project will replace surface parking on the interior of the campus to eliminate vehicular congestion. The Transit Mall will improve access to the campus by city transportation services.

**Hexagon 7:** The West Campus Parking Structure (#79B) is expanded with a new footprint to provide up to 1,000 additional parking spaces and will provide needed accessibility between the upper and lower campus.

**Hexagon 8:** Energy Research Lab. This project (#40A) is a 10,000 GSF facility proposed to be funded from grants and donors, and represents the first dedicated applied research facility on the campus.
Hexagon 9: This proposed new Science Laboratory Replacement Building (#5B) will be located on the new Sciences Quad. It will replace antiquated laboratory space dating to the 1950’s and provide additional laboratory space to accommodate enrollment growth. Long-term projects for the quad for increased capacity include building 3F and 5E, both science laboratory buildings.

Long-Term Master Plan Projects:

Hexagon 10: The Arts & Humanities Quad will integrate the Performing Arts and Humanities with the Library, University Center (Student Union), and the new Educational Services Building. Existing structures (#1, 8A, 10) will be removed in the future.

Hexagon 11: New Student Housing (#50, 57); property proposed for acquisition.

Hexagon 12: South Campus Parking Structure (#20).

Hexagon 13: Student Housing Replacement (#60A, 61A, 61B) and North Campus Parking Structure (#57A).

Hexagon 14: Relocation and expansion of Plant Operations and Corporation Yard from main campus to east perimeter site (#59, 59A).

Hexagon 15: Library Addition (#41A, 41B).

Hexagon 16: Student Activities (#77A-C) and Student Center South (#77).

Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the proposed master plan revision to 12,000 FTE will require state funded projects at an estimated cost of $429 million, and nonstate projects at an estimated cost of $109 million in today’s dollars. This will avoid over $152 million in unnecessary capital renewal and deferred maintenance expenditures over the next 30 years.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A comprehensive FEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR identifies remaining unavoidable significant impacts relating to Cultural/Historical Resources and Traffic. The cultural impact refers to the master plan proposed demolition of numerous old small houses and other campus buildings proposed for replacement and potentially sited elsewhere on campus. Resolution of these requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations, which is provided for in the proposed resolution. The Draft EIR also
identified potentially significant impacts for which mitigation measures are included that reduce impacts below the level of significance. A complete description and discussion of project impacts and mitigation measures are included in the FEIR in section 19 as part of this agenda item.

The FEIR is a Program Level EIR, intended to encompass a range of future development over an extended period of time, defined broadly rather than explicitly. Certification of this FEIR will allow the proposed near term projects listed above under “Proposed Revisions,” to proceed without a separate EIR for each project when they are approved for construction. Each of these projects has been analyzed at the level of construction for implementation, and will be further analyzed to determine its consistency with the FEIR when presented for future schematic approval.

Issues Identified Through Public Participation

A series of community forums were held on campus, and in the cities of Arcata and Eureka. A pedestrian oriented faculty/staff housing project intended to add several hundred new housing units for the community was proposed south of the campus. This project also included additional classrooms, meeting rooms, and research facilities. Concerns in the neighborhood and the city of Arcata about the impact on the existing homes led to the university’s decision to drop these components, and the related acquisition, from the proposed master plan revision.

Additional concerns were raised about the possible impacts on the area from parking and student housing demand arising from the additional enrollment. Due to these concerns the university increased its targets for additional parking and student housing, and added a transit mall to encourage alternatives to personal automobile use and on-campus parking.

The Draft EIR addressed potential impacts associated with the Humboldt State University Master Plan revision after incorporating the changes noted above. The campus held a public scoping meeting on June 3, 2004 to identify public concerns to be addressed in the EIR. The 45-day public comment period began on August 13, 2004 and ended on September 27, 2004. The following agencies submitted comments:

- City of Arcata
- California Department of Transportation
- North Coast Unified Air Quality Management District
- Arcata Fire Protection District
- Native American Heritage Commission

The comment letters and the responses to these comments are provided in Appendix E of the FEIR. The comments included concerns about:
Fire Protection
Student Housing
Traffic and Parking
Water and Sewer Capacity

The following is a summary of the major comments and responses.

Traffic: The city of Arcata and Caltrans both noted that the addition of campus-generated vehicular traffic resulting in a decline in the level of service at intersections off-site to the campus would require university funding to mitigate.
Response: Funding of improvements in public roadways is specifically within the authority and responsibility of the respective public agencies, not the Board of Trustees of the California State University. Statewide policy prohibits the CSU from the gifting of state funds to outside agencies for non-educational purposes.

Water and Sewer Capacity: The city of Arcata noted that the increased enrollment at the campus will exceed the existing capacity of water, sewer, and storm water systems, and will require university funding to mitigate.
Response: Between the 1970’s and the current day, the city’s water and sewer system have been impacted by growth in the community, despite negligible enrollment growth at the campus. The analysis in the EIR shows that increased enrollment would have a less than significant effect on the capacity of the city’s water and sewer system. When additional capacity enrollment projects are developed, the campus will comply with state law, and negotiate appropriate capacity fees with the city as a utility provider.

Fire Protection: The Arcata Fire Protection District noted that the campus represents the single largest fire safety response concern in the district, and that recent budget cuts have left the district unable to provide adequate levels of emergency response. Also, the city of Arcata noted that an on-campus fire station was critical to long-term public safety in the city.
Response: All Humboldt State University projects meet or exceed the California Building Code requirements. Compliance with this code is monitored and verified by the California State Fire Marshal. HSU facilities are all monitored by fire detection systems that report to a 24-hour dispatch center. The Arcata Fire Protection District comment letter followed the failure of a city special assessment to fund fire safety services. The Arcata Fire Protection District has indicated a concern that their fire stations are to the west of the Highway 101 freeway (the western boundary of the HSU campus), and that firefighting services would be unavailable to the campus in the event of an earthquake. The city and university have received a report from Caltrans that they intend to provide an emergency route across the Highway 101 freeway within three years to mitigate the problem of a damaged bridge.
Campus Growth: The city of Arcata disagreed with Draft EIR that the “...projected population growth associated with the proposed master plan revision and the need for housing are not considered to be significant impacts in and of themselves.” They did go on to note that the university is statutorily prohibited from undertaking offsite mitigation.

Response: As noted in the city’s comment letter, the university is statutorily prohibited from undertaking offsite mitigation. It should be noted that the university had originally proposed acquiring property south of the campus which would have enabled it to develop faculty and staff housing that would have mitigated the city’s concern about the impacts on housing. This was deleted at the request of the city of Arcata.

A variety of other comments were received on matters with less than significant impact, or with impacts that will be mitigated to a less than significant level.

The mitigation measures listed in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program will substantially reduce most of the significant environmental effects identified in the FEIR and in public comments. Nonetheless, certain significant adverse environmental effects of the project are unavoidable, even after the incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures identified in the FEIR. For the remaining adverse impacts related to Cultural/Historical Resources and Traffic, the benefits of the project have been balanced, and any significant unavoidable adverse impacts remaining are outweighed by, and are considered to be acceptable due to, specific educational, economic, legal, social and technological benefits, based upon the facts set forth in the findings in the FEIR.

Alternatives

Section 19 of the FEIR analyzed the following two alternative development programs in accordance with CEQA and state CEQA Guidelines. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified. The preferred alternative is Humboldt State University’s proposed Master Plan for 12,000 FTE.

Alternative 1: No Project – Continuation of the 1990 Master Plan
Alternative 2: Reduced Project Size of 10,000 FTE

The CEQA Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations provide specific findings regarding the infeasibility of these alternatives.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that:
1. The FEIR for the Humboldt State University master plan revision was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures, project alternatives, and comments and responses to comments associated with the approval and implementation of the proposed master plan revision, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, the CEQA guidelines, and CSU CEQA procedures.

2. The FEIR addresses the proposed increased enrollment, and all discretionary actions relating to it, including near term construction projects as identified in Section 1.0 Project Description of the FEIR.

3. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code (CEQA) and Section 15091 of Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), which require that the Board of Trustees make findings prior to approval of a project along with a statement of fact supporting each finding.

4. This board hereby adopts the Findings of Fact and related mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program for Agenda Item 3 of the November 16-17, 2004 meeting of the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identifies specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures, which are hereby incorporated by reference.

5. The board has adopted Findings of Fact that include specific overriding considerations that outweigh certain remaining unavoidable significant impacts to cultural/historical resources and traffic.

6. Prior to the 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 administrative record of proceedings for the project is comprised of the following:

   a. The Draft EIR for the Humboldt State University master plan revision;
   b. The FEIR, including 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, 90802-4210 and at Humboldt State University, Department of Facilities Management, 1 Harpst Street, Arcata California, 95521.

7. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the Humboldt State University master plan revision dated November 2004 as complete and in compliance with CEQA.

8. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Program for Agenda Item 3 of the November 16-17, 2004 meeting of the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).

9. The Humboldt State University master plan revision dated November 2004 is approved at a master plan enrollment ceiling of 12,000 FTE.

10. 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 Humboldt State University master plan revision dated November 2004.

11. The designated “near term” projects identified in the FEIR are determined to be fully analyzed in the FEIR for purposes of compliance with CEQA for future implementation.
Humboldt State University

Proposed Campus Master Plan
Master Plan Enrollment: 12,000 FTE
Approval date: September 1965
Main Campus Acreage: 172
# Proposed Campus Master Plan Enrollment: 12,000 FTE

1. Siemens Hall  
2A. Art A  
2B. Art B  
3A. Science A  
3B. Science B  
3C. Science C  
3D. Science D  
3E. Science E  
3F. Science Replacement Building  
4. Harry Griffith Hall  
4A. Classroom Building  
5. Forestry  
5A. Laboratory Building  
5B. Science Laboratory Replacement Building  
6. Founders Hall  
7. Jenkins Hall  
7A. Jenkins Hall – Visual Art Renovation & Addition  
7B. Jenkins Hall – Visual Art Renovation & Addition  
8. Music  
8A. Temporary Music  
9. University Center Storage  
10. Theatre Arts  
11. Wildlife & Fisheries  
12. Observatory (Off Campus)  
13. Feuerwerker House  
14. Nelson Hall  
15. Child Care  
17. Marine Wildlife Care Center  
18. Brookings House  
20. South Campus Parking Structure  
21. Redwood Manor (Residential)  
22. Redwood Manor (Administrative)  
23. Gist Hall  
23A. Gist Hall – Theatre Arts Replacement & Addition  
24. Forbes P.E. Complex  
24C. Fieldhouse  
25. East Campus Parking Structure  
26. Van Matte Hall  
27. Telonicher Marine Laboratory  
28. Housing Operations Building  
29. Greenhouse  
31. Swetman Child Development Lab  
32. Natural History Museum  
34. Wildlife Facilities  
35. Fish Hatchery  
36. Mary Warren House  
37. Baiocchi House  
38. Walter Warren House  
39. Toddler Annex  
40. Natural Resources  
40A. Energy Research Lab  
41. Library  
41A. Library Addition  
41B. Library Addition  
42. Student Health Center  
45. University Center  
46. Plant Operations  
48. Hazardous Waste Handling Facility  
49. Redwood Bowl  
50. Student Housing  
51. Cypress Residence Hall  
52. Bret Harte House  
53. Warren House  
54. Telonicher House  
55. Balahanis Hall  
56. Hadley House  
57. Granite Student Housing  
57A. North Campus Parking Structure  
58. Switchgear Building  
59. Plant Operations  
59A. Storage Yard  
60. Redwood Residence Hall  
60A. Sunset Residence Hall - Replacement  
61. Sunset Residence Hall  
61A. Redwood Residence Hall - Replacement  
61B. Redwood Residence Hall - Replacement  
62. Jolly Giant Commons  
63. Pepperwood Residence Hall  
64. Tan Oak Residence Hall  
65. Maple Residence Hall  
66. Madrone Residence Hall  
67. Hemlock Residence Hall  
68. Chinquapin Residence Hall  
69. Alder Residence Hall  
70. Cedar Residence Hall  
71. Little Apartments  
72. Wagner House  
74. Ceramics Lab  
75. Sculpture Lab  
76. Water Tower  
77. Student Center South  
77A. Student Activities  
77B. Student Activities  
77C. Student Activities  
79. Educational Services Building  
79B. West Campus Parking Structure  
81. Davis House  
82. Parking Authorization Center  
83. Hopkins House  
85. Spidell House  
87. Beard and Cables House  
88. University General Storage  
89. Behavioral & Social Sciences  
90. Schmidt House  
91. Hagopian House  
93. Brero House  
94. Jensen House  
96. Shipping & Receiving  
97. Buck House  
99. Jenkins House  
100. Student & Business Services  
100A. Classroom Building  
100B. Classroom Building  
104. South Campus Restrooms  
105. Boat Facility  
106. Temporary Buildings  
108. Housing Cogeneration Building  
109. Fern Hall  
110. Willow Hall  
111. Laurel Hall  
112. Creekside Lounge  
113. Juniper Hall  
115. Temporary Buildings  
119. Wireless Communication Facility

**LEGEND:** Existing Facility / Proposed Facility  
**Note:** Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Data Base (SFDB)
HUMBOLDT STATE UNIVERSITY
Master Plan Enrollment: 8,000 FTE

1. Siemens Hall
2. Homer P. Balabanis Creative Arts Complex
3. Science Complex
4. Harry Griffith Hall
5. Forestry
6. Founders Hall
7. Jenkins Hall
8. Music Complex
8A. Music
9. University Center Storage Building
10. Theatre Arts
11. Wildlife & Fisheries
12. Physical Science Field Laboratory
   (Observatory - Off Campus)
13. Feuerwerker House
14. Nelson Hall
15. Child and Family Center
16. Marine Wildlife Care Center (MWCC)
17. Brooks House
18. South Campus Parking Structure
20. Redwood Manor (Residential)
21. Redwood Manor (Administrative)
22. Gist Hall
23. Forbes P.E. Complex (Natatorium, Gymnasia)
24. Field House
25. Van Matre Hall
26. Telonicher Marine Laboratory (Off Campus)
27. Housing Operations Building
28. Greenhouse
29. Swetman Child Development Lab
30. Natural History Museum (Off Campus)
31. Wildlife Facilities
32. Fish Hatchery
33. Mary Warren House
34. Baiocchi House
35. Walter Warren House
36. Toddler Annex
37. Natural Resources
38. Library
39. Student Health Center
40. University Center
41. Plant Operations
42. Hazardous Waste Handling Facility
43. Redwood Bowl
44. Student Housing
45. Cypress Residence Hall
46. Bret Harte House
47. Warren House
48. Telonicher House
49. Balabanis House
50. Hadley House
51. Granite Student Housing
52. Switchgear Building
53. Storage Yard
54. Redwood Residence Hall
55. Sunset Residence Hall
56. Jolly Giant Commons
57. Pepperwood Residence Hall
58. Tan Oak Residence Hall
59. Maple Residence Hall
60. Madrone Residence Hall
61. Hemlock Residence Hall
62. Chinquapin Residence Hall
63. Alder Residence Hall
64. Cedar Residence Hall
65. Little Apartments
66. Wagner House
67. Ceramics Lab
68. Sculpture Lab
69. Water Tower
70. Student Center
71. Center for Environmental Ethics and Technology
   (CEET)
72. Performing Arts Auditorium
73. Performing Arts Parking Structure
74. Davis House
75. Parking Authorization & Referral Center (PARC)
76. Hopkins House
77. Student Support Services Building
78. Spidell House
79. Beard and Cables House
80. University General Storage Facility
81. Schmidt House
82. Hagopian House
83. Campus Entryway
84. Brero House
85. Jensen House
86. Shipping & Receiving
87. Buck House
88. Upper Play Field
89. Lower Play Field
90. Student and Business Services
91. South Campus Restrooms
92. Buildings
93. Tennis Courts
94. Cogeneration Building
95. Fern Hall
96. Willow Hall
97. Laurel Hall
98. Creekside Lounge
99. Juniper Hall
100. Wireless Communication Facility &
     Cell Tower

LEGEND: Existing Facility / Proposed Facility
Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Data Base (SFDB)
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify the Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision Enrollment Ceiling Change at California State University, Monterey Bay

Presentation by

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

In 1998, the Board of Trustees approved a master plan enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTE, comprised of 16,700 FTE taught off-site via distance learning and 8,300 FTE taught in traditional on-campus lecture/laboratory enrollment for California State University, Monterey Bay. As the master plan enrollment ceiling for all other campuses, except Monterey Bay, refer to on-campus lecture and laboratory seat count capacity only, this item proposes to correctly refer to the physical master plan ceiling as only the on-campus lecture and laboratory seat count capacity, and to increase that amount from 8,300 FTE to 8,500 FTE. The trustees have also historically recognized that the university provides instruction in other spaces on campus such as outdoor physical education and independent studies which complements the lecture and laboratory capacity and is reflected in physical master planning.

This item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees for California State University, Monterey Bay:

2. Approve reduction of the master plan enrollment ceiling from 25,000 Full Time Equivalent Students (FTE) (16,700 off-campus, 8,300 on-campus) to 8,500 FTE on-campus enrollment.
3. Approve the proposed master plan revision.

Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan that is based on the following goals:

- Create a blueprint for implementation based on realistic academic growth
- Consolidate academic growth to enable a pedestrian environment
- Define sites for campus facilities included in Planning Horizons I, II, and III

Attachment B is the existing campus master plan approved by the board in May 1998.
The Board of Trustees must certify that the Final SEIR, as tiered from the original California State University, Monterey Bay (CSUMB) master plan EIR, certified in May 1998, is adequate and complete under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in order to approve the campus master plan revision. The Final SEIR, Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations, and the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Program are available for review by the board and the public at: http://cpd.csumb.edu/ with links to the specific documents listed. The remaining unavoidable significant impacts are in the areas of water supply and traffic.

Potential Contested Issues

Pursuant to the trustees’ request that potential contested issues be noted early in the agenda item, the following is provided:

1. Off-Site Mitigation Funding. A number of comments received relate to financial contributions by CSUMB toward off-site mitigations, which include infrastructure improvements, transportation improvements, and other local, off-site, mitigation measures.

   **CSU Response:** CSU is exempt and/or restricted from local land-use regulations and fee assessments, unless specified by the legislature. The California Legislature enacted Government Code Section 54999 to expressly allow state agencies to negotiate with public utility service providers for an appropriate capital facilities fee required to provide water, storm-drainage, wastewater disposal, and other utility capital improvements. In an effort to insure mutually beneficial outcomes, CSUMB and Ford Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) engaged in negotiations in 1997 and 1998 to craft an “Agreement Regarding Development”. Those negotiations were suspended when FORA brought a lawsuit against CSUMB, seeking payment consistent with the Base Reuse Plan, Capital Improvement Plan, and other developer fees envisioned at the time. This lawsuit currently awaits California State Supreme Court action.

2. Traffic. The plan does not adequately analyze regional and subregional traffic impacts on critical roads and intersections. Some roads and intersections are adversely impacted with mitigation measures in place.

   **CSU Response:** A thorough traffic analysis was conducted on the local and regional network. The CSU is working to mitigate impacts as described in the EIR for traffic impacts within its jurisdictional boundaries consistent with their statutory obligations. CSUMB concurs with Caltrans that there are significant unavoidable regional impacts (such as on state Highway 1) that cannot be mitigated. Funding of improvements for public roadways is specifically within the authority and responsibility of the respective public agencies, not the Board of Trustees of the California State University. Since the CSU cannot implement mitigation measures that are under the jurisdiction and responsibility of another agency, the impact remains significant and unavoidable under CEQA. Per CEQA Guidelines, the CSU Board of Trustees, in their role as
Lead Agency under CEQA, may approve a project with remaining significant environmental effects.

3. Water. The Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) uses different campus water demand factors from those in the CSUMB proposed master plan revision. In addition, MCWD did not consider the water saving impact of the campus’s proposed conservation measures in the MCWD current water assessment.

**CSU Response:** CSUMB evaluated the master plan build-out under the water district’s previously approved demand factors, as well as a second set of demand factors provided by MCWD to the university on September 3, 2004. Both demand scenarios are analyzed in the Final SEIR in order to respond to MCWD’s request. However, CSUMB believes that their demand factors used in the EIR analysis of water use are reasonable, based on similar factors applied at other campuses in the CSU system, and that demand projections for the master plan build-out of 8,500 FTE can be met within the existing water allocation with the mitigation and conservation measures proposed in the Final SEIR.

**Background**

In 1994, the CSU received approval to acquire a 1,350-acre portion of the former Fort Ord Military base to establish a new CSU campus on the Monterey Peninsula. In May of that year, the Board of Trustees certified a Final EIR for the initial physical development of the campus. Four years later, in May 1998, the board approved the university’s first campus master plan. The planning principles established in the 1998 campus master plan were retained in the current planning effort and served as the basis for the development of the new goals.

In the spring of 2002, CSUMB initiated a physical master plan update to guide the development and implementation of the campus. CSUMB students, faculty, and staff participated in a university-wide planning process to shape a physical context that supports the university’s vision for the next 20-plus years. The ultimate goal of the master plan update is to provide long-term growth recommendations for the continued transformation of the army base into a dynamic and vibrant campus.

**Enrollment Ceiling Change**

The original enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTE was established in 1998 for 8,300 FTE on-campus students and 16,700 non-traditional (off-campus) students. At the time, it was envisioned that technology-driven instructional delivery would be the driving force behind the large number of non-traditional/distance learner FTE. However, upon entering the university’s tenth year and realizing a successful accreditation process, it was found that the ratio of on-campus to non-traditional FTE set in the original enrollment ceiling had not transpired. Thus, academic planning and programs have been adjusted to acknowledge that the development of and access to
both technology and resources needed to develop and implement this vision had not matured and were not available. As a result, an adjusted realistic amount of non-traditional FTE served off campus based on available campus resources is now proposed. The campus has revised the number of non-traditional FTE proposed to be served off campus from 16,700 FTE to 3,500 FTE.

The reduction in the non-traditional distance learning component is for three reasons: student access to technology from homes in the rural tri-county (San Benito, Santa Cruz, Monterey) area has not matured enough to meet the non-traditional student demands; the cost of the academic model is greater than expected; and the determinant factors that govern the academic success rate for first time college students from the tri-county area are tied to traditional learning situations. The campus will continue to assess the enrollment growth in non-traditional FTE should the expectation of serving 3,500 FTE off campus need further refinement.

Historically, master plan ceilings approved by the board have not included the non-traditional FTE or students taught off-site. The enrollment ceiling has referred to strictly the number of students that could be accommodated in lecture classrooms and laboratories. In order to utilize the term “physical master plan enrollment ceiling” consistently across the campuses of the California State University, the board is requested to approve a master plan ceiling of 8,500 FTE for CSU Monterey Bay. This is a 200 FTE increase in the proposed on-campus FTE from what the board approved in 1998. The proposed physical master plan identifies the building sites to provide academic instructional space, faculty offices, student services, administrative and other institutional support space needed to serve the on campus and off campus FTE.

Proposed Revisions

The proposed facilities plan is based on the master plan enrollment of 8,500 on-campus FTE and 1,900 faculty, staff and management personnel over the next 20 years. CSUMB plans to house sixty percent of its traditional enrollment students on campus in order to fulfill its master plan goal of creating a residential campus. The campus has reassigned program areas into the following four regions:

- West Campus consisting of athletic uses such as the stadium, the play fields, the gym and the varsity sports complex;
- North Campus consisting of student, faculty and staff housing, and non-academic business administration functions;
- Central Campus consisting of the academic core, student housing; campus partnership zones; and
- East Campus consisting of the open space reserve, faculty and staff housing as well as student family housing.
Based on academic growth projections and a review of similar facilities at other campuses, the physical master plan is proposed in three planning horizons spanning roughly 10 years per horizon. In each planning horizon, open space development will focus on formal and informal spaces such as plazas, entry courtyards, greens, and pedestrian linkages.

Planning Horizon I focuses on the development of major academic buildings; instructional support buildings; physical activity spaces; and infrastructure. This horizon will contain primarily new construction and the renovation of existing buildings to add 400,000 to 600,000 gross square feet (GSF) for the instructional program, approximately 1,200 beds for student housing, and approximately 1,025 units for faculty and staff housing.

Planning Horizon II will add 230,000 to 320,000 GSF of academic, student, and instructional support space; sports and recreation facilities; and approximately 600 beds for student housing.

Planning Horizon III will further develop the space needed to move CSUMB toward its goal of becoming a comprehensive institution. This horizon can provide an additional range of 375,000 to 515,000 GSF of academic, student support, and structured parking space. The 600 new student beds planned will account for the final installment of CSUMB’s objective of sixty percent on-campus student residential housing.

The three near term projects that have been analyzed in the SEIR at a construction level are: Academic Building II (#505), a 64,000 GSF facility for the School of Information Technology and Communications Design in the College of Science, Media Arts, and Technology; student housing (600 beds) (#441-443, 451-452, 463, 471-473, 480-482); and North Campus Housing, Phase I which will provide 492 units of for-sale and rental housing for faculty and staff (#399).

**Hexagon 1:** Consolidates academic development in an area defined as the Heart of Green. Includes the new Library (#508), Academic Buildings II – IX (#26, 501, 502, 505, 506, 509, 521, 532), Student Services (#530), Administration (#520), the Institute for Public Policy (#510), the Utility Complex (#503), and the Student Union (#504).

**Hexagon 2:** Creates two distinct entrance plazas, acknowledging the importance of gateways to the communities in the Salinas Valley and the Monterey Peninsula.

**Hexagon 3:** Consolidates varsity and intramural facilities in the area described as West Campus. Includes the development of indoor sports and support facilities (#901, 902, 903, 904), completion of the Natatorium Complex (#100), and outdoor fields in support of the program. Also includes the Child Care Center (#830) and the renovation of five existing buildings (#921, 922, 924, 926, 928).
Hexagon 4: Locates North Campus Housing for faculty and staff (#399). Phase I of the project will build 492 units of for-sale and rental housing for faculty, staff and institutional partners. Phase II will add 533 units for a total of 1,025 units.

Hexagon 5: Locates sites for two future parking garages to be constructed on the periphery of the academic core to meet the anticipated parking demand (#320 and 330) and reduce vehicular traffic in the campus core.

Hexagon 6: Locates student housing within walking distances from the academic core. The student housing will be on two locations, one across from Third Street, an expansion of the North Quad Housing Project (#304, 305 and 306) and the second will be east of Sixth Avenue (#441-482; 12 buildings).

Hexagon 7: Creates Campus Partnerships I and II (#380 and 690) providing zones for future development that will directly enhance the institutional mission.

Hexagon 8: Locates a new Technology Center (#411) to provide additional office space for information technology staff.

Hexagon 9: Locates future expansion of student housing on the southeast corner of the campus. This housing will be located south of ‘C’ Street and between Sixth and Seventh Avenues (#401-404 and #601-604).

Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the proposed master plan revision is estimated to cost $400 million in state funded and $500 million in nonstate funded projects (in current dollars).

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the CSU CEQA guidelines. As a “Supplement” to the 1998 Master Plan Final EIR, this Supplemental EIR is broadly, and programmatically, based on the 1998 EIR certified by the board. This SEIR addresses the potential environmental effects of implementation of the CSUMB proposed master plan revision at a program level. Certification of this Final SEIR will allow the proposed three near term projects listed above under “Proposed Revisions,” to proceed without a separate Final SEIR for each project when they are approved for construction. Each of these projects has been analyzed at the level of construction for implementation, and will be further analyzed to determine its consistency with the Final SEIR when presented for future schematic approval. The SEIR, although based programmatically on
the 1998 document, carries out a thorough analysis of all substantive changes from the prior approved master plan to the proposed master plan revision.

The SEIR informs decision-makers and the public of the potential environmental effects of the proposed project. In addition, the SEIR provides public agencies with the environmental information required to evaluate the proposed project to determine whether it may have an impact on local and regional service providers to establish methods for reducing adverse environmental impacts, and to consider alternatives prior to approval.

**Issues Identified Through Public Participation**

The 45-day public review period for the Draft SEIR began on July 28, 2004 and ended September 10, 2004. The following agencies submitted comments during the public review period:

- California Office of Planning and Research
- Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District (MBUAPCD)
- State of California, Department of Transportation (Caltrans)
- Marina Coast Water District
- City of Marina
- Transportation Agency for Monterey County
- Monterey Salinas Transit
- Monterey County Public Works Department
- Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA)

Additionally, these agencies submitted comments after the close of the public review period:

- California Coastal Commission [September 13, 2004]
- Monterey Peninsula Unified School District [September 13, 2004]

The comment letters and the responses to these comments are provided in Section IV of the Final SEIR. The comments included concerns about:

- Housing
- Off-Site Mitigation Funding
- Public Services
- Traffic
- Water Supply

The following is a summary of the major comments and responses:

**Off-Site Mitigation Funding:** Master planned commercial public/private development on campus, as proposed in the revised master plan, may require university contributions for local infrastructure improvements under the FORA impact fee program. Although educational facilities are exempt from FORA’s development impact fee and other local land-use impact fees,
the university is obligated under Government Code Section 54999 to pay a capital improvement fee for regional utility infrastructure improvements required for all university facility construction.

**Response:** These comments state that CSUMB should pay the fee assessments identified in the Fort Ord Reuse Plan for such capital facilities as local and regional transportation, water, wastewater, parks and recreation, and habitat management. CSU legal counsel for the initial 1998 master plan and EIR prepared a thorough analysis of CSU requirements, restrictions, and exemptions from local assessments. This is presented in Appendix B of the Final SEIR. In summary, the CSU and its campuses are restricted from paying local land-use fees and assessments, unless specified by the legislature. The California Legislature enacted Government Code Section 54999 to expressly provide for the CSU to negotiate with public utility providers for an appropriate capital facilities fee required to provide water, storm-drainage, wastewater disposal facilities, and other utilities. A lawsuit addressing the demand for off-site mitigation payments by the CSU to local agencies is currently awaiting California State Supreme Court action.

**Traffic:** The plan does not adequately analyze regional and subregional traffic impacts on critical roads and intersections. All comments requested CSUMB to contribute funding.

**Response:** A thorough analysis was conducted on the local and regional network of those areas to be impacted by the campus build-out. Impacts and mitigations were identified in the SEIR as required by CEQA. The SEIR identifies the mitigation responsibility for regional improvements that are under the jurisdictions of other agencies for implementation. FORA and its member agencies have adopted an impact fee and capital improvement program. However, as a state agency CSU is expressly restricted from contributing to the implementation of mitigation measures that are under the jurisdiction and responsibility of another agency. Since the funding mechanism for the regional improvements cannot be guaranteed by the trustees and therefore, the implementation of the identified mitigation measures cannot be assured, the impacts remain significant and unavoidable. The CSU Board of Trustees, as Lead Agency, is required to adopt Overriding Considerations where project benefits will outweigh significant adverse impacts that remain unmitigated as a result of project implementation.

**Water:** The Marina Coast Water District (MCWD) calculated different campus water usage values from those in the CSUMB proposed master plan revision.

**Response:** The Final SEIR water demand tables identify both the CSUMB water demand factors and the MCWD demand rates. The water demand methodology utilized for the CSUMB proposed master plan revision and Final SEIR carefully accounts for all water users and locations, and is believed to be an accurate and conservative estimate of future water demand.

As previously stated, CSUMB water demand estimates are lower than those applied by the MCWD. This is due to the fact that metering is in progress and has not been completed. Additionally, CSUMB rates reflect incorporation of water conservation measures and practices
into the proposed master plan revision process as well as the operational realities of a campus environment wherein occupancy is often not year round. For comparison, the Final SEIR provides information on both the CSUMB water demand factors and those from the MCWD and proposes mitigation under either scenario to meet water demands. Under the CSUMB scenario, once mitigation and conservation measures are in place there would be adequate water to meet Planning Horizon II and III. Mitigation and conservation measures will result in water being available to meet the needs of the 8,500 on-campus FTE.

**Housing:** Proposed additional housing not included in the 1998 Base Reuse Plan and accompanying EIR requires separate CEQA analysis and mitigation.

*Response:* The CSUMB proposed master plan revision is consistent with the 1998 Base Reuse Plan. Additional specific project level analyses for the faculty and staff North Campus Housing, Phase I and the Student Housing Projects have been provided in the Final SEIR, as a separate section of the environmental document.

**Public Services:** The SEIR should fully discuss the impacts and proposed mitigations for county-provided services due to campus growth including fire, sheriff, hospital, elections, social services, etc. Specifically, CSUMB is requested to contribute capital and operating expenses if a fire station is approved.

*Response:* See response above regarding Off-Site Mitigation Funding. The Final SEIR discusses the service requirements of the campus facilities and housing. Government Code Section 54999 et seq., does expressly provide for local utility providers to negotiate for the imposition of “capital facilities fees” for the connection of specified utility services. Utilities covered under Section 54999 include water, power, solid waste, flood control, drainage, and sewage treatment and disposal and do not include fire, police or related non-utility services.

**Alternatives**

In section 17.1 of the SEIR, the following project alternatives are analyzed in accordance with CEQA and State CEQA Guidelines. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts is also identified. The preferred alternative is the CSU Monterey Bay, proposed master plan revision.

*Alternative 1:* No Project - Continuation of the 1998 Master Plan  
*Alternative 2:* Reduced Project Size – Reduces housing and other uses 50%  
*Alternative 3:* Development to Year 2015 – Limits planning horizon to year 2015  
*Alternative 4:* Development under FORA Reuse Plan – Freezes Master Plan at 25,000 FTE  
*Alternative 5:* Alternative Location – Alternative site analysis

Alternatives 1 and 3 were environmentally superior. However, the SEIR acknowledges that none of the alternatives achieves the objectives of the master plan for 8,500 FTE. The CEQA
Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations provide specific findings regarding
the feasibility of these alternatives.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The Final SEIR for the CSU Monterey Bay master plan revision was prepared
to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures, project alternatives,
and comments and responses to comments associated with the approval and
implementation of the proposed master plan revision, pursuant to the
requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act, the CEQA
guidelines, and CSU CEQA procedures.

2. The Final SEIR addresses the proposed increase in on-campus enrollment, and
all discretionary actions relating to it, including near term construction
projects as identified in Section 1.0 Project Description of the Final SEIR.

3. The Final SEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 1997081036) was prepared pursuant
to the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the CEQA Guidelines,
and the CSU CEQA procedures, and is Supplemental to the Final EIR
certified in May 1998 by the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Campus
Planning, Buildings and Grounds, for the original CSU Monterey Bay Master
Plan, which is hereby incorporated by reference.

4. This resolution is adopted pursuant to the requirements of Section 21081 of the
Public Resources Code (CEQA) and Section 15091 of the California Code of
Regulations (CEQA Guidelines), which require that the Board of Trustees
make findings prior to approval of a project along with a statement of fact
supporting each finding.

5. The board hereby adopts the Findings of Fact and related mitigation measures
identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for Agenda Item 4
of the November 16-17, 2004, meeting of the Board of Trustees’ 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.

6. The board has adopted Findings of Fact that include specific overriding
considerations that outweigh certain remaining unavoidable significant
impacts specific to water supply and traffic.
7. Prior to certification of the Final SEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned Final SEIR and finds that the Final SEIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The board hereby certifies the Final SEIR for the proposed project as complete and adequate in that the Final SEIR addresses all significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines. The administrative record of the proceedings for the board’s action consists of the following:

a. The Final EIR for the CSU Monterey Bay Master Plan, certified in May 1998;
b. The Draft SEIR for the CSU Monterey Bay master plan revision;
c. The Final SEIR, including comments received on the Draft SEIR, and responses to comments;
d. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject master plan revision, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at such proceedings; and
e. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (a) through (d) 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, CA 90802-4210 and California State University, Monterey Bay, Department of Facilities Management, 100 Campus Center, Building 84A, Seaside, CA 93955.

8. The board hereby certifies the Final SEIR for the CSU Monterey Bay master plan revision dated November 2004 as complete and in compliance with CEQA.

9. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the board’s action for Agenda Item 4 of the November 16-17, 2004 meeting of the Board of Trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).

10. The CSU Monterey Bay master plan revision dated November 2004 is approved at a master plan enrollment ceiling of 8,500 FTE.
11. 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 CSU Monterey Bay master plan revision.

12. The designated “near term” projects identified in the Final SEIR are determined to be fully analyzed in the Final SEIR for purposes of compliance with CEQA for future implementation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CLASSROOM MODULE</td>
<td>504.</td>
<td>Student Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>CLASSROOM MODULE</td>
<td>505.</td>
<td>Academic Building II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>CLASSROOM MODULE</td>
<td>506.</td>
<td>Academic Building III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>TELEPHONE EQUIPMENT SHELTER</td>
<td>508.</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>LIBRARY LEARNING COMPLEX</td>
<td>509.</td>
<td>Academic Building IX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>STUDENT ACTIVITY CENTER</td>
<td>510.</td>
<td>Institute for Public Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>DINING COMMONS</td>
<td>520.</td>
<td>Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>MEDIA LEARNING COMPLEX</td>
<td>521.</td>
<td>Academic Building VII</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES</td>
<td>530.</td>
<td>Student Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>TELEDRAMATIC ARTS &amp; TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>533.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>WORLD THEATER</td>
<td>534.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY CENTER</td>
<td>535.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>MUSIC HALL</td>
<td>536.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Electrical Switchgear</td>
<td>537.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>SHIPPING &amp; RECEIVING</td>
<td>538.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>WAREHOUSE</td>
<td>539.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>FACILITIES SERVICES &amp; OPERATIONS</td>
<td>540.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>TELECOMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>541.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>WATERSHED INSTITUTE</td>
<td>542.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>NETWORK AND COMPUTING</td>
<td>543.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>6TH AVENUE CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>544.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>ACADEMIC COMPLEX I</td>
<td>545.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>CAMPUS SERVICES CENTER</td>
<td>546.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>WORLD LANGUAGES AND CULTURES</td>
<td>547.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>WORLD LANGUAGES AND CULTURES</td>
<td>548.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>SCIENCE WET LAB</td>
<td>549.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>CHAPMAN SCIENCE ACADEMIC CENTER</td>
<td>550.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>LEARNING SUPPORT</td>
<td>551.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>CENTER FOR READING DIAGNOSIS &amp; INSTRUCTION</td>
<td>552.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>VISUAL/PUBLIC ARTS COMPLEX</td>
<td>553.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>VISUAL/PUBLIC ARTS COMPLEX</td>
<td>554.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>VISUAL/PUBLIC ARTS COMPLEX</td>
<td>555.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80.</td>
<td>CAMPUS HEALTH CENTER</td>
<td>556.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81.</td>
<td>BLACK BOX CABARET</td>
<td>557.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

EXISTING FACILITY/PROPOSED FACILITY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>WORLD LANGUAGES AND CULTURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER 2</td>
<td>49.</td>
<td>SCIENCE WET LAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE CENTER 3</td>
<td>50.</td>
<td>SCIENCE ACADEMIC CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>CLASSROOM MODULE</td>
<td>53.</td>
<td>SCIENCE ACADEMIC CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>CLASSROOM MODULE</td>
<td>54.</td>
<td>Science Center Phase II/Lecture Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>SERVICE LEARNING INSTITUTE</td>
<td>58.</td>
<td>LEARNING SUPPORT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>CLASSROOM MODULE</td>
<td>71.</td>
<td>VISUAL/PUBLIC ARTS COMPLEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>LIBRARY LEARNING COMPLEX</td>
<td>72.</td>
<td>VISUAL/PUBLIC ARTS COMPLEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>SCIENCE</td>
<td>73.</td>
<td>VISUAL/PUBLIC ARTS COMPLEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>STUDENT ACTIVITY CENTER</td>
<td>74.</td>
<td>FILM ARCHIVE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL CENTER EAST</td>
<td>80.</td>
<td>CAMPUS HEALTH CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>DINING COMMONS</td>
<td>81.</td>
<td>BLACK BOX CABARET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>INSTRUCTIONAL CENTER WEST</td>
<td>82.</td>
<td>PUBLIC SAFETY/CLASSROOMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>MEDIA LEARNING COMPLEX</td>
<td>83.</td>
<td>Student Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>STUDENT SERVICES</td>
<td>84.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCES</td>
<td>85.</td>
<td>Meeting &amp; Learning Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Student Union</td>
<td>86.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY SERVICES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24A.</td>
<td>Institute for Public Policy</td>
<td>87.</td>
<td>Dining/Support Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Library</td>
<td>90.</td>
<td>WELLNESS ACTIVITY CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>TELEDRAMATIC ARTS &amp; TECHNOLOGY</td>
<td>91.</td>
<td>CHILD DEVELOPMENT CENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>WORLD THEATER</td>
<td>93.</td>
<td>WELLNESS CENTER COMPLEX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>UNIVERSITY CENTER</td>
<td>95.</td>
<td>Bowling Alley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>MUSIC HALL</td>
<td>96.</td>
<td>Stadium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Festival Center</td>
<td>97.</td>
<td>Visitor Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>SHIPPING &amp; RECEIVING</td>
<td>98.</td>
<td>MEETING HOUSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>100.</td>
<td>OUTDOOR POOL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>FACILITIES SERVICES &amp; OPERATIONS</td>
<td>105.</td>
<td>PLAYING FIELDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Satellite Communications Telepark</td>
<td>106.</td>
<td>PLAYING FIELDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Satellite Communications Telepark</td>
<td>201.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Satellite Communications Telepark</td>
<td>202.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>TELECOMMUNICATIONS</td>
<td>203.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>WATERSHED INSTITUTE</td>
<td>204.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>NETWORK AND COMPUTING</td>
<td>205.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>CAREER DEVELOPMENT/STUDENT ORGANIZATIONS</td>
<td>206.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44A.</td>
<td>Academic/Office Complex 2</td>
<td>207.</td>
<td>Student Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>6TH AVENUE CLASSROOMS</td>
<td>208.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45A.</td>
<td>SERVICE LEARNING</td>
<td>209.</td>
<td>Student Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>BUILDING 046</td>
<td>210.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46A.</td>
<td>Academic Complex I</td>
<td>211.</td>
<td>RESIDENCE HALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>CAMPUS SERVICES CENTER</td>
<td>301.</td>
<td>STUDENT HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>WORLD LANGUAGES AND CULTURES</td>
<td>302.</td>
<td>STUDENT HOUSING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>303.</td>
<td>STUDENT HOUSING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for the Villas Parkmerced Lot 42 Property Acquisition for San Francisco State University

Presentation by

Elvyra F. San Juan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests approval of a campus master plan revision by the Board of Trustees for San Francisco State University. The proposed master plan revision maintains a maximum of 20,000 full-time equivalent students. Attachment A is the proposed campus master plan dated November 2004 and Attachment B is the existing campus master plan dated March 1999.

Background

The university has been challenged to provide the space for facilities needed to maintain and support its thriving university environment and to serve its mission as an accessible university. The 1988 campus master plan identified lands directly adjacent to the university to be acquired. This proposed master plan revision is similar in nature and is to acquire the Villas Parkmerced property immediately southwest of the campus known as Lot 42. Included in the acquisition would be the street medians and traffic circles immediately adjacent.

The land is approximately 2.81 acres, in a similarly zoned community as the campus, and includes 66 garden apartment units (1-, 2-, and 3-bedroom apartments), 66 covered parking spaces, and a centrally located laundry facility.

Relationship to Campus Master Plan

The campus is in need of expansion space in order to meet its academic and master planning goals. In particular, it faces immediate demands in the areas of graduate and married student housing. This is consistent with the organization of the master plan and the designation of the housing zone at the southwestern corner of the campus. If the property is acquired, as current residents vacate units, it is the intent of the university to offer the units to married and graduate students, and students over the age of 25, who typically find it difficult to secure accommodations in the Bay Area’s extremely competitive housing market.
The southwestern perimeter of the campus is also underserved in the area of parking. The additional 66 parking spaces will greatly benefit all campus users, but especially those associated with the housing program.

Fiscal Impact

The total estimated cost of the proposed master plan revision is approximately $11 million, which will be funded through the Systemwide Revenue Bond program and a loan from the multi-family housing program on the campus.

Proposed Revisions

The key proposal of the proposed master plan revision is shown on Attachment A:

Hexagon 1: Lot 42 (2.81 acres) developed with 66 one- and two-story garden apartment units in three separate buildings (the Font Boulevard Apartments #74) with 66 covered parking spaces.

California Environmental Quality (CEQA) Action

As this proposed master plan revision does not change the intended legal use of the new property, the university has filed a Categorical Exemption with the California Office of Planning and Research, State Clearinghouse Number 2004018158.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the San Francisco State University, campus master plan revision dated November 2004 is approved.
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

Master Plan Enrollment: 20,000 FTE

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

Master Plan Approved by the Board of Trustees: September 1964

1. Burk Hall
2. Business Building
3. HSS Building
4. Science Building
5. Gymnasium
6. Fine Arts Building
7. Creative Arts Building
8. Lakeview Center
9. New Lakeview Classroom/Faculty Office Building
10. Psychology Building
11. J. Paul Leonard Library
12. J. Paul Leonard Library Addition
13. The Village At Centennial Square (Buildings 23a-23d)
14. Corporation Yard (Buildings 25a-25e)
15. Central Plant/Waste Management
16. Student Health Center
17. Franciscan Building
18. Residence Dining Center
19. Administration Building
20. Humanities Building
21. Health, Physical Education and Recreation Building
22. Outdoor Physical Education Facility (Winston)
23. Florence Hale Stephenson Field
24. Hensill Hall
25. Thornton Hall
26. Engineering/Computer Science Building
27. Temporary Modulars (Buildings 114-122)
28. Parking Structure II
29. Childrens’ Center
30. Softball Field
31. Accessory Building
32. Parking Garage
33. Vidal Drive Apartments
34. Font Boulevard Apartments
35. Future Development
36. Parking Structure
37. Student Union
38. Mary Ward Hall
39. Mary Park Hall
40. Future Development
41. Student Apartments
42. Sutro Library
43. New Creative Arts Building
44. Cox Stadium
45. Maloney Field
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SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

Master Plan Enrollment: 20,000 FTE

SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY

Master Plan Approved by the Board of Trustees: September 1964

1. Burk Hall
2. Business Building
3. HSS Building
4. Science Building
5. Gymnasium
6. Fine Arts Building
7. Creative Arts Building
8. Lakeview Center
9. New Lakeview Classroom/Faculty Office Building
22a. J. Paul Leonard Library Addition
23. The Village At Centennial Square (Buildings 23a-23d)
25. Corporation Yard (Buildings 25a-25e)
26. Central Plant/Waste Management
27. Student Health Center
28. Franciscan Building
29. Residence Dining Center
30. Administration Building
32. Humanities Building
35. Health, Physical Education and Recreation Building
36. Outdoor Physical Education Facility (Winston)
46. Florence Hale Stephenson Field
50. Hensill Hall
51. Thornton Hall
52. Engineering/Computer Science Building
53. Temporary Modulars (Buildings 114-122)
55. Parking Structure II
57. Childrens’ Center
70. Softball Field
71. Accessory Building
72. Parking Garage
73. Vidal Drive Apartments
88. Parking Structure
89. Student Union
91. Mary Ward Hall
92. Mary Park Hall
93. Future Development
97. Student Apartments
98. Sutro Library
99. New Creative Arts Building
200. Cox Stadium
202. Maloney Field
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