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3. Professional Appointment, Information

Discussion Items
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Michael D. Stennis, Chair
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William D. Campbell
Jim Considine
Gray Davis, Lieutenant Governor, ex officio
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Other Trustees Present
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Anthony M. Vitti
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Charles W. Lindahl, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
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Christine Helwick, General Counsel
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Warren J. Baker, President, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, present
Alistair W. McCrone, President, Humboldt State University, absent
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Chair Stennis greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 4:03 p.m.

Approval of Minutes
The minutes of the November 11, 1997, meeting were approved as submitted.

Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded
With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Stennis presented agenda item 1 as a consent item.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-98-01).

Professional Appointments
With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Stennis presented agenda item 2 as a consent item.

Approval of Schematic Plans
Chair Stennis asked Jon Regnier, senior director, physical planning and development, to present the item.

Using a visual slide description of the two projects, Mr. Regnier briefly reviewed the item as presented in the agenda.

In response to Trustee Campbell’s request and at Chair Stennis’s direction, President Suzuki stated that the Cal Poly Pomona Agriscapes project is a part of the effort to move the focus of the College of Agriculture from a rural to an urban emphasis. It no longer makes sense to concentrate on production agriculture but on a concept the College of Agriculture refers to as urban agriculture. The majority of what takes place in the agricultural industry today occurs in urban areas, e.g., food processing; marketing; distribution; and, increasingly important, education. The Agriscapes project is designed to educate the urban population on the importance and nature of the agricultural industry and, at the same time, do it in an entertaining manner. It is the hope of the university to attract a larger number of people to the facility as well as generate revenue for the College of Agriculture.

Referencing the CSU Long Beach Peterson Hall project, Trustee Goldstein noted that the science building is functionally obsolete. He inquired as to the general condition of the science labs systemwide.

Mr. Regnier stated that due to dramatic code changes regarding fume hoods, open-bench chemistry, and the conversion to microchemistry, building a replacement facility has proved to be less expensive than retrofitting buildings that were designed in the 1950s and 60s. Construction has been completed on replacement science facilities at the Northridge and Fullerton campuses. Similar projects are under construction at the Pomona and San Diego campuses, and one-half of the two-building complex at San Francisco State University is under design. Probably the least effective teaching spaces in the system are the science labs at the San Francisco and Long Beach campuses, as were those at Pomona, San Diego, Northridge and Fullerton. Other campuses, e.g., Los Angeles, are in the process of evaluating whether to
renovate or replace existing science facilities. The CSU is in its fourth year of changing its focus from building new growth facilities to that of renovating or replacing facilities and has recognized the priority ranking for these types of projects.

Trustee Wang raised the issue of cost per square foot for various projects. Mr. Regnier responded that we have cost guides by type of project and will be glad to share that information at a future board meeting or with any trustee desiring a one-on-one meeting.

Trustee Campbell indicated a need for some members of the board to have a better comfort level on building costs.

Trustee Vitti stated that when he first became a board member, he had the same concerns and issues. In response, Mr. Regnier reviewed the cost guide information with the committee members. As a result, Trustee Vitti recognizes that comparing commercial building costs to CSU building costs is like comparing apples to oranges. The CSU costs involve requirements imposed by the state and items that would not necessarily be included in a commercial building. Trustee Vitti has a good comfort level regarding this topic and believes that this issue is an impossible problem to overcome.

Trustee Razi inquired whether the bidding process is conducted by the campuses or in the central office.

Mr. Regnier responded that we are in a transition process where, in some cases, the campuses (having received certification) will bid and manage their construction projects. In other cases, the Office of Physical Planning and Development will continue to manage projects and provide consultative oversight systemwide.

Lieutenant Governor Davis agreed to the importance of comparing apples to apples and gave an example of his office leasing experience.

Trustee Gould inquired as to the percentage breakdown of fees and contingency. Mr. Regnier indicated that the State Administrative Manual allows a total fee composition of 18 percent for new construction and 20 percent for remodeling. Realizing that the larger the project, the smaller the percentage for architectural and engineering (A&E) contracts, the approximate breakdown is as follows: 7 percent for A&E fees, 7 percent for construction management, and 5 percent for contingency.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 01-98-02).

**Status Report on the 1998/99 State Funded Capital Outlay Program—Governor’s Budget**

Mr. Jon Regnier reviewed the item handout by highlighting the achievements under the governor’s budget compact regarding the funding of CSU high-priority capital outlay projects and the streamlining of the state capital outlay process. Also, he indicated that this is a very good capital outlay budget, and we are pleased that all of the CSU requested projects were included in the budget under the capital outlay streamlining initiative, with no additional approvals required.

**Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:32 p.m.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By
Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary
This agenda item requests approval to amend the 1997/98 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

1. California State University, Chico
   Food Services Renovation and Energy Improvements
   PWCE $ 3,470,000

2. California State University, Fresno
   Alumni House
   PWC $ 1,000,000

3. California State University, Sacramento
   Hornet Stadium Track Improvements
   PWC $ 1,000,000

4. San Diego State University
   Aztec Center Renovation
   PWCE $ 545,000

5. Sonoma State University
   Student Apartments II
   PWCE $25,000,000

Recommended Action
Approval of the resolution.
## COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded**

This item amends the 1997/98 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. California State University, Chico Food Services Renovation and Energy Improvements</td>
<td>CSU Chico</td>
<td>PWCE</td>
<td>$3,470,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Chico proposes to remodel the food services facility in the Bell Memorial Union. The project includes modernization and reorientation of the facilities including the conversion to a food court. The existing HVAC system and electrical supply to the building will be upgraded to reduce energy costs. The design and development of construction documents will be funded from the Student Union Dormitory Revenue Fund reserves. Construction costs will be funded by proceeds from the sale of revenue bonds to be approved by the trustees at a future date. All costs including future debt service for the project will be self-supported by program revenue, student union fees, reserves and sale of student union revenue bonds.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. California State University, Fresno Alumni House</td>
<td>CSU Fresno</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Fresno wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a new alumni house. The facility will include administrative offices, meeting rooms and a full-service kitchen. The exterior design of the facility will utilize materials and colors consistent with the campus architectural style. The proposed project is being funded by donor contributions. Campus selection of a project architect will be reported to the Board of Trustees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. California State University, Sacramento Hornet Stadium Track Improvements</td>
<td>CSU Sacramento</td>
<td>PWC</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSU Sacramento has been awarded the 2000 United States Olympic Trials for Track and Field. The campus wishes to proceed with the design and construction of improvements to the Hornet Stadium track and field facilities to comply with the specifications of the USA Track and Field Federation, and the International Amateur Athletic Federation. The improvements include stadium lighting, stands and utility services. A local benefactor has given the university $1,000,000 to fund the project. Campus selection of a project architect will be reported to the Board of Trustees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. San Diego State University Aztec Center Renovation</td>
<td>San Diego State University</td>
<td>PWCE</td>
<td>$545,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Diego State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of improvements to the Aztec Center. This project will rehabilitate and improve the interior of the common area seating space, improve and relocate restrooms to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act, and expand the patio seating area and events stage. These improvements will enhance the aesthetics, pedestrian traffic flow and operations of the center. Financing will be from locally held funds budgeted for student union repairs, replacement and future development. Campus selection of a project architect will be reported to the Board of Trustees.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. **Sonoma State University**  
   **Student Apartments II**

Sonoma State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of additional on-campus student housing to accommodate 604 bed spaces. The configuration will be 147 four-bedroom apartments with shared kitchen and living spaces, and 16 studio apartments. In accordance with code requirements, two percent will be designed to accommodate students with disabilities. Landscaping will be provided to allow the proposed units to blend with the existing housing on campus. It will be bid as a design-build project similar to the previous campus housing projects. The Board of Trustees’ approval for the sale of revenue bonds to finance the project will be requested at a future date.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

Presentation By
Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary
This agenda item requests approval to amend the 1997/98 State Funded Capital Outlay Program to add the following project:

California State University, Sacramento  PWC  $1,000,000
Electrical Substation

Recommended Action
Approval of the resolution.
Agenda Item 2
March 17-18, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

This item amends the 1997/98 State Funded Capital Outlay Program to add the following project:

California State University, Sacramento PWC $1,000,000
Electrical Substation

CSU Sacramento wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a 69 KV electrical substation. The project will install multiple transformers at a single site and will be constructed within the existing substation compound. The project will enable the campus to purchase power at a lower rate to provide an estimated annual savings of $248,000. The financing is through a third-party financing agreement for lease purchase of the equipment. Annual savings will initially be used to pay for the debt service and campus maintenance and operating costs.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

Information Item

Agenda Item 3
March 17-18, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Professional Appointment

Presentation By
Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary
In accordance with trustee policy on professional appointments, CSU Northridge is reporting on the selection of a project architect for one major capital outlay project.
ITEM
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Professional Appointment
Trustee policy requires that campus professional appointments for major capital outlay projects be reported to the board as an information item.

1. California State University, Northridge
   Associated Students Children’s Center
   Project Architect: Amador Whittle

The campus has selected Amador Whittle to design the Associated Students children’s center. This $1,850,000 project is funded by student fees and replaces the existing 1940s facility. The project includes seven classrooms, support spaces, landscaping, and playground facilities.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve Parking Structure I—California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Presentation By
Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary
This agenda item proposes certification of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approval of the Parking Structure I project at the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo. The trustees must reapprove the project as a result of the environmental assessment process.

Recommended Action
Approval of the resolution.
ITEM
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COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve Parking Structure I—California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Background
An Initial Study and Negative Declaration (IS/ND) were prepared for the proposed California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I in 1995. The IS/ND included an expanded analysis of the potentially significant environmental effects of the project, including geologic hazards, air quality, noise, transportation/circulation, public services, and aesthetics. The IS/ND also recommended measures to alleviate the potentially significant impacts of the project. The California State University Board of Trustees certified the Negative Declaration in November 1995.

Residents of the Alta Vista neighborhood (located to the south and southwest of the project site) subsequently challenged the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) process and IS/ND in court. The court agreed with the neighborhood that the notice prepared for the negative declaration was unclear as to project description, and instructed the university to provide additional information in a revised notice for the project. In order to more fully investigate environmental impacts of the project, the university agreed to prepare an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the parking structure. In further settlement of the lawsuit, the university agreed to several conditions for the project. The conditions are listed below in the Alta Vista Neighborhood Association Agreement. As a result of the court ruling on the CEQA process, the trustees must reapprove the project.

The Parking Structure I project will provide parking for students, faculty and staff at Cal Poly. It is consistent with the 1993 University Land Use Plan that proposes parking structures near the three major entrances to the campus. The structure will be adjacent to the new performing arts center and south of the Mott Physical Education Building and the H.P. Davidson Music Center and will replace spaces lost to construction of other facilities on campus as well as provide additional parking for public events. It will be constructed over six of the ten existing lighted tennis courts. At least three of these courts will be rebuilt adjacent to the structure. The structure will be visible from a nearby off-campus residential neighborhood, as well as from the Grand Avenue residence halls. Attachment A is a map of the project site.

Scope
The Parking Structure I project includes a three-story facility (four levels), pedestrian bridge, two elevators, and three stairwells. The university would like to proceed with the design and construction of the project, which includes construction of the parking structure, elimination of existing surface parking areas (150 spaces in the lighted G2 parking lot) and six currently lighted tennis courts, replacement of four courts, and landscaping near the structure and in the vicinity of Slack Street, Hathway Avenue, and Longview Lane.

The parking structure replaces campuswide parking spaces lost to the construction of the business building, the recreation/sports/physical education complex, the student services building and the Foundation administration building. Construction is Type I, poured-in-place concrete with a height above grade of
38 feet and 51 feet to top of elevator towers. The structure has 916 standard parking stalls and 20 disabled parking stalls for a total count of 936 parking spaces. The major entry to the structure is from Grand Avenue onto the third level above grade. Exiting from the structure occurs onto Grand Avenue and Pacheco Way. Emergency access would be available from the intersection of Hathway Avenue and Longview Lane to the southwest.

**Basic Statistics**

- Gross Building Area: 312,450 square feet
- Total Parking Capacity: 936 spaces
- Surface Coverage: 79,000
- Building Height (not including elevator towers): 38 feet

**Cost Estimate—Cost Index ENR 5595**

- Construction Cost ($22.13 per gross square foot): $6,916,000
- Includes site improvements and landscaping
- Fees and Contingency: $1,807,000
- Total Project Cost ($27.92 per gross square foot): $8,723,000

- Construction cost per space: $7,388
- Project cost per space: $9,319

**Funding**

The project is funded by the Dormitory Revenue Fund—Parking, supplemented by campus parking revenues.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

As a result of the court action (previously described in background section), a comprehensive EIR has been prepared for the Parking Structure I project to address construction level impacts of the proposed facility. An outline of the impacts is set forth in the section below, as well as a detailed listing of impacts and recommended mitigation measures.

The following information is relevant to the EIR and CEQA process:

- State Clearinghouse Number: SCH No. 95051007
- Initial Study and Notice of Preparation: October 10, 1996
- Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR): August and October 1997
- State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research (OPR): September 9, 1997
- Notice: 45-day public review period: October 22, 1997
- DEIR review period complete: December 8, 1997

The 45-day public review period for the DEIR closed on December 8, 1997. Sixteen comment letters were received and have been addressed in the FEIR. Public agencies commenting on the project are the Air Pollution Control District, the San Luis Obispo Community Development Department, the mayor of San Luis Obispo, and the San Luis Obispo Council of Governments. The Alta Vista Neighborhood
Association, its president, and nine area residents also submitted letters of comment. The comments focus primarily on:

- Geologic Hazards
- Traffic and Circulation
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Visual Impact

An FEIR was prepared which incorporates the comments received from the distributions of the DEIR and the university responses.

**Environmental Impacts**

The DEIR addresses the following potentially significant impacts associated with the implementation of the Parking Structure I project. A comprehensive listing and discussion of impacts and mitigation measures are included in Chapter 5 of the FEIR provided as part of this agenda item.

**Land Use**

The proposed project may disrupt nearby residences and campus dormitories. Neighborhood-related noise and visual impact are potentially significant but can be mitigated.

**Geology**

Ground accelerations may occur which would cause significant but mitigable impacts. Liquefaction is considered potentially significant but mitigable. Ground rupture as a result of faults in the project vicinity is considered less than significant.

**Traffic and Circulation**

The parking structure operation would result in short-term congestion within the structure with a maximum vehicle departure following evening events. This impact is considered significant but mitigable. The structure would modify and increase traffic in the nearby neighborhood.

**Air Quality**

Construction activities would generate pollutants that could affect local air quality. Project-related traffic and on-site sources would emit air pollutants at levels that exceed thresholds of significance. Vehicle exhaust emissions within the proposed parking structure could result in the state 1-hour carbon monoxide standard being exceeded at adjacent athletic facilities and nearby residences for short periods of time. With proposed event management, this impact can be reduced.

**Noise**

Construction activities would create short-term high noise levels and affect dormitories and residences adjacent to the project site. These impacts are considered significant but mitigable. Cumulative noise impacts caused by increased traffic on Grand Avenue and California Boulevard would be considered significant but mitigable.
Visual Impact
The proposed project would introduce some additional light and glare into an existing developed area of the campus. Existing tennis courts and surface parking areas on the site are currently lighted for night use and safety. Light and glare impacts may be significant but are mitigable. The parking structure would be visible from the nearby dormitories and residences adjacent to the campus. These impacts are significant but mitigable. An extensive landscape plan will be implemented with the development of the parking structure.

Public Safety
The parking structure can be a contributing factor to criminal activities in the area. This impact is considered significant but mitigable. Potential hazards exist because of tennis court surface materials that contain asbestos. This is considered a significant but mitigable impact.

Alternatives
The EIR focused on alternatives that are capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse effects associated with the project while feasibly attaining the basic objective of the project to meet current and anticipated parking demand on campus. The alternatives evaluated include:

• No Project Alternative (not building the parking structure facility).

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

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

The various impacts of the considered alternatives are summarized in the following table on page 6.
Summary Comparison of Alternatives to the Proposed Parking Structure I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue Areas</th>
<th>Project (Tennis Courts)</th>
<th>Grand Ave Alternative</th>
<th>Dormitory Alternative</th>
<th>No Project</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Land Use</td>
<td>Increases parking for public auditorium events consistent with campus plan</td>
<td>Increases parking consistent with campus plan</td>
<td>Increases parking consistent with campus plan</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Loss of two tennis courts</td>
<td>No loss of tennis courts</td>
<td>No loss of tennis courts</td>
<td>Not consistent with campus plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative impacts on Alta Vista</td>
<td>Negative impacts on dorms</td>
<td>Very negative impacts on dorms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2 Geologic Hazards</td>
<td>No excavation required</td>
<td>Significant, difficult excavation</td>
<td>Significant excavation</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toe of landslide stability</td>
<td>On top of landslide toe</td>
<td>On landslide</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3 Traffic and Circulation</td>
<td>Impacts to Grand Ave. Increase on Slack, Longview, Hathway</td>
<td>Impacts to Grand Ave. Increase on Slack, Longview, Hathway</td>
<td>Impacts to Grand Ave. Increase on Slack, Longview, Hathway</td>
<td>No additional parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Access is considerably more difficult than other sites</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.4 Air Quality</td>
<td>Significant, unavoidable carbon monoxide to Alta Vista and dorms</td>
<td>Significant, unavoidable carbon monoxide to dorms and eastern Slack</td>
<td>Significant, unavoidable carbon monoxide impacts to dorms</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5 Noise</td>
<td>Increase in ambient noise, greater near Longview and Hathway</td>
<td>Increase in ambient noise, greater near dorms and Slack</td>
<td>Increase in ambient noise, near dorms—very close proximity</td>
<td>No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Visual Impact</td>
<td>Visible from Slack, Longview &amp; Hathway and several residences in Alta Vista</td>
<td>Visible from Slack, Longview &amp; Hathway and several residences in Alta Vista (perhaps more so)</td>
<td>Visible from dormitories only slightly visible from Alta Vista (intervening buildings)</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Greatest impact at intersection of Longview and Hathway</td>
<td>Greatest impact at Slack Street residences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.7 Public Safety</td>
<td>Increase in possibility of crime</td>
<td>Impacts substantially similar to tennis court location</td>
<td>More isolated, greater threat of crime</td>
<td>No Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Higher concentration of pedestrian and auto conflicts</td>
<td>No asbestos impacts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Asbestos removal required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>Air quality and visual are most serious impacts</td>
<td>Substantially similar to project except for more difficult impacts relating to excavation of site</td>
<td>Better for Alta Vista, but considerably worse for dormitory residents due to proximity</td>
<td>Status quo for most impacts Does not achieve objective of the university</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alta Vista Neighborhood Association Agreement

As part of the settlement with the Alta Vista Neighborhood Association (AVNA) to allow the parking structure to move forward, the university (by the Board of Trustees) agreed to several measures that will reduce impacts to the surrounding area. These measures are set forth below and were incorporated into the project description.
1. Trustees will agree to implement the following mitigation measures as outlined by the trustees’ staff at a community meeting held on June 10, 1996, at the Albert B. Smith Alumni and Conference Center. The measures will be part of the development of any parking structure that may be built to serve the performing arts center. The trustees shall not be obligated to implement these mitigation measures unless the parking structure built at the conclusion of the EIR process is located within 300 yards of Hathaway Avenue, Slack Street, or Longview Lane.

   A. Elimination of the planned 159-space parking lot addition at lot G-2.

   B. No vehicular ingress/egress from the parking structure onto Hathaway Avenue or Longview Lane, except for emergency use. “Emergency” in this section and section (C) below, shall be defined to be “an occurrence involving a clear and imminent danger demanding action to prevent or mitigate loss of, or damage to, life, health, property, or essential public services.”

   C. No through traffic from Pacheco Way except during fall quarter move-in for the residence halls, spring quarter open house, and for emergency use (as defined in section (B) above).

   D. During major events on campus, special signs and traffic control measures will be in place. This includes directing traffic toward Grand Avenue, Highland Drive, and California Boulevard campus exits.

   E. Landscaping is planned to enhance the aesthetics of the parking structure.

2. No additional parking (surface or structural) other than the project resulting from the current EIR process will be built in the immediate area bounded by Longview Lane, Slack Street, and Pacheco Avenue for a period of five years. The university will provide advance notice to the residents in the area of any parking project to be constructed after this five-year period. In order to ensure that such a notice is properly received, AVNA shall provide the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly) Office of Vice President for Administration and Finance with the name and address of the person who shall receive notice of the university’s intention to construct a parking project in the location bounded by Longview Lane, Slack Street, and Pacheco Avenue. The provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to situations where the university restripes a parking lot resulting in an increase or decrease in parking spaces.

3. Trustees agree to prepare an EIR for the project pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act. The EIR will analyze, at a minimum, the original G-1 site alternative and a “no project” alternative for the project under the requirements of CEQA. The EIR, as part of the “no project” alternative, will also consider the alternative of providing parking through other means than construction of a new parking structure, including parking demand management.

4. Trustees agree to implement the Cal Poly Parking Management Plan [contained in the FEIR in Appendix 5.3] that has been developed since the approval of the performing arts center in November 1990.

5. Cal Poly shall undertake an annual review of its Parking Management Plan. As part of this review, Cal Poly will seek and consider comments by local residents. AVNA shall provide the Cal Poly Office of Vice President for Administration and Finance with the name and address of the person who shall receive notice of Cal Poly’s annual review of this plan.
6. While Cal Poly cannot commit to control traffic at the Grand Avenue/Slack Street intersection because this is within the jurisdiction of the city of San Luis Obispo, Cal Poly will agree to cooperate with city of San Luis Obispo officials concerning traffic control at this intersection.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

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

WHEREAS, The Final Environmental Impact Report for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Parking Structure I (State Clearinghouse No. 95051007) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act (state CEQA Guidelines); and

WHEREAS, This board by this resolution will certify that the Final Environmental Impact Report is complete and adequate and that it fully complies with all requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines; and

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

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

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

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

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

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

3. Impacts and Mitigation Measures.

The FEIR identified a number of potentially significant effects that could result from the proposed project. However, the Board of Trustees finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those potential significant effects to a less than significant level. Those impacts which are not reduced to a less than significant level are identified and overridden due to specific social, economic and technical feasibility considerations. A description of the potential significant effects and mitigation measures which are adopted follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

Geo-1. Ground acceleration due to potential major earthquake on Los Osos or San Andreas fault.
Geo-3. Impacts due to liquefaction.

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

Mitigation Measure Geo-1(a). Compliance with Uniform Building Code, Health and Safety Code, the County Seismic Safety Element, and other applicable ordinances including soils.

Mitigation Measure Geo-1(b). Incorporation of the recommendations of the Geotechnical Investigations Report would ensure that after site preparation, the soil conditions would be adequately stable to support the parking structure.

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

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

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

TC-5. Conflicts with pedestrians, bicycles, and automobiles due to construction activities and project operation.

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

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

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

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

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

D. Air Quality. The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following significant effects on air quality:
AQ-1. Adverse impacts on ambient levels of NOx and PM_{10} due to exceedance of Air Pollution Control District (APCD) significance thresholds during project construction.

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measure AQ-1(b). Implementation of dust control measures will reduce levels of fugitive dust around the project site to the extent feasible during construction activities.

Mitigation Measure AQ-2(a). Prepayment of parking fees would reduce excessive ambient CO concentrations from vehicle start up emissions and vehicle queuing.

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

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

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

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

N-1. Increased temporary noise levels due to construction activities.
Adverse cumulative noise impacts due to increased traffic on Grand Avenue and California Boulevard.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

F. Visual Impact. The Board of Trustees has determined that the proposed project could cause the following possible significant effects on visual impact:

VR-2. Increased light and glare impacts to motorists and adjacent land uses including nearby residences.

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

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

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

Mitigation Measure VR-3(a). The university and Chancellor’s Office shall approve the architectural design of the parking structure to ensure unity with natural and architectural character of the surrounding area.
Mitigation Measure VR-3(b). Landscape design measures shall be implemented to soften the effect of building and paving and to provide vegetative screening to minimize views of the structure by neighboring residences.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Mitigation Measure PS-1(f). Provide a security guard and closed circuit cameras for security.

As set forth above, changes or alterations have been, or can be incorporated into the project that avoid or substantially reduce the significant environmental effects as identified in the FEIR. All feasible mitigation measures that can be applied to the project have been included in the FEIR. Residual significant impacts remain. The Board of Trustees has determined that these residual significant impacts are outweighed by the benefits of the proposed project.

4. Alternatives.

The DEIR also discussed the following project alternatives:

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

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

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

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

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

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

The campus land use plan anticipates the construction of two additional parking structures near the other major entrances to the campus. For this reason, locating the structure a considerable distance away would simply provide redundant facilities at these other locations, and would not meet the overall objective of the campus land use plan, which is to concentrate parking near the campus core in the several entrance locations. Thus, a location across campus was not considered a reasonable alternative.

5. **Statement of Overriding Considerations.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. Cal Poly has endeavored to reduce the number of cars coming onto campus through a variety of programs, including but not limited to subsidy of local transit fares, vanpools, and ridership programs. The university is continuing its efforts to further reduce the number of automobile trips. Nevertheless, with the loss of nearly 1,100 spaces, the campus needs to accommodate the current needs of students, faculty and staff.

F. Air Quality. Construction of the proposed project would result in the emission of air pollutants exceeding the APCD significance thresholds for CO, Oxides of Nitrogen (NOₓ) and Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>). This impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant and is considered unavoidable. The various air quality issues are as follows:

*“A Capacity for Growth” CPEC August 1995
Operational impacts. Vehicular and utility emissions associated with the proposed project would contribute to the lack of attainment of the state ozone and PM$_{10}$ standards and would exceed APCD significance thresholds for CO and NO$_x$. The University’s trip reduction efforts will continue to improve this impact. Because the non-attainment is region-wide, this impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant; therefore, it is considered unavoidable.

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

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

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

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

In order to further mitigate this impact, the university has agreed to participate in an air quality monitoring program designed to identify if and when the CO limit is exceeded. If exceedances do occur, the parking management plan will be amended to control the number of vehicles entering the structure for a single event, thus reducing the number of cars starting simultaneously in the structure. It is anticipated that exceedance, based upon a review of similar structures, would be a rare event. The alternative of reducing the size of the structure is, therefore, not merited, when management can resolve air quality issues should they arise.
Cumulative. Further, emissions associated with cumulative projects would exceed the APCD significance threshold. This impact cannot be mitigated to a level of less than significant; therefore, it is considered unavoidable. The cumulative emissions are part of air quality issues associated with the entire region, and reduction of these emissions to a level of less than significant is beyond the control of the university.

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

A. Air Quality:

Impact AQ-1 (Equipment). Construction of the proposed project would result in the emission of air pollutants exceeding the APCD significance thresholds for NOx and PM_{10}. Combustion emissions generated by construction would degrade local air quality and contribute to exceedances of the nitrogen dioxide (NO2) 1-hour state air quality standard.

The FEIR recommends the following mitigation measures:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The FEIR recommends the following mitigation measures:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED, That the Parking Structure I project for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, is approved.
Attachments A and B of CPB&G Item 4
can be viewed in the published edition of the
March 17-18, 1998, agenda of the CSU Board of Trustees
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Summary
This agenda item requests the Board of Trustees’ approval of the categories and criteria to be used for the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program. The categories and criteria have been reviewed by the campus administrative staff and the Executive Council.

Recommended Action
Approval of the resolution.
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COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Categories and Criteria for the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

The Board of Trustees annually adopts categories and criteria that are used in setting priorities for the State Funded Capital Outlay Program. The proposed categories and criteria for the 1999/00 program are included as Attachment A. They have been reviewed with the campus administrative staff and the Executive Council. Due to projected enrollment growth issues surrounding the accommodation of enrollment using distributed learning and other off-campus institutional means, a criterion has been added to clarify that the physical master plan enrollment ceilings apply to on-campus enrollment only. On-campus enrollment will be used to justify capital projects that address enrollment demand projected for the main campus.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is hereby directed to use these categories and criteria to prepare the 1999/2000 State Funded Capital Outlay Program for The California State University. If this results in an “action year” (1999/2000) request beyond reasonable expectation of available funding, the chancellor is delegated authority to adjust the number of campus projects submitted.
Categories and Criteria to Set Priorities for the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

General Criteria

• A campus may submit a maximum of one project for the budget year, including health and safety projects. Exceptions to this limit will be considered on an individual project basis. Equipment and seismic strengthening projects are excluded from this limit.

• For the four planning years, a campus may submit a maximum of three projects per year, including health and safety projects.

• Seismic strengthening projects will be prioritized according to recommendations from the Seismic Review Board.

• Campuses are to prepare their project requests for the five-year program using PWC lump sum funding for all new project starts. Project requests for remaining projects in the five-year program that received an initial phase of funding should use the lump sum method for the balance of funds required to complete the projects with the exception of equipment funds.

• Current trustee-approved campus physical master plan enrollment ceilings apply to on-campus enrollment only. These numbers are to be used as the basis of comparison for justifying capital projects that address enrollment demand to be accommodated on campus. Enrollment estimates that exceed these figures are expected to be accommodated through distributed learning and other off-campus instructional means.

Individual Categories and Criteria

I. Funds for Projects of Systemwide Benefit

These funds are distributed among campuses for minor capital outlay projects, and preliminary planning for projects proposed in the five-year plan including: feasibility studies, master planning, utility master planning and/or energy studies based on need.

II. Renovation

A. These funds correct structural, health and safety code deficiencies by addressing life safety problems and promoting code compliance in existing facilities. Projects include seismic strengthening, correcting building code deficiencies, and addressing regulatory changes which impact campus facilities or equipment.

B. These funds make new and remodeled facilities operable by providing equipment, renovating building systems, and replacing utility services to make buildings and the campus infrastructure operable.

C. These funds meet campus deficiency needs by renovating or constructing new replacement buildings in response to academic and support program needs and deficiencies.

III. Growth

These funds eliminate instructional and support deficiencies, including new buildings, additions, land acquisitions, and site development.
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March 17-18, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Status Report on the 1998/99 State Funded Capital Outlay Program

Presentation By
Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary
The California State University’s proposed 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1998/99 through 2002/03 were presented at the September 1997 meeting of the Board of Trustees. The 1998/99 state funded request totaled $290,266,000. In accordance with the final year of the Governor’s Compact with Higher Education, the board approved a revised budget request of $150 million for life safety, seismic upgrades, equipment, infrastructure upgrades, building renovations, and one growth project. Funding is dependent upon voter approval of general obligation bonds in 1998.

The governor’s proposed 1998/99 budget was published January 9, 1998, and included an additional $11.3 million for the CSU Northridge, Renovation for Initial Facility, Phase 1a at the Ventura Off-Campus Center, bringing the total CSU capital outlay budget to $161.3 million.

The Legislative Analyst’s Office will publish the Analysis of the 1998/99 Budget Bill in February 1998. A comparison between the CSU 1998/99 State Funded Capital Outlay Program request, the funding in the governor’s budget, and the LAO recommendations will be distributed at the meeting.