

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

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

March 17, 1998

Members Present

Michael D. Stennis, Chair
Ali C. Razi, Vice Chair
Jim Considine
Martha C. Fallgatter, Chairman of the Board, ex officio
Bernard Goldstein
Eric C. Mitchell
Joan Otomo-Corgel
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Charles B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio
Stanley T. Wang

Members Absent

Roland E. Arnall
William D. Campbell
Ronald L. Cedillos

Other Trustees Present

Laurence K. Gould, Jr.
James H. Gray
Robert G. Foster
William Hauck
Maridel Moulton
Anthony M. Vitti

Chancellor's Office Staff

June M. Cooper, Senior Vice Chancellor and Interim Chief of Staff
Charles W. Lindahl, Interim Senior Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs
Richard P. West, Senior Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement
Christine Helwick, General Counsel
Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director, Physical Planning and Development
Samuel A. Strafacci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources

Presidential Liaisons

Warren J. Baker, President, California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, present
Alistair W. McCrone, President, Humboldt State University, present
Peter P. Smith, President, California State University, Monterey Bay, present

Chair Stennis greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 3:55 p.m.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the January 27, 1998, 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 03-98-03).

Amend the 1997/98 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-98-04).

Professional Appointment

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Stennis presented agenda item 3 as a consent information item.

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

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

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

Chair Stennis acknowledged those in the audience who had requested permission to speak before the committee regarding the passage of the final Environmental Impact Report and approval of the Parking Structure I at San Luis Obispo. Those speaking in opposition to this item were Cynthia Vix, Sherrill Lewis, and Russell Hall of the Alta Vista Neighborhood Association; and Jana Zimmer, attorney for the Alta Vista Neighborhood Association.

Speaking in favor of this item were Cindy Entzi, SLO ASI president; Matt Ceppi, SLO ASI executive vice president; and Tom Brown, Dennis Kish, and Sandy Viborg, community representatives.

In referring to the environmental impact study conducted on this project, Trustee Pesqueira inquired if staff had received any comments from the public similar to the letters from interested parties included in the trustees' agenda packet, and if there were any unmitigable problems.

Mr. Regnier answered in the affirmative to the first question and stated that staff had responded to their concerns in the Environmental Impact Report. With respect to the second question, he said that one of the biggest issues that was mitigated with the neighborhood residents was reduction of traffic traveling through the neighboring streets. To achieve this control, the campus had to design the structure limiting to one location the entry-exit point for the parking structure.

William Knight, university counsel coordinator, Office of General Counsel, stated that the agenda item and the resolution include findings of significant impact, adoption of feasible mitigations, a determination that some impacts will remain significant, and a statement of overriding considerations.

Trustee Pesqueira asked if the significant impacts are in relationship to the air quality, and is the west side of the parking garage open.

Messrs. Knight and Regnier responded yes to both questions. Dr. Regnier observed that three sides of the parking garage will be open and the only closed side will back up to the toe of the slope allowing the westerly winds to flow through the structure.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-98-05).

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

Mr. Regnier presented the proposed categories and criteria for the 1999/2000 state funded capital outlay program as described in the printed agenda item.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 03-98-06).

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

In reference to the status report handout, Mr. Regnier stated that the legislative analyst had raised several issues with various portions of the trustees' budget. He indicated that staff is working with the campuses to mitigate the analyst's comments, with the intentions of bringing back to this committee the budget that was approved by the governor last January.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:41 p.m.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 1
May 12-13, 1998

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 Student Housing Acquisition	A	\$5,287,604
2. California State University, Northridge Biotech Development, Phase I	PWCE	\$18,000,000
3. San Jose State University Public Safety/Parking Department Building	PWCE	\$5,425,000
4. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Campus Store Expansion	PWCE	\$1,127,000

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1
May 12-13, 1998

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:

1. California State University, Chico	A	\$5,287,604
Student Housing Acquisition		

CSU Chico wishes to proceed with the acquisition of four properties to provide 341 bedspaces for student housing. The Colony Inn property includes a 240-bedspace cluster design apartment complex consisting of thirteen two-story buildings containing sixty units and two one-story buildings. Each unit has four bedrooms sharing a common kitchen, dining room and two bathrooms. Each bedroom has a private exterior entry. There is an office, resident manager's apartment, community room, swimming pool and volleyball court. The 68,068-gross-square-foot complex was constructed in 1975 on 4.35 acres. The purchase price is \$2,500,000. The McConnell properties consist of three parcels of townhouse-type three- and four-bedroom, two-bath units totaling 101 bedspaces. The 35,026-gross-square-foot complex was constructed from 1986 to 1989 on 1.47 acres. The purchase price is \$1,151,261. The Colony Inn and McConnell properties also include adjacent parking totaling 264 spaces. The combined properties were appraised at \$4,100,000. The project includes \$1,636,343 for upgrade and renovation of the buildings to meet current code requirements.

The campus request to sell revenue bonds to finance the project costs is being presented to the Committee on Finance.

2. California State University, Northridge	PWCE	\$18,000,000
Biotech Development, Phase I		

CSU Northridge wishes to proceed with the Biotech Development, Phase I project which will provide academic, research, and development facilities at the university's north campus. The proposed project has academic ties to the university's College of Engineering and Computer Science, College of Health and Human Development, and College of Science and Mathematics. Biotech Development, Phase I includes a 150,000-gross-square-foot two-story research and development building and a 65,000-gross-square-foot conference center/central plant. Surface parking lots for the initial facilities will provide 432 spaces.

The biotech development is expected to be constructed in three phases totaling approximately 720,000 gross square feet at a cost of \$72,000,000. Phase II includes two two-story buildings with parking, and Phase III includes a two-story building with parking. The campus has negotiated a development agreement and ground lease with private developer Alfred Mann and his biotech companies, including MiniMed, Advanced Bionics, MRG, and the Alfred Mann Foundation, to fully fund the development. The ground lease provides an option for an additional eight acres for the development of two buildings totaling 100,000 square feet of office space for biotech uses.

3. San Jose State University **PWCE** **\$5,425,000**
Public Safety/Parking Department Building

San Jose State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of a new public safety/parking department building. The three-story, 24,048-gross-square-foot building will provide space for the departments' functions that are currently housed at three separate locations throughout the campus. The proposed project will be located next to the existing 7th Street parking garage. Funding will be provided by campus traffic and parking operation reserves. Campus selection of a project architect will be reported to the Board of Trustees.

4. California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo **PWCE** **\$1,127,000**
Campus Store Expansion

CPSU San Luis Obispo wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the campus store expansion project. This is a 3,000-square-foot renovation plus 3,000-square-foot addition to the existing convenience store located in the heart of the campus. The store also provides a retail setting for goods produced by the College of Agriculture students. It is operated by the Cal Poly Foundation in a state facility. The project will be funded by on-hand Foundation store operation reserves. Campus selection of a project architect will be reported to the Board of Trustees.

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 be amended to include: (1) \$5,287,604 for the acquisition of off-campus student housing for California State University, Chico; (2) \$18,000,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the California State University, Northridge Biotech Development, Phase I project; (3) \$5,425,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, and equipment for the San Jose State University Public Safety/Parking Department Building; and (4) \$1,127,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo Campus Store Expansion project.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 2
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Professional Appointments

Presentation By

Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary

In accordance with trustee policy on professional appointments, this information item reports on the campus appointments for FY 1998/99 consulting master plan architects and three major capital outlay projects.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Professional Appointments

In accordance with trustee policy, the following campuses wish to report on professional appointments made since the last board meeting:

I. Fiscal Year 1998/99 Consulting Master Plan Architects	First Appointed
CSU Bakersfield	BFGC Architects Planners, Inc. 1975
CSU Chico	Lionakis Beaumont Design Group, Inc. 1983
CSU Dominguez Hills	Louis Liets Architects, Inc. 1961
CSU Fresno	Allen Y. Lew & William E. Patnaude, Inc. 1967
CSU Hayward	Cannon Design Group 1991
Humboldt State University	Freeman Hubbard Architects 1989
CSU Long Beach	Killingsworth, Stricker, Lindgren, Wilson & Associates 1961
CSU Los Angeles	La Cañada Design Group, Inc. 1997
California Maritime Academy	NBBJ Architecture 1995
CSU Monterey Bay	Sasaki Associates, Inc. 1994
CSPU Pomona	Robbins Jorgensen Christopher 1996
CSU Sacramento	E. M. Kado Associates, AIA, Inc. 1991
CSU San Bernardino	Rossetti Associates Architects 1990
San Diego State University	Delawie Wilkes Rodrigues Barker & Bretton Associates 1989
San Francisco State University	ELS/Elbasant & Logan Architects 1990
San Jose State University	Allan M. Walter & Associates, Inc. 1986
CPSU San Luis Obispo	RRM Design Group 1992
CSU San Marcos	Robbins Jorgensen Christopher 1993
Sonoma State University	TLCD Architecture 1998
CSU Stanislaus	John Rollings + Associates 1996

II. Major Capital Outlay Projects

1. CSU Fresno
Smittcamp Alumni House
Project Architect: The Taylor Group Architects of California, Inc.

An interview panel consisting of campus personnel selected the architectural firm of The Taylor Group Architects of California, Inc., to design the Smittcamp Alumni House. This is a donor funded project and will be a new building for development and alumni affairs.

2. CSU Sacramento
Hornet Stadium Track Improvements
Project Architect: Design West

An interview panel consisting of campus personnel selected the architectural firm of Design West to design the Hornet Stadium track improvements project. The project will include resurfacing the running track, installation of a practice track and improvements to the jump and throw areas. Stadium lighting, grand stands and utility service will be upgraded.

3. San Diego State University
Aztec Center Renovation

Project Architect: Mosher/Drew/Watson/Ferguson, Architects

An interview panel consisting of campus personnel and members of the Associated Students selected the architectural firm of Mosher/Drew/Watson/Ferguson, Architects to design the Aztec Center renovation. This project will rehabilitate and improve the interior of the common area seating, improve and relocate restrooms to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act and expand the patio seating area and events stage.

BRIEF

Information Item

Agenda Item 3
May 12-13, 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 approval of general obligation bonds anticipated to go before the voters in November 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 published the Analysis of the 1998/99 Budget Bill on February 18, 1998, and recommended withholding funding on six projects pending additional information and/or reevaluation. Physical planning and development continues to provide the requested information to the LAO and has held several meetings to resolve its questions and concerns.

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

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 4
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan for California State University, Monterey Bay

Presentation By

Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary

This item requests the Board of Trustees' approval to establish a Physical Master Plan for the California State University, Monterey Bay campus to reach an on-campus enrollment of 8,300 full time equivalent students (FTES) and a total enrollment of 25,000 FTES. The master plan specifies the enrollment and space programs proposed to support the educational mission of the university in each of four planning horizons, through the year 2030.

In addition, a Program Environmental Impact Report has been prepared to analyze the potential impacts of the proposed master plan in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) must be certified by the Board of Trustees in order to approve the proposed physical master plan.

The item includes the proposed Master Plan Executive Summary (February 12, 1998) and the FEIR (February 20, 1998).

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 4
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan for California State University, Monterey Bay

Background

In 1991 the United States Department of the Army announced the planned closure of the Fort Ord military base. The California State University (CSU) received approval in May 1994 for the transfer of approximately 1,350 acres of property on former Fort Ord to establish a new campus—CSU Monterey Bay (CSUMB). The property conveyed to the CSU included the following physical improvements built by the military: 1,253 family residential units, 20 residence halls, 190 facilities formerly used for military training and administration, infrastructure, and open space, including 330 acres of oak woodland. Attachment A shows the regional location of the campus and Attachment B is the existing campus map. The CSU adopted an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) in May 1994 to address the potential effects of the property conveyance and transfer, establishment of the CSUMB campus at its current location, and initial renovations of buildings. The first parcels of the conveyed land were transferred to the university in June 1994. The campus opened in August 1995 with 654 students in renovated former military facilities.

Public Participation

The decision to locate the CSUMB campus at the former Fort Ord site was part of a community-wide decision making process to address the state's need for capacity in higher education, as well as the desire of the local community and regional interests to revitalize the economy with the activity and consumers generated by a major public university.

Two committees were formed to specifically provide direction in preparing the master plan: the Master Plan Task Force (MPTF) and the Community Master Plan Advisory Committee. The MPTF is discussed in the next section. The Community Master Plan Advisory Committee was comprised of representatives of local, county, state, and federal agencies and community interest groups as follows: Monterey County, City of Seaside, City of Marina, Fort Ord Reuse Authority, University of California, Presidio of Monterey, California State Parks and Recreation, Bureau of Land Management, Monterey Area Convention and Visitors Bureau, Farm Bureau, and an environmental advocate. These agencies and organizations were selected because of their responsibility for land use at former Fort Ord and/or their interest in community-wide concerns.

Master Plan Summary

The proposed CSUMB Master Plan provides a guide to the physical development of the campus in a manner that supports and enhances the university's educational mission. The scope of the plan includes educational, residential, recreational, open space, and support space requirements and a land use plan to guide siting of future development under four planning horizons in conjunction with academic enrollment projections. Planning Horizons One through Four correspond to the years 2005, 2008, 2015, and 2030, respectively.

Attachment C illustrates the existing campus buildings proposed for renovation. Attachment D illustrates the proposed master plan at full build-out (Planning Horizon Four, Year 2030). The campus enrollment projections indicate a steady increase in traditional and nontraditional FTES to the total enrollment of 25,000 FTES (8,300 on-campus) in the year 2030. (Nontraditional students are those students whose primary contact with the campus is via distance learning and/or with periodic short-term and intensive low-residency on-campus learning experiences.) A summary of the enrollment accommodated in the four planning horizons follows:

Planning Horizon	Academic Year	Program Student Enrollment in FTE	Total Student Enrollment in FTE
1	2005	Traditional 5,231 Nontraditional 1,570	6,801
2	2008	Traditional 6,600 Nontraditional 2,300	8,900
3	2015	Traditional 8,300 Nontraditional 4,200	12,500
4	2030	Traditional 8,300 Nontraditional 16,700	25,000

An increase in the proportion of nontraditional (off-campus) enrollment relative to the traditional (on-campus) enrollment in future planning horizons allows CSUMB to reach its enrollment planning figure of 25,000 FTES while only slightly increasing the campus population and physical impact on natural resources.

As part of the planning process, 15 specific near-term projects were identified that are expected to be constructed prior to build-out of Planning Horizon One (Year 2005). Most of the near-term projects consist of renovation of existing facilities for educational uses; however, new construction also is proposed. These projects were analyzed in the EIR to allow construction without any further environmental review.

Fiscal Impact

A fiscal analysis has estimated the state and nonstate supported financial resources needed to implement the proposed master plan including the near-term projects and site development. The overall cost estimate for ultimate build-out will approach 750 million dollars in today's dollars, not including residential housing. Approximately one-third of those costs would be proposed for state funding, with the remainder from nonstate sources. The proposed development program is structured to be funded by a variety of sources, including state, federal, private, grant, and donor funding.

Water Allocation

On January 9, 1996, CSU Monterey Bay (CSUMB) formally requested a “guaranteed” water allocation from the Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) for the development of a 25,000 FTE campus. Based on the U.S. Army’s historic allocation of 6,600 acre feet per year (afy) of water from the Monterey County Water Resources Agency for the operation of the former Fort Ord, CSUMB has been advised that current analysis indicates there is only enough water to support a 50 percent build-out of the total acreage of the former Fort Ord property, including the CSUMB campus. This analysis took into consideration the water requirements of all of the reuse entities at the former Fort Ord along with water conservation practices, the ability to utilize reclaimed water, and the potential for additional water sources.

On April 17, 1996, the FORA Board adopted a water allocation plan that provided CSUMB 1,160 afy of water, less 125 afy to be realized through water conservation practices. The CSU, in its negotiations with the U.S. Army for the acquisition of the land and improvements to establish the campus, could not secure a guaranteed water allocation. The U.S. Army determined at that time to defer the final determination of a water allocation. The Army provided CSU with assurances in its Memorandum of Agreement with CSU and its Quitclaim Deed for the property transferred to the CSU, that CSU would be provided its equitable share of the water rights.

The CSUMB proposed master plan does, nevertheless, provide for an ultimate campus build-out of 25,000 FTE at the year 2030 established by the California Postsecondary Education Commission (CPEC) with the current water allocation. This is accomplished by incorporating both a traditional and nontraditional enrollment mix. The “nontraditional” CSUMB student would be one who receives the majority of instruction off campus via distance or computer mediated programs. CSUMB believes that its master plan addresses the enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTE, and addresses statewide enrollment demands in a manner that is consistent with its mission to be innovative, technologically based, and environmentally responsive.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

A Program EIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is presented to the board for certification as part of this agenda item.

The Program EIR evaluates the overall long-term physical master plan and growth of the campus to 25,000 FTES (8,300 on-campus; 16,700 nontraditional) at build-out. On-campus housing is planned to accommodate approximately 60 percent of the traditional FTES and 30 percent of faculty and staff. The EIR also evaluates at a construction level of analysis the near-term projects that are expected to be developed by or prior to the year 2005.

An Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) of an EIR was prepared in August 1997 for the proposed project. In addition, a public scoping session was conducted by the university on September 3, 1997. Based on the comments received from the NOP and scoping session as well as the Initial Study, a DEIR was prepared. The DEIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research (OPR) on November 21, 1997, and to other responsible agencies. Notice of the availability of the DEIR and 45-day public review period was concurrently published. Local

cities, Monterey County, business associations, and other interested agencies and individuals were provided a copy of the DEIR and master plan along with the notice of public review. The 45-day review period was extended for an additional 14 days at the request of local agencies. The public review period ended January 20, 1998. CSUMB held two public meetings during the DEIR public review period to provide information and receive public comments regarding the adequacy of the environmental analysis. The FEIR incorporates the results of comments received from the distribution of the DEIR.

The DEIR addressed potential impacts associated with the campus master plan build-out as well as the near-term projects. The DEIR identified the following resources with potentially significant impacts, for which mitigation measures are included in Attachment F:

- geology and soils
- hydrology and water quality
- water supply
- biotic resources
- cultural resources
- aesthetics
- traffic and circulation
- air quality
- public utilities
- public services
- hazardous materials and health and safety

A complete listing and discussion of impacts and proposed mitigation is included in the FEIR provided as part of this agenda item.

Alternatives

The Alternatives section of the DEIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15126(d) which requires the analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives that could feasibly attain the objectives of the proposed project and that also are capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse environmental effects associated with the proposed project.

The preferred alternative is the master plan, as proposed by the campus, which provides for the following elements:

- 8,300 FTES traditional (on-campus) and 16,700 FTES nontraditional (off-campus)
- 237,000 gross square feet of auxiliary support uses
- 9,500 residents (primarily existing housing) and 900 residence hall beds

The alternatives shown below were analyzed and compared to the proposed project as noted above. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified.

- No Project Alternative—The proposed master plan would not be adopted and limited development of the site would occur as a result of currently approved and reasonably imminent development associated with facilities currently in use.
- Reduced Project Size/Reduced Auxiliary (formerly referred to as Commercial) Uses Alternative— This alternative proposes campus educational space as identified in the master plan but reduces the total auxiliary space by 50 percent. The project evaluated in the DEIR was the development of approximately 237,000 gross square feet of auxiliary space planned by campus build-out; this alternative proposes 118,500 square feet of auxiliary space.
- Development to Year 2015 Alternative—This alternative assumes campus enrollment and development would be limited to year 2015 levels (12,500 FTES).
- Development under Fort Ord Reuse Authority (FORA) Reuse Plan Alternative—This alternative assumes that the campus would be developed as proposed in the FORA Reuse Plan, traditional 25,000 FTES on campus.
- Alternative Location—This alternative addresses an alternative site for the campus. This alternative was deemed infeasible because the campus is currently an operating educational facility and previous documents prepared by the CSU confirm the location of a CSU campus on this site. No feasible alternative location has been proposed.

A chart summarizing the comparison of alternatives is provided in Attachment E.

In general, the No Project Alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative. However, this alternative would not meet the goals of the master plan to establish a university to ultimately serve 25,000 FTES and to foster economic vitality within the area. Therefore, CSU finds this alternative to be inconsistent with the project objectives and would not result in the benefits sought by the CSU and local community.

The Reduced Project Size/Reduced Auxiliary (formerly referred to as Commercial) Uses Alternative results in a decrease in impacts commensurate with the 50 percent reduction in auxiliary space. However, it does not reduce the severity of the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR. This alternative would meet some of the project objectives, but not all of them. The CSU finds this alternative would not meet the goals of creating a residential campus community or of fostering economic vitality.

The Development to Year 2015 Alternative reduces the amount of planned development by approximately one million square feet and limits enrollment to 12,500 FTES which would result in fewer overall environmental impacts than the proposed project. However, this alternative would not avoid the significant and unavoidable impacts identified in the EIR. This alternative would meet some of the project objectives but not all of them. CSU finds this alternative would not meet the goal of ultimately serving 25,000 FTES.

Development under the FORA Reuse Plan Alternative assumes that the proposed master plan would not be implemented and the area would be developed as proposed in the FORA Reuse Plan, with traditional educational and residential capacity to serve 25,000 FTES on campus (without a significant

nontraditional FTES off-campus component). This alternative would not reduce any impacts of the project and would, because of the substantially larger student and related personnel on campus, produce greater impacts. While CSU finds this alternative to be feasible, the FORA Reuse Plan is not specific as to the future allocation of water to the CSU sufficient to support an on-campus population of a traditional 25,000 FTES and the FORA plan has been challenged in court and is the subject of ongoing litigation.

Having considered all of the alternatives listed above, the project as proposed by CSUMB, which relies on a major nontraditional distance education enrollment component, is judged to be the most practical in achieving the needs of the CSU with a balanced consideration of the impacts the project will have on the environment. This alternative would develop CSUMB within the current proposed allocation of water as set forth by FORA. Consequently, the necessary findings and statement of overriding considerations are being provided in connection with the decision to proceed with the project.

The Alternative Location addresses an alternate location for the CSUMB campus. Because the campus is currently an operating educational facility, the state and local community has identified the site as a desirable and feasible location, and relocating the campus to another site would not meet the goals of the master plan, CSU finds this alternative to be infeasible.

When the No Project Alternative is identified as the environmentally superior alternative, CEQA Guidelines require that an EIR also identify the environmentally superior alternative among the other alternatives. The second environmentally superior alternative is Alternative 3 (Development to Year 2015), which provides for reduced uses and reduces the severity of many of the environmental impacts associated with the master plan. While this alternative reduces significant impacts, it does not avoid significant impacts and it also does not provide for a campus enrollment of 25,000 FTES in the year 2030, as provided by the master plan.

Issues Identified Through Public Participation

As previously noted, the 45-day public review period for the DEIR was extended for an additional 14 days and closed on January 20, 1998. Thirty-six comment letters were received. The comments and responses to comments are provided in the FEIR. Only seven comment letters were submitted by members of the public and were not negative in nature. The majority of comment letters were submitted by local agencies, including FORA, surrounding cities, UC Santa Cruz, and the County of Monterey. Significant issues were raised in these letters focused primarily on university autonomy, financial contributions to regional infrastructure and auxiliary support activities, and applicability to redevelopment at the former military base, as follows:

- a. **Land Use Authority of the CSU**—Several of the surrounding municipal governments commented that the development of the CSUMB campus should be regulated by the underlying land use jurisdictions or by FORA. California law vests this responsibility with the trustees.
- b. **Regional Infrastructure Financing**—Related to the land use issue described above, many of the local municipalities commented that the CSU should pay a pro-rata share of the off-campus infrastructure capacity costs that development of the university will affect. These infrastructure

improvements were identified by FORA as necessary to mitigate the regional impacts caused by development of the overall Fort Ord Reuse Plan. Both the DEIR and FEIR explain the legislative requirements set forth in Government Code Section 54999 (GC 54999) for CSUMB to pay negotiated fees to the purveyors of water, drainage, electricity, gas, communications utilities, wastewater, and solid waste disposal services for additional capacity to serve the university. CSUMB will and currently does pay these fees.

CSUMB has identified master plan impacts to infrastructure capacity as significant and has identified the regional improvement program to be implemented by FORA (identified as mitigation in FORA's FEIR) as the appropriate mitigation to reduce the impact to a less than significant level. While implementation of the mitigation cannot be assured, the CSU finds that the agencies responsible for these measures both can and should implement them, and without such mitigation, the impact remains significant and unavoidable (refer to Overriding Considerations).

CSUMB's position in this matter has been characterized by the local municipalities as a "breach of faith" or "lack of cooperation" on the university's part in the community effort to redevelop former Fort Ord and realize the associated economic benefits. This characterization is unfounded. CSU has identified local agencies as the governmental agencies responsible for funding these costs and providing these facilities (see FEIR, Appendix B).

In response to this concern, CSUMB has initiated a discussion with FORA (representing the interests of the local jurisdictions) proposing a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). This MOU would provide additional CSUMB contributions to regional infrastructure. No agreement has yet been reached so that the FEIR and project are not conditioned upon such an MOU.

- c. **Consistency with the FORA Reuse Plan and EIR**—Several comments stated that the master plan may not be consistent with the land use type and intensity conceptually presented in the FORA Reuse Plan. The university plan includes educational facilities, recreational facilities, residential uses, and university support services compatible with the FORA "Design Principles" for land use.
- d. **Commercial Development**—Several of the FORA local agencies (cities) have commented that commercial development by CSUMB that is not directly related to the educational mission of the university is subject to local land use authority and applicable fees. Some comments also state that these uses will compete with commercial development envisioned in the FORA Reuse Plan for areas outside the CSU campus.

The DEIR acknowledges that these latter types of business uses would be subject to local land use jurisdiction and related fees and exactions. The FEIR clarifies that uses that are not directly related to the educational mission of the university would be subject to local land use permitting authority.

- e. **Growth Monitoring**—A few of the comments have questioned CSUMB’s plan to focus on generating FTE from nontraditional programs wherein the typical student in this program would spend the majority of time off campus. The comments have requested that CSUMB conduct growth monitoring as a means to ensure that the on-campus population does not exceed projections, thereby exceeding identified environmental impacts. This concern has been raised particularly in relation to traffic generation. The FEIR explains that growth at the campus will be monitored through the CSU reporting requirements, including current and projected enrollment and capital outlay program. Because the environmental analyses conducted in the EIR utilize population characteristics and facilities development as a basis for determining impacts of the master plan, impact levels will be monitored by virtue of the growth reporting programs currently in place.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that upon consideration of the information contained in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan, the board finds that:

WHEREAS, The FEIR for the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures, and project alternatives associated with the approval of the master plan and all discretionary actions related thereto; and

WHEREAS, The FEIR for the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan (State Clearinghouse Number 97081036) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the state CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, This board, by this resolution, will certify that the FEIR 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); and

WHEREAS, This board hereby adopts the findings of fact in Attachment F which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures and which are hereby incorporated by reference; and

WHEREAS, The findings in Attachment F which are hereby incorporated by reference and adopted by this board include specific overriding considerations that outweigh certain remaining significant impacts; now, be it further

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

1. Preparation of an Environmental Impact Report

An FEIR has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act;

2. Review and Consideration by the Board of Trustees.

Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan 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. The DEIR for the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan;
- 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 meetings; and
- D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents specified in 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 and at the Office of Facility Planning, CSU Monterey Bay, 100 Campus Center, Seaside, California 93955.

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board adopts the findings set forth in Attachment G of CPB&G Agenda Item 4, May 12-13, 1998, including the rejection of mitigation measures presented in Part A, the identification of other agencies that are the proper agencies responsible for mitigation measures in Part B, and the other findings regarding agency proposals presented in Part C of Attachment G. The board specifically finds that the rejected mitigation measures were infeasible and describes the reasons for rejecting these measures in Part A of Attachment G of this resolution; and, be it further

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board hereby certifies the Final Environmental Impact Report for the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Board of Trustees of The California State University, hereby adopts the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan, dated May 1998; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the California State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan is adopted with the goal of serving a total enrollment of 25,000 FTES, of which approximately 8,300 FTES will be traditional on-campus enrollment and the remainder will be nontraditional off-campus students; 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 State University, Monterey Bay Physical Master Plan, Final Environmental Impact Report; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That 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 Matrix incorporated in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan, which is Attachment H, CPB&G Agenda Item 4, May 12-13, 1998, and which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resource Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor of The California State University is hereby authorized to negotiate and execute an agreement with FORA and local agencies that are a statutory part of FORA, which may specify:

- (1) The proportionate contribution of The California State University to Fort Ord area-wide infrastructure improvements as set forth in the FORA master plan and as determined to be directly related to development of the CSUMB campus, and
- (2) Those university support business uses that will be developed on the campus as an integral part of the university community, which clearly support the university mission, and may identify those projects that all parties recognize are within the autonomous planning authority of The California State University as an agency of the State of California.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 5
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify a Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California State University, Northridge

Presentation By

Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary

This item requests Board of Trustees' certification of a Final Master Environmental Impact Report (Final MEIR) and approval of the CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision for the entire 353-acre campus. The revision proposes specific building relocations required as a result of the Northridge earthquake, and identifies previously approved minor master plan revisions. It also includes the development of the 65-acre north campus area. In November 1997, new uses were proposed for the entire north campus, a preliminary site plan was prepared, and plans for development of the north campus were incorporated into the draft CSUN master plan.

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolution.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 5
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUND

Certify a Final Master Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for California State University, Northridge

Background

California State University, Northridge (CSUN) is located on approximately 353 acres and can be characterized as two "campuses": north and south (or main) campus which are separated by Lassen Street. The principal academic facilities are located on the south campus (288 acres). Student/staff apartments, an existing football stadium, surface parking lots, and undeveloped land currently comprise the north campus (approximately 65 acres). The proposed Master Plan Revision addresses the entire 353-acre campus.

The campus has over 100 buildings including classrooms, offices, administration, athletic facilities, on-campus housing, and physical plant management. A number of buildings sustained extensive damage during the 1994 Northridge earthquake. While many buildings have been repaired, some buildings that were extensively damaged have either been demolished or will soon be demolished. Following a two-week closure, the university reopened in February 1994 with the addition of 350 temporary trailers and several temporary dome structures.

This Master Plan Revision proposes relocation of buildings as a result of the earthquake, proposes revisions to the north campus, and identifies previously approved minor master plan revisions.

Campus Master Plan Proposal

Several new and reconstructed facilities are being proposed for the main campus and north campus. Projects funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and state matching funds include the demolition of specific buildings, replacement facilities for the demolished buildings, and conversion of buildings to new uses. The new replacement facilities will primarily be two- to three-story, low density structures located on appropriately sized sites.

The conceptual program for the development of the north campus includes proposed biotech and entertainment industry related uses. The northern portion of the site will be developed by the private sector with approximately 28 acres of biotech uses. This includes four two-story buildings for research and development, and a two-story conference center for lectures, meetings and other academic programs. Although the buildings will be built by the private sector for the university, the land will not be sold and the development will be supportive of CSUN's academic programs for its students, staff and faculty.

Entertainment-industry related uses (including sound stages and offices for pre- and post-production activities for films and movies, television and other entertainment modes) will be developed by the private sector on approximately 30 acres in the southern portion of north campus. The existing university village apartments (120 units on approximately 7 acres) will remain under the proposed master plan.

The proposed revisions are shown on Attachment A and are identified with a hexagon numbering system. Attachment B is the existing master plan. The improvements proposed for the main and north campuses include the following:

1. Relocate and expand the biotech research and development buildings (#78) into four buildings, and relocate conference center (#35). This eliminates the university inn (#74) and restaurants (#75) as future facilities.
2. Relocate two office buildings (#76) previously shown on the north campus plan. This results in the deletion of the aerospace/advanced technology center (#77).
3. Reconfigure media entertainment center (#73) from three buildings to five buildings.
4. Demolish university tower apartments (#95), fine arts (#1), and south library (old #5) buildings. The campus is deleting the future pedestrian overpass (#30) and a future addition to the satellite union and recreation center (#47).
5. Site a new administration building (new #5). With this siting, the memorial pool (#14) will be relocated and Etiwanda Avenue will be realigned. The old administration building will be converted into the student services center (#9).
6. Previously approved minor master plan revisions include:
 - a. Site a new health and human development (new #30) building. This causes the relocation of the center for communication studies (#18) building.
 - b. Site a new college of arts, media and communications (#1) building.
 - c. Site a new technology center (#117).
 - d. Site a new master distribution facility (#72). This causes two future lecture halls (#23) to be relocated to accommodate the telecommunications underground distribution.
7. Relocate future parking structures (#79 and #81).
8. Relocate botanical garden (#32) and softball field (#50). This correctly locates the existing botanical gardens, and deletes the future science addition 2 (#22.2).
9. Reconfigure corporation yard addition based on recently completed central plant and miscellaneous related structures (cooling tower (#87) and substation (#86) buildings. Reconfigure the future art and design center addition (#46).
10. Delete proposed future Multi-Purpose Stadium (#33).

Cost

The proposed Master Plan Revision will result in an increased capital outlay cost of approximately \$72,000,000. The campus estimates the earthquake related demolition, reconstruction, and conversion of noted facilities will cost \$70,000,000, and is fully funded by FEMA and state matching funds (90%-10% match). This estimate includes the work related to the administration; health and human development; college of arts, media and communications; technology center; and master distribution facility buildings. The relocation of the softball field is estimated at \$2,000,000 and will be donor funded. The relocation of previously planned future buildings is not anticipated to impact costs.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

An Initial Study and Notice of Preparation (NOP) was prepared for the proposed project (the master plan) in November 1997. In addition, a public scoping session was conducted by the university on December 4, 1997. Based on the comments received from the NOP, scoping session, and the Initial Study, a Draft Master Environmental Impact Report (Draft MEIR) was prepared. The Draft MEIR was submitted to the State Clearinghouse, Office of Planning and Research, on February 3, 1998, and to responsible agencies. Notice of the 45-day public review period was published. A copy of the Draft MEIR was provided to local business associations, homeowner associations, and others who have expressed an interest in the master plan, including the north campus development. A public hearing on the Draft MEIR was held at CSUN on February 25, 1998. The Final MEIR incorporates the results of comments received from the distribution of the Draft MEIR and is included with this item.

Public Input

CSUN received 33 comment letters on the proposed Master Plan Revision during the public review period for the Draft MEIR. Thirteen letters were received from state or local agencies, four letters were received from local neighborhood associations/community groups/private organizations, and 16 letters were received from individuals. Copies of the 33 letters received by CSUN are provided in the Final MEIR, Section VIII, with responses to comments provided immediately following each letter. In addition, the Draft MEIR has been subject to public comment at a public hearing conducted by CSUN on February 25, 1998. Summaries of oral comments presented at the public hearing and the responses are provided following the written comments and responses in the same section.

The comments primarily relate to the following issues: (1) traffic, circulation and parking impacts and associated noise and air quality impacts; (2) the impacts associated with the implementation of the draft CSUN master plan proposed loop road; (3) the development of the open air stadium, either on the north campus or on the main campus, and (4) uses within the biotech "light-industrial" development. Many of the comments from organizations and individuals expressed concerns specifically regarding construction of the proposed multi-purpose open air stadium adjacent to Lindley Avenue and related parking, traffic, and neighborhood intrusion by stadium users. Local homeowner associations organized letter-writing and petition campaigns that resulted in a number of local resident groups expressing their concern with these issues. Many questioned the need for a 15,000-seat stadium on the campus. Impacts associated with these issues are addressed in the Draft MEIR. Additional information in response to public concerns is provided in Section VIII of the Final MEIR. There is substantial public controversy regarding the stadium location as proposed in

the Draft MEIR (north campus master plan location) and its impacts upon the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Leaving the existing stadium site as presently shown on the CSUN Master Plan, approved by the Board of Trustees in September 1993, will mitigate a significant number of residents' concerns.

Identified Environmental Impacts

The Draft MEIR identified potential impacts associated with the proposed Master Plan Revision. The following potentially significant impacts were addressed and mitigation measures identified in the Draft MEIR: (a) land use; (b) transportation (circulation); (c) noise; (d) air quality; (e) public services; and (f) geology. Based on the analysis conducted for the Draft MEIR and implementation of proposed mitigation measures, these impacts are categorized as either less-than-significant, significant but mitigated to less-than-significant, or remaining significant and unavoidable.

Summary of Impacts Determined to be Less-than-Significant

Land Use

Implementation of the Master Plan Revision would not result in any substantial alterations to the existing land use pattern on the main campus or surrounding area. Although the uses proposed for the north campus site are not comparable to the adjacent residential uses, they would be of the same scale and character as the southern 288-acre portion of the campus. The stadium will remain at its currently approved (September 1993) master plan site on the south campus.

Water

The ultimate build-out of the Master Plan Revision would require 740,520 gallons of water per day, an increase in demand of 211,300 gallons per day compared to existing conditions. It is not expected that this increase in water demand would significantly affect existing water allocations. Mitigation measures are proposed to be adopted, although the impact is less-than-significant.

Police Protection Services

No significant adverse impacts are anticipated. Mitigation measures are proposed to be adopted, although the impact is less-than-significant.

Summary of Impacts Determined to Be Significant

Pursuant to and in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, the Draft MEIR identified potential adverse impacts associated with project implementation on transportation, air quality, noise, aesthetics and light and glare, earth resources, and public services and facilities. However, project requirements will include mitigation of these impacts, in whole or in part, as follows:

Significant Impacts Reduced to Less-than-Significant

Mitigation measures are feasible for each of the following impacts to reduce potential impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Fire Protection Services

Project implementation would result in an increased demand for fire protection services and emergency medical services. Ten mitigation measures have been identified to bring the impacts to a less-than-significant level.

Aesthetics and Light and Glare

The adoption and subsequent implementation of the Master Plan Revision will result in beneficial aesthetic impacts. Mitigation measures are not required because there are no significant adverse impacts. North campus stadium lighting mitigation measures are no longer needed, since the stadium will remain at the currently approved (September 1993) master plan site on the south campus.

Earth Resources

Southern California is a seismically active region and thus all new and existing development is susceptible to sustaining damage during strong seismic events. No impacts associated with other geologic hazards or topography are anticipated.

Sanitary Sewer

The existing sewer system on the campus is inadequate and requires upgrading and significant improvements. Treatment of wastewater generated by campus facilities is not expected to have a significant impact on City of Los Angeles facilities. Capital improvements addressed in the Master Plan Revision include upgrading the sewer system and fitting the proposed buildings and landscaping irrigation systems with water efficient devices to reduce the amount of sewage generated on campus.

Impacts that Remain Significant after Mitigation

Mitigation measures are feasible and would partially and substantially reduce each of the following impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. The project's contribution to exceedances of local standards after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures is anticipated to remain a significant adverse impact which would require adoption of a statement of overriding consideration with regard to each impact as a condition of project approval. The statement of overriding considerations in Attachment C has been prepared to provide the necessary findings for project approval.

Solid Waste

There is limited daily capacity and long-term disposal capacity available at Los Angeles County landfills. Build-out of the Master Plan Revision would increase solid waste generated on the campus and contribute to the ultimate exhaustion of the lifespan of the Calabasas Landfill, resulting in a significant impact.

Noise

Construction Impact: Construction activities would increase noise levels to unacceptable levels in the project vicinity. This would be a temporary significant impact. Mitigation measures would reduce noise levels in the project vicinity, but not to acceptable levels for residential uses, particularly those adjacent to the project site.

Stadium Impact: Impacts would occur as a result of spectator noise and sound amplification, as well as from parking lot activities and bus movements from events at the football stadium. Noise levels generated by spectators remaining in parking areas for tail gate parties, and bus movements after nighttime events could cause significant impacts to nearest residential receptors. Location of the stadium as approved in September 1993 will substantially mitigate these impacts.

Air Quality

Construction of the proposed developments on the main campus and the north campus would result in short-term construction emissions which would remain below the thresholds of significance during the entire construction period for all the criteria pollutants with the exception of NOx emissions. Long-term operational emissions from stationary and mobile sources would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance for CO, ROC and NOx.

Transportation

The traffic impact analyses determined that traffic generated by the proposed Master Plan Revision would generate significant project impacts at 18 of the 21 intersections analyzed in this study after the completion of Phase I. At buildout of Phase II by Year 2008, 19 of the 21 analyzed intersections are projected to have significant impacts. Significant impacts are projected to remain after implementation of mitigation measures at 11 of the 19 impacted intersections.

Alternatives Analysis

As required by the CEQA, the Draft MEIR addressed alternatives to the proposed Master Plan Revision. The alternatives section of the Draft MEIR has been prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15126(d), which requires the analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse environmental effects associated with the proposed project. The alternatives section contains an analysis of the effects of a "No Project" alternative and identifies environmentally superior alternatives.

Five alternatives to the proposed project are evaluated in the Draft MEIR. These alternatives were selected to illustrate the range of alternative actions the CSU system can take regarding the Master Plan Revision, and the environmental impacts associated with each alternative.

1. **No Project Alternative (Alternative A):** This alternative assumes the existing master plan would remain in effect for the foreseeable future. At the main campus, only earthquake-related repairs and replacements would take place (such as the new administration building; the new college of arts, media and communications buildings; the replacement of the Oviatt Library wings; the new health and human development building; and the new information technology and research building). All other projects and buildings (such as the realignment of Etiwanda Avenue, the concert hall and other future buildings, the loop road and the parking structures) would not be built. For the north campus, the no project alternative means the retention of the existing buildings, including the north campus library annex, the existing football stadium, and surface parking areas. One exception is the demolition of the university tower apartments, which will be completed in July 1998.

2. **Alternative Site Plan (Alternative B):** For the main campus, the alternative site plan assumes the development of the replacement and/or the construction of new buildings without the construction of the three proposed parking structures. For the north campus, the new stadium would not be developed; instead, the 12 acres would be developed with additional entertainment industry-related and academic facilities. Under this alternative, the new 15,000-seat stadium would be built on the main campus.
3. **Lower Density Alternative (Alternative C):** This alternative has two variations or scenarios. Both alternatives assume 480,000 square feet for the biotech uses (rather than 680,000 to 720,000 square feet as proposed). However, the first scenario assumes no athletic facilities (with the 12 acres devoted to entertainment-related and academic uses). The second scenario assumes only 18 acres devoted to entertainment-related uses and only a 12,000-seat stadium on the north campus.
4. **Light-Industrial Only Development on North Campus:** Under this alternative, 58 acres of the 65 acres of the north campus area would be developed with light-industrial and related uses (such as research and development similar to the biotech industry uses envisioned in the proposed project). The existing university village apartments (7 acres) would remain. This alternative assumes a 15,000-seat open-air athletic facility built on the main campus. For the main campus, this alternative assumes the development as proposed in the draft CSUN master plan. All future buildings and facilities for the main campus, as proposed in the draft CSUN master plan, would still be implemented.
5. **Entertainment Industry Only Development on North Campus:** Under this alternative, 58 acres of the 65 acres of the north campus area would be developed with entertainment-industry and related uses; the existing university village apartments (7 acres) would remain. This alternative assumes a 15,000-seat open-air athletic facility built on the main campus. All future buildings and facilities for the main campus, as proposed in the draft CSUN master plan, would still be implemented.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

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

1. A Final MEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 97121003) has been prepared to address the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the California State University, Northridge Master Plan Revision, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act;
2. Prior to certification of the Final MEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above mentioned Final MEIR. CSUN has recommended and the board accepts the proposal that the stadium be removed from the master plan. Comments on the Draft EIR identified many objections from local residents to the stadium and its projected impacts. The board finds that the removal of the stadium will eliminate many adverse traffic, noise and glare impacts and will not result in any adverse environmental impact. The Final meir therefore has analyzed all project impacts. The board hereby certifies the Final MEIR for the California State University, Northridge, Master Plan Revision as complete and adequate in that the Final MEIR 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 the California Environmental Quality Act, the record of the proceedings for the project is comprised of the following:

- A. The Draft MEIR for the California State University, Northridge, Master Plan Revision;
- B. The Final MEIR including comments received on the Draft MEIR 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 meetings.
- D. Attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents specified in 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 and the Office of Facilities Planning, CSU Northridge, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, California 91330.

And, be it further

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board certifies the Final MEIR for the California State University, Northridge Master Plan Revision, dated May 1998, 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 State University, Northridge Master Plan Revision, dated May 1998; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That all of the mitigation measures and all of the findings, including the Statement of Overriding Considerations in Attachment C, Agenda Item 5, of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds are hereby adopted and the mitigations shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Table, incorporated in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan which is adopted and which is contained in Attachment D, Agenda Item 5, of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds and which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the California State University, Northridge Master Plan Revision, dated May 1998, is approved.

ATTACHMENT C
CPB&G—Item 5
May 12-13, 1998

California State University, Northridge

Campus Master Plan Revision

Findings of Fact

and Statement of Overriding Considerations

Pursuant to Sections 15091 and 15093 of the State CEQA Guidelines and
Section 21081.6 of the Public Resources Code

Final Master Environmental Impact Report
State Clearinghouse Number 97121003

2
ATTACHMENT C
CPB&G—Item 5
May 12-13, 1998

Project Files May Be Reviewed at:
California State University, Northridge
Office of Facilities Planning
18111 Nordhoff Street
Northridge, California 91330

May 1998

Table of Contents

Section 1.	Introduction and Purpose
Section 2.	Findings on Project Alternatives Considered in the Environmental Impact Report
	A. No Project Alternative
	B. Alternative Site Plan
	C1. Lower Density Alternative #1
	C2. Lower Density Alternative #2
	D. Light-Industrial Only Development on North Campus
	E. Entertainment Industry Only Development on North Campus
Section 3.	Findings on Significant and Potentially Significant Impacts of the Proposed Project Identified in the Draft Master EIR and Final Master EIR
	Transportation
	Air Quality
	Noise
	Aesthetics and Light and Glare
	Earth Resources
	Public Services and Facilities
	Sanitary Sewers
	Solid Waste
	Fire Protection Services
Section 4.	Mitigation Measures for Less-than-Significant Impacts
	Land Use
	Noise
	Public Services and Facilities
	Water
	Police Protection Services
Section 5.	Statement of Overriding Considerations
Section 6.	Citations
	Printed References

SECTION 1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE

This statement of findings and overriding considerations, pursuant to Section 15093 of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, addresses the environmental effects associated with construction and operations of California State University, Northridge (CSUN) under its Campus Master Plan May 1998. The adverse environmental impacts, including potentially significant impacts of the project, were identified in the Environmental Impact Report (EIR). They are provided herein in accordance with Article VI, Section 9.5 of the Los Angeles City CEQA Guidelines and Article 7, Section 15091 of the state CEQA Guidelines as revised on August 1, 1983.

The CSUN Campus Master Plan May 1998, Draft Master Environmental Impact Report (Draft Master EIR) identified significant environmental impacts which will result from the implementation of the updated Master Plan. Based on comments received by CSUN from responsible agencies and the public, the Final Master EIR includes additional clarification regarding the potential impacts. Section 15091 of the CEQA Guidelines requires that the Lead Agency issue written findings for those significant impacts, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale for each finding. The California State University (CSU) Board of Trustees is the Lead Agency responsible for the preparation of the EIR in compliance with CEQA.

In accordance with Section 15093 of the CEQA Guidelines, whenever significant impacts cannot be substantially mitigated, benefits of the proposed project must be balanced against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. The Lead Agency must provide a Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations where the decision of the Lead Agency allows the occurrence of significant effects which are identified in the Final Master EIR, but are not at least substantially mitigated. Section 15091 and Section 21081 (Findings) of CEQA state in part that:

“No public agency shall approve or carry out a project for which an environmental impact report has been completed which identifies one or more significant effects on the environment that would occur if the project is approved or carried out unless both of the following occur:

- a) The public agency makes one or more of the following findings with respect to each significant effect:
 - (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid significant effects on the environment.
 - (2) Those changes or alterations are within the responsibility and jurisdiction of another public agency and have been, or can and should be, adopted by that other agency.
 - (3) Specific economic, legal, social, technological or other considerations, including considerations for the provision of employment opportunities for highly trained workers, make infeasible the mitigation measures or alternatives identified in the environmental impact report.

- b) With respect to significant effects which were subject to a finding under paragraph (3) of subdivision (a), the public agency finds that specific overriding economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the significant effects on the environment.”

This document is divided into the following six sections:

- Section 1. Introduction and Purpose;
- Section 2. Findings on Project Alternatives Considered in the Environmental Impact Report;
- Section 3. Findings on Significant and Potentially Significant Impacts of the Proposed Project Identified in the Draft Master EIR/Final Master EIR;
- Section 4. Mitigation Measures for Less-than-Significant Impacts;
- Section 5. Statement of Overriding Considerations; and
- Section 6. Citations.

PROJECT BACKGROUND

In January 1994, the CSUN campus sustained extensive damage due to the Northridge earthquake. Every building was affected and many buildings were irreparably damaged and were required to be demolished. Following a month-long closure, the university reopened in February 1994 with the addition of 350 temporary trailers and several temporary domes.

In early 1995, following the university’s initial earthquake recovery effort in 1994, CSUN began to re-explore uses for the north campus area to generate revenue to support the university’s educational mission. CSUN undertook a public-selection process to build a public-private partnership to foster this development. In September 1995, CSUN sent a Request for Qualifications to more than 150 real estate development firms across the country and received responses from nine development firms in November 1995. The concepts ranged from 20 acres to 65 acres of development on the north campus, including housing, a sports arena/performing arts complex, a golf driving range, and several combinations of retail development on Devonshire Street.

Following selection of a retail development, the University MarketCenter, a Draft EIR was prepared. However, due to community concerns, the project was downscaled. A task force comprised of community members from business associations, chambers of commerce, homeowners groups, and university staff, faculty, students and alumni was established in April 1997 to develop a concept plan for the 65-acre north campus area. The concept plan includes a variety of uses including a hotel/conference center, movie studios/production facilities, research and development facilities, retail, and a football stadium. In September 1997, it was determined that the anticipated revenue from the revised University MarketCenter did not merit development of the project as proposed, and plans for the project were discontinued.

The current proposals for the north campus are the result of proposals submitted to CSUN staff to implement the concept plan proposed by the university’s task force, primarily the result of suggestions offered by staff of L.A.’s Business Team, Office of Mayor Riordan, City of Los Angeles.

The proposed project evaluated in the Final Master EIR is the implementation of an updated Campus Master Plan for the entire 353-acre CSUN campus. The Campus Master Plan is a comprehensive campus-wide planning tool which proposes specific physical improvement projects, establishes design guidelines which will guide future development, and identifies future projects and their locations. The components of the proposed project range from design guidelines to site plans for specific buildings.

Initially, the process for the preparation of the Campus Master Plan update did not address development on the north campus area. However, in November 1997, new uses were proposed for the entire 65 acres of the north campus, a preliminary site plan was prepared, and the north campus area was incorporated into the draft CSUN Campus Master Plan.

INITIAL STUDY AND NOTICE OF PREPARATION

In accordance with Section 15063 of the CEQA Guidelines, a Lead Agency must conduct an Initial Study following preliminary review of the project. The Initial Study for the subject EIR was developed based upon early review of the proposed project. Based on results of the Initial Study and public response, it was determined that a Master EIR was required. On November 17, 1997, CSUN distributed a Notice of Preparation, including the Initial Study, to all responsible agencies, interested agencies, and interested groups and individuals, soliciting their comments. The State Clearinghouse assigned this EIR the SCH No. 97121003.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

CSUN has prepared the EIR in accordance with CEQA Statutes and Guidelines, June 1986, pursuant to Section 21151 of CEQA. CSUN has supervised the preparation of this Master EIR. The EIR is a full-disclosure informational document which will inform and assist public agency decision makers and the general public of the significant environmental effects of the project. Possible ways to minimize significant effects are identified in the Master EIR, and reasonable alternatives to the project are evaluated. This document assesses the environmental impacts, including unavoidable adverse impacts and cumulative impacts, which may result from the implementation of the CSUN Campus Master Plan update. This EIR is also intended to support the permitting process of all agencies whose discretionary approvals must be obtained for particular elements of this project.

The Draft Master EIR was made available to the public for review on February 3, 1998. A 45-day public review of the Draft Master EIR was completed on March 20, 1997. All comment letters received were reviewed, and they are reprinted in the Final EIR along with responses to all substantive comments. Agencies and citizens who received copies of the Draft Master EIR are included in Section VIII, Comments and Responses to Comments of the Final Master EIR.

Areas of Public Concern and Local Controversy

CSUN received 33 comment letters during the public review period, and no letters after close of the review period. Thirteen letters were received from state agencies or local agencies, four letters were received from local neighborhood associations/community groups/private organizations, and 16 letters were received from individuals, as noted in the following list:

Letter No. Agency

1	County Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County
2	City of Los Angeles Fire Department
3	City of Los Angeles Police Department
4	Southern California Association of Governments
5	City of Los Angeles Department of Public Works, Bureau of Street Lighting
6	City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering
7	Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority
8	Los Angeles Unified School District
9	City of Los Angeles Department of Building and Safety
10	South Coast Air Quality Management District
11	City of Los Angeles Department of City Planning
12	City of Los Angeles Department of Transportation
33	Office of Planning and Research (letters were numbered based on chronological order)

In addition to the twelve written letters received from responsible agencies, CSUN has received written comments from several local residents and associations. Letters received by the CSUN relative to the Draft Master EIR, provided immediately following the letters from responsible agencies, are from the following:

<u>Letter No.</u>	<u>Organization/Individual</u>
13	Sorris M. Bohanan
14	Ronald and Judith Hall
15	Roger Waldbaum
16	Cynthia Gallety
17	Frank Capka
18	La Villanueva Homeowners Association
19	Garth Beveridge
20	Wilner, Klein & Siegel
21	Northridge Townhome Estates - letters from 120 members
22	Lawrence Dunham and Linda Marie-Dunham
23	Nadine McNulty
24	Patricia and Robert LoPresti
25	Jerry G. O'Neill
26	Leon Gerhardt
27	Lindley West Coalition
28	Douglas A. Parker
29	Kelly and Catherine Lord
30	Hans E. Phillips and Paula Phillips
31	Mr. and Mrs. George F. Coger
32	Jo Ann Riley and Berenice Moises

In addition, the Draft Master EIR has been subject to public comment at a public hearing conducted by CSUN on February 25, 1998. Summaries of oral comments presented at the public hearing and the responses are provided following the written comments and responses to the written comments.

Several of the comments from organizations and individuals expressed concerns regarding the construction of the proposed multi-purpose open air stadium. To avoid repetitious responses, one response (Topical Response A) was prepared for the Responses to Comments (Section VIII of the Final Master EIR) with several subsections to address the various concerns raised by the public relating to the proposed stadium. The comments on the Draft Master EIR and responses to comments are provided in Section VIII of the Final EIR. The comments primarily relate to the following issues: (1) traffic, circulation and parking impacts caused by the increase in full-time student enrollment and associated noise and air quality impacts; (2) the impacts associated with the implementation of the draft Campus Master Plan's proposed loop road; (3) the development of the open air stadium, either on the north campus or on the main campus. Local homeowners associations organized letter-writing and petition campaigns that resulted in a number of local residents expressing their concern with these issues, particularly the development of a new stadium on the campus. Impacts associated with these three issues are addressed in the Draft Master EIR and additional information to respond to public concerns is provided in Section VIII of the Final Master EIR. Nonetheless, there is still substantial public controversy regarding the location of the new stadium.

Summary of Significant Impacts

Pursuant to and in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, the Master EIR identifies potential adverse impacts associated with project implementation on transportation, air quality, noise, aesthetics and light and glare, earth resources, and public services and facilities. However, project requirements will include mitigation of these impacts, in whole or in part, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION

Impact: The traffic impact analyses determined that traffic generated by the proposed Campus Master Plan would generate significant project impacts at 18 of the 21 intersections analyzed in this study after the completion of Phase I. At buildout of Phase II by Year 2008, 19 of the 21 analyzed intersections are projected to have significant impacts.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures T1 through T24 are feasible and would partially reduce impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures for Phase I would allow for significant impacts to be mitigated to levels of insignificance at 12 of the 18 impacted intersections. However, significant impacts are projected to remain after the implementation of mitigation measures at 6 of the 18 affected intersections. These include the following:

- Reseda Boulevard and Rinaldi Street
- Zelzah Avenue and Devonshire Street
- Zelzah Avenue and Lassen Street

- Zelzah Avenue and Nordhoff Street
- Balboa Boulevard and Devonshire Street
- I-405 Freeway southbound ramps/Blucher Avenue and Devonshire Street

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures for Phase II would allow for significant impacts to be mitigated to levels of insignificance at 8 of the 19 impacted intersections. Significant impacts are projected to remain after implementation of mitigation measures at 11 of the 19 impacted intersections. These include the six intersections in Phase I plus the following:

- Amigo Avenue/State Route 118 Freeway westbound ramps and Rinaldi Street
- Reseda Boulevard and State Route 118 Freeway eastbound ramps
- Reseda Boulevard and Devonshire Street
- Reseda Boulevard and Lassen Street
- Lindley Avenue and Lassen Street

This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

AIR QUALITY

Impact: Preparation of each site on the main campus and the proposed north campus developments would result in short-term exhaust emissions from demolition and grading equipment, fugitive dust emissions, and vehicle emissions. Estimated daily average construction emissions would remain below the thresholds of significance during the entire construction period for all the criteria pollutants with the exception of NO_x emissions.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures A1 through A13 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Development of the project would have a significant adverse effect on NO_x concentration levels during project construction. Construction of the proposed project would have a short-term significant unavoidable impact on air quality (NO_x). This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Impact: Long-term operational emissions from stationary and mobile sources would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance for CO, ROC and NO_x. Stationary sources (natural gas and electrical consumption) on their own would not result in significant impacts. The proposed project is estimated to generate a total of 66,140 daily trips (including existing trip volumes), which are equivalent to approximately 793,680 vehicle miles per day (VMD). Estimated daily emissions associated with project-generated VMDs would exceed the thresholds of significance for CO, ROC, and NO_x. Although the project would contribute to violations of air quality standards, it would be consistent with the AQMP as the proposed project is within the population and growth projections contained in the AQMP.

Finding:

CSU finds that Mitigation Measures A14 through A25 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Providing convenient access to public transportation and implementing a Transportation Demand Management Program would enable partial reduction of the project's contribution to local increases in pollution. However, the project's contribution to exceedances of local standards after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures is anticipated to remain a significant adverse impact. Sensitive receptors in the project vicinity would be subject to adverse conditions resulting from increases in pollutant concentrations associated with the proposed project and pollutant concentrations projected for the area. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

NOISE

Impact: Construction activities would increase noise levels to unacceptable levels in the project vicinity intermittently, depending on the construction activity and the types of construction equipment used. This would be a temporary significant impact in the vicinity of each construction site and would cease after completion of construction.

Finding: Construction of the proposed project would increase noise levels in the project vicinity to unacceptable levels intermittently, depending on the construction activity and the types of equipment used. CSU finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures N1 through N9 would reduce noise levels in the project vicinity, but not to acceptable levels for residential uses, particularly those adjacent to the project site. Therefore, construction noise would be a short-term significant impact, which would cease after completion of construction activities. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Impact: Impacts would occur as a result of spectator noise and sound amplification from operation of the football stadium.

Spectator Noise: Based on a capacity crowd of 15,000 people at the proposed football stadium, residential receptors located along Devonshire Street, Zelzah Avenue, and Lassen Street would experience spectator noise levels which would exceed the noise ordinance standards during daytime and nighttime events. These noise levels would occur when all the spectators are cheering or yelling in unison and lower noise levels would be experienced during periods of reduced crowd capacity or crowd cheering.

Sound Amplification System/Band: Sound level would be expected to exceed the noise ordinance standards at the majority of residential receptors during daytime events (with the exception of the residential receptors located along Devonshire Street). For nighttime events, the noise ordinance standards would be exceeded at all the nearest residential receptor locations.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures N10 through N12 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. The future football stadium operations and associated sound amplification system would be expected to generate

noise levels that would at the very least be discernible at the nearest residential receptors. Although stadium events would be limited to less than 30 events per year, the noise may be a source of annoyance during the nighttime hours, which would be considered an adverse impact. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Impact: Impacts would occur as a result of parking lot activities from operation of the football stadium. Noise levels generated by spectators remaining in parking areas for tail gate parties, and/or playing of radios after nighttime events could cause significant impacts to nearest residential receptors.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures N13 and N14 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Stadium parking lot activities in connection with future football stadium operations would be expected to generate noise levels that would, at the very least, be discernible at the nearest residential receptors. Although stadium events would be limited to less than 30 events per year, the noise from parking lot activities may be a source of annoyance during the nighttime hours, which would be considered an adverse impact. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Impact: Impacts would occur as a result of bus movements in connection with football stadium events. Noise from chartered buses after 10:00 p.m. would be a source of annoyance to the nearest residences which would border the access roads.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measure N15 is feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Noise generated by bus movements in connection with stadium events would be expected to, at the very least, be discernible at the nearest residential receptors. Although stadium events would be limited to less than 30 events per year, the noise from bus movements may be a source of annoyance during the nighttime hours, which would be considered an adverse impact. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

AESTHETICS AND LIGHT AND GLARE

Impact: The adoption and subsequent implementation of the CSUN Campus Master Plan will result in beneficial aesthetic impacts. The Campus Master Plan will redefine the campus through the establishment of a hierarchy of elements including landscaping, open space, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, lighting, and signage.

Finding: CSU finds that mitigation measures are not required because there are no significant adverse impacts. The project would result in significant beneficial impacts to the aesthetic environment.

Impact: No intrusive light or glare sources would be created by the adoption and subsequent implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan.

Finding: CSU finds that mitigation measures are not required because there are no significant adverse impacts.

EARTH RESOURCES

Impact: Southern California is a seismically active region and thus all new and existing development is susceptible to sustaining damage during strong seismic events. No impacts associated with other geologic hazards or topography are anticipated.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures ER1 through ER4 are feasible and would reduce potential risks to less-than-significant levels.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Sanitary Sewer

Impact: Build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan would result in sewage generation of approximately 549,920 gallons per day, an increase of 157,920 gallons per day compared to existing conditions which could result in a potentially significant impact on the existing sewer system on campus, as well as local sewer lines (which are near or at capacity). The existing sewer system on the CSUN campus is inadequate and requires upgrading and significant improvements. Capital improvements, addressed in the Master Plan, include upgrading the sewer system and fitting the proposed buildings and landscaping irrigation systems with water efficient devices to reduce the amount of sewage generated on campus. Treatment of wastewater generated by CSUN campus facilities is not expected to have a significant impact on the Donald C. Tillman Reclamation Plant. However, the existing sewer lines may need to be upgraded to accommodate the project's sewage flow as the sewer lines discharge into the main sewer.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS1 through PS5 are feasible and would reduce potential impacts on existing sewer lines and wastewater treatment facilities to a less-than-significant level. Project implementation, however, would still result in an incremental increase in sewage generation.

Solid Waste

Impact: Build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan would result in the generation of approximately 273,400 pounds of solid waste per day, an increase of 77,400 pounds per day compared to existing conditions. Although private haulers can adequately service the project site, there is limited daily capacity and long-term disposal capacity available at Los Angeles County landfills. Build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan could have a potentially significant impact on the availability of daily and long-term disposal capacity.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS6 through PS8 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Project implementation would increase the amount of solid waste generated on the CSUN campus by 77,400 pounds per day, which would contribute to the ultimate exhaustion of the lifespan of the Calabasas Landfill, resulting in a significant impact. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Fire Protection Services

Impact: Project implementation would result in an increased demand for fire protection services and emergency medical services.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS9 through PS18 are feasible and would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

Summary of Less-than-Significant Impact

LAND USE

Impact: Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not result in any substantial alterations to the existing land use pattern on the main campus or surrounding area nor would it create any nonconforming uses. Although the uses proposed for the north campus site are not comparable to the residential uses, they would be of same scale and character as the southern 288-acre portion of the CSUN campus.

The proposed Campus Master Plan update implements the CSU policies [set forth by the applicable sections of the state Education Code Master Plan (Sections 66600, 66606, 89080, 89036 and 89046)] both through (1) physical improvements for the main campus and (2) a development proposal for the north campus to develop public-private partnerships to generate income to support student programs to further the university's educational mission.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measure LU3 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

NOISE

Impact: Although not significant, noise would occur from general operations of north campus and main campus activities.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures N16 through N21 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Water

Impact: The ultimate build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan would require 740,520 gallons of water per day, an increase in demand of 211,300 gallons per day compared to existing conditions. It is not expected that this increase in water demand would significantly affect existing water allocations. Although the city does not face a water shortage in terms of water rights and entitlement, there is still a need to conserve water as a valuable natural resource and water should be conserved in southern California even in years of normal climate.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS19 through PS27 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

Police Protection Services

Impact: No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS28 through PS33 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

SECTION 2. FINDINGS ON PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

The alternatives section of the Master EIR (Section V, Alternatives) is prepared in accordance with CEQA Guidelines 15126(d), which requires the analysis of a reasonable range of alternatives capable of eliminating or reducing significant adverse environmental effects associated with the proposed project. The alternatives section contains an analysis of the effects of a No Project alternative and is intended to identify any environmentally superior alternative. The following alternatives were considered:

Alternative A - No Project Alternative: This alternative assumes the existing Campus Master Plan will remain in effect for the foreseeable future. In terms of the main CSUN campus, only earthquake-related repairs and replacements would take place. For the north campus, the No Project alternative means the retention of the existing buildings (with the exception of the University Tower Apartments scheduled for demolition).

Alternative B - Alternative Site Plan: For the main campus, the alternative site plan assumes the development of the replacement and/or the construction of new buildings but without the construction of the three proposed parking structures. All design-related proposals (new signage, landscaping and lighting) would still occur. For the north campus, the new stadium would not be developed; instead, the 12 acres would be developed with additional entertainment industry-related uses and academic facilities and uses. Under this alternative, the new stadium (15,000 seats) would be built on CSUN's main campus in the area southeast of Lindley/Halsted.

Alternative C - Lower Density Alternative: This alternative has two variations, or scenarios. Both alternatives assumes 480,000 square feet for the biotech uses (rather than 640,000 square feet as proposed) and a 40,000-square-foot conference center for academic purposes. However, the first scenario assumes no athletic facilities (with the 12 acres devoted to entertainment-related and academic uses). The second scenario assumes only 18 acres devoted to entertainment-related uses and only a 12,000-seat stadium on the north campus.

Alternative D - Light-Industrial Only Development on North Campus: Under this alternative, 58 acres of the 65 acres of the north campus area would be developed with light-industrial uses; the existing University Village Apartments (7 acres) would remain. This alternative assumes a 15,000-seat open-air athletic facility built on the main campus. All future buildings and facilities for the main campus, as proposed in the Draft Campus Master Plan, and all proposed design-related improvements would still be implemented and applied to both development on the main campus and the north campus.

Alternative E - Entertainment Industry Only Development on North Campus: Under this alternative, 58 acres of the 65 acres of the north campus area would be developed with entertainment-industry and related uses; the existing University Village Apartments (7 acres) would remain. This alternative assumes a 15,000-seat open-air athletic facility built on the main campus. All future buildings and facilities for the main campus, as proposed in the Draft Campus Master Plan, and all design-related improvements would still be implemented and applied to both development on the main campus and the north campus.

NO PROJECT ALTERNATIVE

Compared to the proposed project, the No Project Alternative would result in the following types of impacts:

Under the “no-project” alternative, the environmental characteristics would be generally the same as for the proposed project. No new impacts would be expected in the areas of Earth Resources (Geologic Hazards), Air Quality, Noise, Visual Quality and Aesthetics, Land Use, and Public Services and Utilities.

While the university’s contribution to increased traffic flow would not occur, cumulative development would cause a degradation of the level of service of all area intersections; current development of CSUN generates approximately 46,450 daily vehicle trips (and the proposed Campus Master Plan, at build-out, would generate approximately 64,980 vehicle trips per day). The need to improve area circulation is a future implication whether or not the Campus Master Plan update is approved and implemented. No new parking or access demand would be created.

Finding: Alternative Infeasible

CSU finds the No Project Alternative infeasible because it would not achieve CSU or CSUN long-term objectives. The university’s objectives of enabling CSUN to generate new revenue from public/private partnerships, as reflected in the proposed north campus development, would not be achieved. Further, the objective to expand student educational facilities through public/private partnerships,

which would be achieved through the north campus development, would also not be achieved by this alternative. Specifically, the No Project Alternative would not improve campus-wide facilities and efficiencies, including, but not limited to improved facilities for teaching, improved efficiencies for students, staff and faculty by locating similar uses in proximity to each other, improve parking facilities and improved access to parking through the development of a loop-road, aesthetics, and safety (through improved lighting).

ALTERNATIVE SITE PLAN ALTERNATIVE

Compared to the proposed project, the Alternative Site Plan Alternative would result in the following types of impacts:

This alternative would have similar land use impacts as the proposed project. This alternative would represent an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development of approximately 20 percent as compared to the proposed north campus development; for the main (academic) campus, the scope of development is relatively comparable with the exception of the introduction of an open-air stadium on the main campus.

For this alternative, daily and peak hour trips are slightly more than would be generated by the proposed Campus Master Plan; specifically, an increase from 66,140 daily trips (a 1.3 percent increase). This alternative would still result in impacts at the same intersections affected by the proposed Campus Master Plan.

Construction emissions for this alternative are approximately four percent more than the construction-related daily emissions associated with the development of the proposed Campus Master Plan. As with the proposed project, these estimated emissions would exceed, unless mitigation measures are applied, SCAQMD threshold limits for the criteria for NO_x. Under this alternative, air pollution emissions from vehicular sources would be less in comparison to the proposed project. With approximately 1.3 percent more daily trips generated, this alternative would be expected to have the same impact on air quality than the proposed Master Plan. At area intersections, this alternative would contribute lower concentrations of CO to local levels than the project as currently proposed. However, as with the proposed master plan update, this alternative would not be consistent with the AQMP as its operation would result in the exceedance of the CO, ROC, and NO_x threshold limits.

The noise impacts due to construction may be slightly less because this alternative would have less construction activities, due to its reduced scale. Traffic generated under this alternative would increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the campus particularly due to this alternative's non-development of the proposed loop-road system. The construction of the future open-air stadium on the main campus (near Lindley and Halsted) would increase event-related noise impacts on the main campus (including short-term increases in noise levels affecting the residential uses north of Halsted Street and west of Lindley Avenue).

The construction of this alternative would result in similar visual impacts and light and glare for both the main campus and the north campus areas in comparison to the proposed Campus Master Plan update, except for the greater light and glare from the stadium.

All potential impacts related to earth resources would be similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan update for both the main campus and the north campus areas. The impacts associated with strong ground shaking and the seismic safety of buildings on the site would be less for this alternative than for the proposed project because the concentration of buildings and people on the site would be less.

This alternative would affect the same services as the draft Campus Master Plan. Impacts on utilities (water supply, sewer, storm drains, and solid waste) would be less under this alternative than the project due to less intensive development. Energy would be consumed during the alternative project's site preparation for grading operations and material transfer by heavy-duty equipment, but less than the project.

Finding: Alternative Infeasible

This alternative would represent an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development by approximately 20 percent as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan; this alternative would represent a decrease of approximately 20 percent of the potential development on the main campus. However, CSU finds this alternative infeasible because the services, amenities, and increased efficiencies that would result from implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan (such as locating student support services and facilities, including the library, student union, administration building and student services buildings in proximity to each other) would be less for this alternative in comparison with the Campus Master Plan as proposed.

LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE #1

Compared to the proposed project, the Lower Density Alternative #1 would result in the following types of impacts:

This alternative would have similar land use impacts as the proposed project. This alternative would represent an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development of approximately 25 percent as compared to the proposed north campus development; for the main (academic) campus, the scope of development is relatively comparable with the exception of the introduction of an open-air stadium on the main campus.

Compared to the proposed project, this alternative would generate approximately one percent less trips than the proposed Campus Master Plan. Therefore, this alternative would generate approximately the same impacts at the intersections studied for the proposed Campus Master Plan.

These emissions are approximately seven percent less than the total construction emissions associated with the development of the proposed Campus Master Plan. These estimated emissions would not exceed SCAQMD threshold limits for all the criteria pollutants except for NOx. Under this alternative, air pollution emissions from vehicular sources would be less in comparison to the proposed project. With less than one percent fewer daily trips generated, this alternative would be expected to have the same impact on air quality as the proposed Campus Master Plan. At area intersections, this alternative would contribute lower concentrations of CO to local

levels than the Campus Master Plan as proposed. However, as with the proposed master plan update, this alternative would not be consistent with the AQMP as its operation would result in the exceedance of the CO, ROC, and NO_x threshold limits.

Traffic generated under this alternative would increase existing ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the campus. The construction of the future open-air stadium on the main campus (near Lindley and Halsted) would increase event-related noise impacts on the main campus (including short-term increases in noise levels affecting the residential uses north of Halsted Street and west of Lindley Avenue).

The construction of this alternative would result in similar visual impacts and light and glare for both the main campus and the north campus areas in comparison to the proposed Campus Master Plan update, except for greater light and glare this alternative would produce in connection with the stadium.

The impacts associated with strong ground shaking and the seismic safety of buildings on the site would be less for this alternative than for the proposed project because the concentration of buildings and people on the site would be less. Other impacts related to earth resources are similar to those that may result from implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan update.

Impacts on utilities (water supply, sewer, storm drains, and solid waste) would be less under this alternative than the project due to less intensive development. Other impacts related to public services and facilities are similar to those that may result from implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan update.

Finding: Alternative Infeasible

This alternative would be generally comparable in terms of the overall intensity of the north campus development. However, CSU finds this alternative infeasible because the services, amenities, and increased efficiencies that would result from implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan (such as locating student support services and facilities, including the library, student union, administration building and student services buildings in proximity to each other) would be less for this alternative in comparison with the Campus Master Plan as proposed.

LOWER DENSITY ALTERNATIVE #2

Compared to the proposed project, the Lower Density Alternative #2 would result in the following types of impacts:

This alternative would have similar land use impacts as the proposed Campus Master Plan update. This alternative would represent an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development of approximately 20 percent as compared to the proposed north campus development; for the main (academic) campus, the scope of development is relatively comparable.

Compared to the proposed project, the approximate 1.5 percent reduction in trips due to this alternative would still affect the same intersections as with the proposed Campus Master Plan.

Since there would be slightly less traffic generated by this alternative overall, queuing and turning conflicts caused by this alternative would decrease.

Construction emissions are more than 20 percent less than the total construction emissions associated with the development of the proposed Campus Master Plan. As with the proposed project, these estimated emissions would not exceed SCAQMD threshold limits for all the criteria pollutants except for NO_x. Under this alternative, air pollution emissions from vehicular sources would be approximately 1.5 percent less than the proposed Campus Master Plan. At area intersections, this alternative would contribute lower concentrations of CO to local levels than the Campus Master Plan as currently proposed. However, as with the proposed master plan update, this alternative would not be consistent with the AQMP as its operation would result in the exceedance of the CO, ROC, and NO_x threshold limits.

As with the proposed project, construction of new facilities would generate short-term (construction phase) and operational noise impacts at sensitive receptors adjacent to the site. The noise impacts due to construction may be slightly less because this alternative would have less construction activities, due to its reduced scale. Traffic generated under this alternative would increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the campus.

The construction of this alternative would result in similar visual impacts and light and glare for both the main campus and the north campus areas in comparison to the proposed Campus Master Plan update.

This alternative would have similar impacts on earth resources as the proposed Campus Master Plan update. The impacts associated with strong ground shaking and the seismic safety of buildings on the site would be less for this alternative than for the proposed project because the concentration of buildings and people on the site would be less.

This alternative would affect the same services as the draft Campus Master Plan. Energy would be consumed during the alternative project's site preparation for grading operations and material transfer by heavy-duty equipment, but less than the project. Impacts on utilities (water supply, sewer, storm drains, and solid waste) would be less under this alternative than the project due to less intensive development. This alternative and the project would both have a significant adverse impact on landfills.

Finding: Alternative Infeasible

This alternative would represent an decrease in the overall intensity of north campus development by approximately 19 percent as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. CSU finds this alternative infeasible because the services, amenities, and increased efficiencies that would result from implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan (such as locating student support services and facilities, including the library, student union, administration building and student services buildings in proximity to each other) would be less for this alternative in comparison with the Campus Master Plan as proposed.

LIGHT-INDUSTRIAL ONLY DEVELOPMENT ON NORTH CAMPUS ALTERNATIVE

Compared to the proposed project, the Light-Industrial Only Development on North Campus Alternative would result in the following types of impacts:

This alternative would have similar land use impacts as the proposed Campus Master Plan update. This alternative would represent an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development comparable to the proposed north campus development; for the main (academic) campus, the scope of development is relatively comparable with the exception of the introduction of an open-air stadium on the main campus.

Compared to the proposed project, the approximate 1.2 percent increase in trips due to this alternative would still affect the same intersections as with the proposed Campus Master Plan. Since there would be slightly more traffic generated by this alternative overall, queuing and turning conflicts caused by this alternative would be slightly more than the proposed Campus Master Plan.

Construction emissions for this alternative would be six percent more than the total construction emissions associated with the development of the proposed Campus Master Plan. As with the proposed project, these estimated emissions would exceed SCAQMD threshold limits for NO_x. Under this alternative, air pollution emissions from vehicular sources would be approximately the same as the proposed Campus Master Plan. At area intersections, this alternative would contribute more concentrations of CO to local levels than the Campus Master Plan as currently proposed. Further, as with the proposed master plan update, this alternative would not be consistent with the AQMP as its operation would result in the exceedance of the CO, ROC, and NO_x threshold limits.

Construction-related noise impacts would be comparable to the proposed Campus Master Plan. The construction of the future open-air stadium on the main campus (near Lindley and Halsted) would result in fewer noise impacts from events affecting the residential uses to the west of the north campus along Lindley Avenue but would increase event-related noise impacts on the main campus (including short-term increases in noise levels affecting the residential uses north of Halsted Street and west of Lindley Avenue).

The construction of this alternative would result in similar visual impacts and light and glare for both the main campus and the north campus areas in comparison to the proposed Campus Master Plan update.

Impacts related to earth resources for this alternative would be similar to the proposed Campus Master Plan. The impacts associated with strong ground shaking and the seismic safety of buildings on the site would be less for this alternative than for the proposed project because the concentration of buildings and people on the site would be less.

This alternative would impact the same services as the draft Campus Master Plan. Energy would be consumed during the alternative project's site preparation for grading operations and material transfer by heavy-duty equipment, but less than the project. As with the proposed project, this

alternative does not represent a significant increase in the amount of energy consumed. Impacts on utilities (water supply, sewer, storm drains, and solid waste) would be less under this alternative than the project due to less intensive development. This alternative and the project would both have a significant adverse impact on landfills.

Finding: Alternative Infeasible

This alternative would represent an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development by approximately 25 percent as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. CSU finds this alternative infeasible because the services, amenities, and increased efficiencies that would result from implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan would (such as locating student support services and facilities, including the library, student union, administration building and student services buildings in proximity to each other) be less for this alternative in comparison with the Campus Master Plan as proposed.

ENTERTAINMENT INDUSTRY ONLY DEVELOPMENT ON NORTH CAMPUS ALTERNATIVE

Compared to the proposed project, the Entertainment Industry Only Development On North Campus Alternative would result in the following types of impacts:

This alternative would have similar land use impacts as the proposed Campus Master Plan update. This alternative would represent an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development of approximately 25 percent as compared to the proposed north campus development; for the main (academic) campus, the scope of development is relatively comparable with the exception of the introduction of an open-air stadium on the main campus.

Compared to the proposed project, the approximate one percent decrease in trips due to this alternative would still have comparable impacts at the same intersections as the proposed Campus Master Plan. With roughly the same traffic generated by this alternative compared to the proposed master plan, queuing and turning conflicts caused by this alternative would increase. Under this alternative, all of the proposed transportation mitigation measures required for the proposed Campus Master Plan would be implemented.

Construction emissions are approximately 30 percent more than the total construction emissions associated with the development of the proposed Campus Master Plan. As with the proposed project, these estimated emissions would exceed SCAQMD threshold limits for NOx. Under this alternative, air pollution emissions from vehicular sources would be approximately one percent less than the proposed Campus Master Plan. At area intersections, this alternative would contribute higher concentrations of CO to local levels than the Campus Master Plan as currently proposed. Further, as with the proposed master plan update, this alternative would not be consistent with the AQMP as its operation would result in the exceedance of the CO, ROC, and NOx threshold limits.

The noise impacts due to construction may be slightly less because this alternative would have less construction activities, due to its reduced scale. Increased traffic generated under this alternative would increase ambient noise levels in the vicinity of the campus. In addition, the

construction of the future open-air stadium on the main campus (near Lindley and Halsted) would increase event-related noise impacts on the main campus (including short-term increases in noise levels affecting the residential uses north of Halsted Street and west of Lindley Avenue).

The construction of this alternative would result in similar visual impacts and light and glare for both the main campus and the north campus areas in comparison to the proposed Campus Master Plan update, except for increased light and glare for the stadium.

This alternative would have similar impacts related to earth resources as the proposed Campus Master Plan update. The impacts associated with strong ground shaking and the seismic safety of buildings on the site would be less for this alternative than for the proposed project because the concentration of buildings and people on the site would be less.

This alternative would affect the same services as the draft Campus Master Plan. Energy would be consumed during the alternative project's site preparation for grading operations and material transfer by heavy-duty equipment, but less than the project. This alternative represents a slight decrease in the amount of energy consumed. Impacts on utilities (water supply, sewer, storm drains, and solid waste) would be less under this alternative than the project due to less intensive development. This alternative and the project would both have a significant adverse impact on landfills.

Finding: Alternative Infeasible

This alternative represents an increase in the overall intensity of north campus development by approximately 25 percent as compared to the proposed Campus Master Plan. CSU finds this alternative infeasible because the services, amenities, and increased efficiencies that would result from implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan (such as locating student support services and facilities, including the library, student union, administration building and student services buildings in proximity to each other) would not be achieved under this alternative.

SECTION 3. FINDINGS ON SIGNIFICANT AND POTENTIALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT IDENTIFIED IN THE DRAFT MASTER EIR/FINAL MASTER EIR

Pursuant to and in accordance with Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code, the Master EIR identifies potential adverse impacts associated with project implementation on transportation, air quality, noise, aesthetics and light and glare, earth resources, and public services and facilities. However, project requirements will include substantial mitigation of these impacts, in whole or in part, as follows:

TRANSPORTATION

Impact: The traffic impact analyses determined that traffic generated by the proposed Campus Master Plan would generate significant project impacts at 18 of the 21 intersections analyzed in this study after the completion of Phase I. At buildout of Phase II by Year 2008, 19 of the 21 analyzed intersections are projected to have significant impacts.

Mitigation Measures: Mitigation measures were developed for those locations where it was feasible from an engineering perspective and cost effective from an economic perspective. In addition, the improvements for the Campus Master Plan project include measures designed to increase the capacity of the roadway system at specific locations. These measures included operational improvements as well as physical improvements.

The following summarizes potential roadway improvements designed to increase the capacity of the system. The emphasis of this process was to identify physical or operational improvements within the existing roadway section and/or improvements to existing signal operations. Improvements involving right-of-way acquisition were typically not considered as infeasible due to the difficulties in acquiring right-of-way.

Phase I

The potential capacity mitigation measures for the CSUN Campus Master Plan (Phase I) include the following:

- T1: Amigo Ave/State Route 118 westbound ramps/Rinaldi Street - Contribute to the design of Automated Traffic Surveillance and Control (ATSAC). This measure would increase the capacity of the intersection by 7 percent per LADOT.
- T2: Reseda Boulevard/Rinaldi Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T3: Reseda Boulevard/State Route 118 Freeway eastbound ramps - ATSAC design contribution.
- T4: Reseda Boulevard/Devonshire Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T5: Reseda Boulevard/Lassen Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T6: Reseda Boulevard/Plummer Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T7: Reseda Boulevard/Nordhoff Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T8: Lindley Avenue/Lassen Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T9: Lindley Avenue/Nordhoff Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T10: Zelzah Avenue/Devonshire Street - Widen and re-stripe Devonshire Street to provide three lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane on the eastbound approach.
- T11: Zelzah Avenue/Lassen Street - Widen and re-stripe Zelzah Avenue to provide northbound and southbound right-turn-only lanes at Lassen Street.
- T12: Zelzah Avenue/Nordhoff Street - ATSAC design contribution.
- T13: Balboa Boulevard/State Route 118 Freeway westbound Ramps - ATSAC design contribution.

- T14: Balboa Boulevard/State Route 118 Freeway eastbound ramps - AT SAC design contribution.
- T15: Balboa Boulevard/Devonshire Street - Widen and re-stripe Balboa Boulevard to provide dual left-turn lanes in the northbound and southbound directions.
- T16: I-405 southbound ramps/Devonshire Street - AT SAC design contribution.
- T17: I-405 southbound ramps/Nordhoff Street - AT SAC design contribution.
- T18: I-405 northbound ramps/Nordhoff Street - AT SAC design contribution.
- T19: Lindley Avenue: Currently dedicated and improved on the west side of the street adjacent to the proposed biotech site; however, additional right-of-way dedication and improvements are necessary on the east side of the street adjacent to the north campus site. The roadway is to be 66 feet wide between curbs (within an 86-foot wide right-of-way, with curbs, gutters, street lights and sidewalks within 10 feet on each side of the street). Therefore, the plans for the north campus (biotech) development need to show Lindley Avenue with an additional dedication for the completion of an 86' ROW (43' on each side of the centerline of the street for a sidewalk, curb, gutters, street lights and roadway). The cost of these improvements are included in a grant request to the Economic Development Administration (EDA).
- T20: Devonshire Street: Currently dedicated for an 80-foot wide roadway within a 100-foot wide right-of-way; currently improved on the north side of the street but there are no improvements on the south side of this street within existing dedicated ROW adjacent to the project site. Required improvements to be made within the existing dedicated ROW will include curbs, gutters, street lights and sidewalks. The cost of these improvements are included in a grant request to the Economic Development Administration (EDA).
- T21: Zelzah Avenue: No additional dedication needed; street has full 100-foot wide dedication (80' for roadway and 10' on each side for curbs, gutters, street lights and sidewalks). Improvements to the west side of Zelzah Avenue will include curbs, gutters, street lights and sidewalks. The cost of these improvements are included in a grant request to the Economic Development Administration (EDA).
- T22: Improvements at corners: Dedications are required at the intersections of Zelzah and Devonshire Street, and Lindley Avenue and Devonshire Street. Specifically, a 20-foot property line return at these intersection is required with access ramps. The cost of these improvements are included in a grant request to the Economic Development Administration (EDA).

Phase II

The potential capacity mitigation measures for the CSUN Master Plan (Phase II) include the 18 measures described above plus the following:

- T23: Zelzah Avenue/Plummer Street - AT SAC design contribution.

Additionally, the following mitigation measure is recommended to reduce vehicular congestion on the campus and on surrounding roadways.

T24: As an integral part of the Campus Master Plan, CSUN will implement a series of on-campus improvements to encourage student, staff and faculty use of bicycles as an alternative mode of transportation. The final plans for the campus bicycle paths will include coordination with the city's Department of Transportation for the city's plans for bike lanes on public streets adjacent to the campus.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures T1 through T24 are feasible and would partially reduce impacts, but not to a less-than-significant level. Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures for Phase I would allow for significant impacts to be mitigated to levels of insignificance at 12 of the 18 impacted intersections. However, significant impacts are projected to remain after the implementation of mitigation measures at 6 of the 18 affected intersections. These include the following:

- Reseda Boulevard and Rinaldi Street
- Zelzah Avenue and Devonshire Street
- Zelzah Avenue and Lassen Street
- Zelzah Avenue and Nordhoff Street
- Balboa Boulevard and Devonshire Street
- I-405 Fwy SB Ramps/Blucher Avenue and Devonshire Street

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures for Phase II would allow for significant impacts to be mitigated to levels of insignificance at 8 of the 19 impacted intersections. Significant impacts are projected to remain after implementation of mitigation measures at 11 of the 19 impacted intersections. These include the 6 intersections in Phase I plus the following:

- Amigo Avenue/State Route 118 Freeway westbound ramps and Rinaldi Street
- Reseda Boulevard and State Route 118 Freeway eastbound ramps
- Reseda Boulevard and Devonshire Street
- Reseda Boulevard and Lassen Street
- Lindley Avenue and Lassen Street

This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

AIR QUALITY

Impact: Preparation of each site on the main campus and the proposed north campus developments would result in short-term exhaust emissions from demolition and grading equipment, fugitive dust emissions, and vehicle emissions. Estimated daily average construction emissions would remain below the thresholds of significance during the entire construction period for all the criteria pollutants with the exception of NOx emissions.

Mitigation Measures: The following mitigation measures should be applied to all specific construction projects on both the main and north campuses:

Measures to Reduce Emissions from Construction Activities

- A1: All unpaved demolition and construction areas shall be wetted at least twice a day during excavation and construction, and temporary dust covers shall be used to reduce dust emissions and meet SCAQMD Rule 403.
- A2: Trucks leaving each construction site shall be washed off.
- A3: All equipment shall be properly tuned and maintained.
- A4: General contractors shall maintain and operate construction equipment so as to minimize exhaust emissions. During construction, trucks and vehicles in loading or unloading queues would be kept with their engines off, when not in use, to reduce vehicle emissions. Construction activities shall be phased and scheduled to avoid emissions peaks, and discontinued during second-stage smog alerts.
- A5: Any stockpiles of soil, sand and similar materials shall be covered.
- A6: A temporary wall of sufficient height to reduce windblown dust shall be erected along the perimeter of the construction site.
- A7: Haul truck staging areas shall be approved by the City of Los Angeles's Department of Building and Safety. Haul trucks shall be staged in nonresidential areas with consideration of proximity and potential impact to identified sensitive receptors.

Measures to Reduce Construction-Related Traffic Congestion

- A8: Rideshare incentives shall be provided for all employees in the north campus uses.
- A9: Transit incentives for construction personnel shall be provided.
- A10: Construction parking shall be configured to minimize traffic interferences.
- A11: Obstruction of through-traffic lanes shall be minimized.
- A12: A flagperson shall be provided to guide the traffic properly.
- A13: Operations affecting roadways for off-peak traffic hours shall be scheduled.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures A1 through A13 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Development of the project would have a significant adverse effect on NO_x concentration levels during project construction. Construction of the proposed project would have a short-term significant unavoidable impact on air quality (NO_x). This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Impact: Long-term operational emissions from stationary and mobile would exceed SCAQMD's thresholds of significance for CO, ROC and NO_x. Stationary sources (natural gas and electrical consumption) on their own would not result in significant impacts. The proposed project is estimated to generate a total of 66,140 daily trips (including existing trip volumes), which are equivalent to approximately 793,680 vehicle miles per day (VMD). Estimated daily emissions associated with project-generated VMDs would exceed the thresholds of significance for CO, ROC, and NO_x. Although the project would contribute to violations of air quality standards, it would be consistent with the AQMP as the proposed project is within the population and growth projections contained in the AQMP.

Mitigation Measures:

Measures to Reduce Mobile Source Emissions

- A14: CSUN shall adhere to all applicable rules and regulations of the SCAQMD to reduce both stationary and mobile source pollutant emissions.
- A15: Commuter transit incentives for employees of north campus uses shall be provided, such as reimbursement for public transit.
- A16: A program of alternative work schedules for north campus uses shall be established.
- A17: The movement of goods shall be scheduled during off-peak traffic hours.
- A18: Local shuttle and regional transit systems shall be provided.
- A19: Dedicated turn lanes shall be provided as appropriate.
- A20: Transit shelters shall be provided.
- A21: Bicycle lanes, storage areas and other amenities shall be provided.
- A22: As applicable, north campus project occupants shall comply with SCAQMD Rule 2202, which applies to any employer who employs 50 or more employees on a full or part-time basis at a work site. This rule, which aims to reduce volatile organic compounds (VOCs), NO_x and CO, provides employers with a menu of options that they can choose from to implement and meet the emission reduction target for their work site.
- A23: The feasibility of providing an electrical charging facility for electric vehicles shall be investigated and documented for north campus development. Such facilities shall be provided as deemed appropriate by CSUN.

Measures to Reduce CO Concentrations

- A24: The project shall be designed and operated to conserve energy as required by the LA City Department of Water and Power, Southern California Gas Company, and/or other appropriate agencies.

A25: Access to existing and/or future public transportation systems, transit stops, and pedestrian walkway systems shall be incorporated into the design of the project, subject to requirements of responsible agencies.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures A14 through A25 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Providing convenient access to public transportation and implementing a Transportation Demand Management Program would enable partial reduction of the project's contribution to local increases in pollution. However, the project's contribution to exceedances of local standards after implementation of the proposed mitigation measures is anticipated to remain a significant adverse impact. Sensitive receptors in the project vicinity would be subject to adverse conditions resulting from increases in pollutant concentrations associated with the proposed project and pollutant concentrations projected for the area. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

NOISE

Impact: Construction activities would increase noise levels to unacceptable levels in the project vicinity intermittently, depending on the construction activity and the types of construction equipment used. This would be a temporary significant impact in the vicinity of each construction site and would cease after completion of construction.

Mitigation Measures:

Measures to Reduce Construction-Related Noise

- N1: The project shall comply with the City of Los Angeles Noise Ordinance.
- N2: North campus construction activities would be restricted in duration so as not to occur before 7:00 a.m. and after 7:00 p.m. on weekdays. On the north campus, no noise generating construction activities would take place on Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays.
- N3: Noise generating construction equipment operated at the construction sites would be equipped with effective noise control devices, i.e., mufflers, lagging, and/or motor enclosures. All equipment would be properly maintained to assure that no additional noise, due to worn or improperly maintained parts, is generated.
- N4: Effective temporary noise barriers would be used and relocated, as needed, whenever possible, to block line of sight between construction equipment and noise sensitive receptors.
- N5: North campus truck deliveries and haul-offs would only be permitted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.
- N6: Noisier construction activities would be scheduled during the midday so that quiet periods can be provided.
- N7: Haul routes should be chosen for all vehicles to minimize the noise exposure on sensitive locations.

- N8: CSUN, or the construction contractors, must notify the communities in advance of any and all construction activities. The construction manager's telephone number would be provided with the notification so that community concerns can be heard.
- N9: Construction noise would be monitored during high levels of activity to determine compliance with local noise criteria. In the event that the noise criteria would be exceeded, the construction activities would be reviewed to determine whether there are reasonable means to further mitigate the construction noise.

Finding: Construction of the proposed project would increase noise levels in the project vicinity to unacceptable levels intermittently, depending on the construction activity and the types of equipment used. CSU finds that implementation of Mitigation Measures N1 through N9 would reduce noise levels in the project vicinity, but not to acceptable levels for residential uses, particularly those adjacent to the project site. Therefore, construction noise would be a short-term significant impact, which would cease after completion of construction activities. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Impact: With elimination of the stadium, no impacts would occur as a result of spectator noise and sound amplification from operation of the football stadium.

AESTHETICS AND LIGHT AND GLARE

Impact: The adoption and subsequent implementation of the CSUN Campus Master Plan will result in beneficial aesthetic impacts. The Campus Master Plan will redefine the campus through the establishment of a hierarchy of elements including landscaping, open space, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, lighting, and signage.

Mitigation Measures: No mitigation measures are necessary.

Finding: CSU finds that mitigation measures are not required because there are no significant adverse impacts. The project would result in significant beneficial impacts to the aesthetic environment.

Impact: No intrusive light or glare sources would be created by the adoption and subsequent implementation of the proposed Campus Master Plan.

Finding: CSU finds that mitigation measures are not required because there are no significant adverse impacts.

EARTH RESOURCES

Impact: Southern California is a seismically active region and thus all new and existing development is susceptible to sustaining damage during strong seismic events. No impacts associated with other geologic hazards or topography are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures:

- ER1: All new facilities shall be designed and built in conformance with the city's Seismic Safety Plan, applicable portions of the Municipal Code, and geotechnical reports prepared for the proposed project, subject to approval by the Department of Building and Safety.
- ER2: All new CSUN facilities shall conform to criteria set forth in the Recommended Lateral Force Requirements and Commentary by the Structural Engineers Association of California.
- ER3: To minimize the potential for injury to project occupants, wall hangings, light fixtures, book shelves, suspended ceilings, and other objects which could cause personal injury should be securely fastened to structural elements of buildings.
- ER4: To assist in response to a seismic event, an emergency response and building-specific evacuation plan for each facility, in accordance with CSUN's emergency response plan, shall be developed and posted on each occupied floor of buildings on the campus. Safety officers should also receive copies of that plan.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures ER1 through ER4 are feasible and would reduce potential risks to less-than-significant levels.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Sanitary Sewer

Impact: Build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan would result in sewage generation of approximately 549,920 gallons per day, an increase of 157,920 gallons per day compared to existing conditions which could result in a potentially significant impact on the existing sewer system on campus, as well as local sewer lines (which are near or at capacity). The existing sewer system on the CSUN campus is inadequate and requires upgrading and significant improvements. Capital improvements, addressed in the master plan, include upgrading the sewer system and fitting the proposed buildings and landscaping irrigation systems with water efficient devices to reduce the amount of sewage generated on campus.

Treatment of wastewater generated by CSUN campus facilities is not expected to have a significant impact on the Donald C. Tillman Reclamation Plant. However, the existing sewer lines may need to be upgraded to accommodate the project's sewage flow as the sewer lines discharge into the main sewer.

Mitigation Measures:

- PS1: The project shall comply with requirements of the city's Sewer Ordinance No. 164,964.
- PS2: The university shall work with the city of Los Angeles to ensure that adequate capacity is available in the sewer lines into which project flows are to be diverted and pay for improvements on affected sewer lines, if needed, as a result of this project, or to provide on-campus holding tanks to allow sewage to be delivered to the local sewer lines in off-peak periods.

- PS3: The California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) requires that a written confirmation be obtained from the Planning and Scheduling Department, Bureau of Engineering, stating that there will be available sewage treatment capacity at the time of connection. A copy of this letter shall be sent to the RWQCB prior to issuance of a Building Permit.
- PS4: The feasibility of a dual plumbing system shall be investigated and if found economically feasible (as determined by CSUN), it shall be installed to feed into a city-wide conveyance system for non-drinking water uses (landscaping) subject to approval of the Department of Public Works and County Department of Health Services conditions. This system shall be constructed when a non-drinking water line is installed adjacent to the site.
- PS5: The use of treated gray water for landscape irrigation shall be investigated.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS1 through PS5 are feasible and would reduce potential impacts on existing sewer lines and wastewater treatment facilities to a less-than-significant level. Project implementation, however, would still result in an incremental increase in sewage generation.

Solid Waste

Impact: Build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan would result in the generation of approximately 273,400 pounds of solid waste per day, an increase of 77,400 pounds per day compared to existing conditions. Although private haulers can adequately service the project site, there is limited daily capacity and long-term disposal capacity available at Los Angeles County landfills. Build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan could have a potentially significant impact on the availability of daily and long-term disposal capacity.

Mitigation Measures:

- PS6: CSUN shall comply with the City of Los Angeles Integrated Waste Management Plan prepared pursuant to AB939 which requires cities in California to reduce solid waste generated by 50 percent in 2000 by implementing a recycling program to reduce the volume of solid waste generated by a project.
- PS7: Recycling shall be included in the design of future uses by reserving space for facilities to support recycling, such as adequate storage areas and access for recycling vehicles. The proposed project shall incorporate storage and collection of recyclable into the project design. Additionally, the refuse collection contract shall include collection of recyclables.
- PS8: Although no new housing is proposed, all occupants of on-campus housing shall be encouraged to recycle, at a minimum, newspaper, glass, bottles, and aluminum and bimetal cans.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS6 through PS8 are feasible and would partially reduce the impact, but not to a less-than-significant level. Project implementation would increase the amount of solid waste generated on the CSUN campus by 77,400 pounds per day, which would contribute to the

ultimate exhaustion of the lifespan of the Calabasas Landfill, resulting in a significant impact. This impact would require adoption of a Statement of Overriding Considerations as a condition of project approval.

Fire Protection Services

Impact: Project implementation would result in an increased demand for fire protection services and emergency medical services.

Mitigation Measures: Unless otherwise approved by the Los Angeles Fire Department (LAFD) at the time each project is submitted to the city's Building Department, these mitigation measures will be implemented to reduce potential impacts on fire protection services.

- PS9: Sprinkler systems, smoke alarms, fire alarms, and other fire prevention devices shall be installed as required by the Los Angeles City Municipal Code. Requirements for necessary permits shall be satisfied prior to occupancy of each building.
- PS10: Adequate off-site public and on-site private fire hydrants shall be required. Their number and location shall be determined by the Fire Department prior to the issuance of building permits. All buildings shall be within 300 feet of an approved fire hydrant.
- PS11: Plot plans that show the access road and turning area shall be submitted for Fire Department approval, prior to the issuance of building permits.
- PS12: On-site Fire Department access lanes shall be clear to the sky, but may be crossed by pedestrian bridges, provided that the access lanes shall maintain an overhead clearance of 14 feet.
- PS13: Access for Fire Department apparatus and personnel to and into all structures shall be required.
- PS14: At least two different ingress/egress roads for each area, that will accommodate major fire apparatus and provide for major evacuation during emergency situations, shall be required.
- PS15: Fire lanes, where required, and dead ending streets shall terminate in a cul-de-sac or other approved turning area. No dead ending street or fire lane shall be greater than 700 feet in length or secondary access shall be required.
- PS16: Additional vehicular access may be required by the Fire Department where buildings exceed 28 feet in height.
- PS17: Entry gates will be built to City standards to the satisfaction of the City Engineer and the Fire Department.
- PS18: CSUN shall comply with all applicable state and local codes and ordinances, and the guidelines found in the Fire Protection and Fire Prevention Plan, as well as the Safety Plan,

both of which are elements of the General Plan of the City of Los Angeles (C.P.C. 19708). Public development shall conform to the standard street dimensions shown on Department of Public Works Standard Plan D-22549.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS9 through PS18 are feasible and would reduce impacts to less-than-significant levels.

SECTION 4. MITIGATION MEASURES FOR LESS-THAN-SIGNIFICANT IMPACTS

LAND USE

Impact: Implementation of the Campus Master Plan would not result in any substantial alterations to the existing land use pattern on the main campus or surrounding area nor would it create any nonconforming uses. Although the uses proposed for the north campus site are not comparable to the residential uses, they would be of same scale and character as the southern 288-acre portion of the CSUN campus. Although the football stadium would be located closer to the residents on the west than on the east as under existing conditions, it does not represent a new non-conforming use. It will continue to be used for the same type of events and will be limited to 30 events a year or less. No rock concerts or any other similar events would be held at the stadium.

Mitigation Measures:

- LU1: Outdoor lighting fixtures in accordance with the Campus Master Plan designated fixtures for the campus buildings, walkways, and parking areas shall be engineered through use of directional shields to minimize off-site glare and illumination, particularly along the perimeter of the campus.
- LU2: Extensive landscaping, in accordance with the landscape plan of the Campus Master Plan, shall be placed around the perimeter of the project to minimize the project's visual impact and the perception of mass on the surrounding area, as well as minimize noise and light impacts.
- LU3: Consideration was given to requiring that upon termination of leases held by the intended first lessee of each north campus facility, a public hearing held by the CSU Board of Trustees would be required prior to the execution of subsequent leases. This mitigation is rejected as unnecessary. It is inconsistent with the trustee standard procedures under which approvals of leases are not done by the Board of Trustees.
- LU4: To prevent potential encroachment on surrounding residential roadways, new developments will be constructed concurrently with facilities for the required accessory parking (parking structures or surface lots).

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures LU1 through LU4, except for LU3 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

Impact: The proposed Campus Master Plan update implements the CSU policies [set forth by the applicable sections of the state Education Code Master Plan (Sections 66600, 66606, 89080, 89036 and

89046)] both through (1) physical improvements for the main campus and (2) a development proposal for the north campus to develop public-private partnerships to generate income to support student programs to further the university's educational mission.

Mitigation Measure:

LU5: Prior to construction, the developers of the north campus uses shall provide detailed estimates of the available internships, jobs, and research opportunities which will be available to the CSUN community.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measure LU5 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

NOISE

Impact: Although not significant, noise would occur from general operations of north campus and main campus activities.

Mitigation Measures: To reduce general noise associated with operational activities, the following mitigation measures should be incorporated:

N16: Mechanical equipment should be acoustically engineered, incorporating mufflers, enclosures, parapets, etc., so that the noise generated by these operations would not exceed the noise standard at receptor locations.

N17: North campus truck deliveries and trash pick-up should only be permitted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m.

N18: Implementation projects will incorporate design measures that locate noise sources such as parking areas, loading zones, trash bins, and mechanical equipment as far away from noise sensitive receptor locations as possible.

N19: The design of the facilities and equipment specifications would include noise control measures to ensure that local noise criteria are not exceeded by equipment operations.

N20: The final engineering design of the project would be reviewed by a recognized acoustical engineer, and specific noise control recommendations would be provided to ensure compliance of the project with local criteria.

N21: Noise monitoring would be conducted during the initial stages of operations to determine compliance with local noise criteria. In the event that the noise criteria are exceeded, the operations would be reviewed to determine further noise control measures.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures N16 through N21 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

Water

Impact: The ultimate build-out of the CSUN Campus Master Plan would require 740,520 gallons of water per day, an increase in demand of 211,300 gallons per day compared to existing conditions. It is not expected that this increase in water demand would significantly affect existing water allocations. Although the city does not face a water shortage in terms of water rights and entitlement, there is still a need to conserve water as a valuable natural resource and water should be conserved in southern California even in years of normal climate.

Mitigation Measures: No adverse impacts are anticipated, thus no mitigation measures are required to mitigate impacts on the city of Los Angeles's water system. However, the following measures should be implemented to reduce water consumption where applicable:

PS19: Water pressure greater than 50 pounds per square inch (psi) in water supply lines shall be reduced to 50 psi or less by means of a pressure-reducing valve.

PS20: 1.5 gallons-per-flush toilet should be installed.

PS21: Drinking fountains shall be equipped with self-closing valves.

PS22: Plumbing fixtures should be selected which reduce potential water loss from leakage due to excessive wear of washers.

PS23: Use of drought-tolerant, low water consuming plant varieties to reduce irrigation water consumption.

PS24: Use mulch extensively in all landscaped areas. Mulch applied on top of soil would improve the water-holding capacity of the soil by reducing evaporation and soil compaction.

PS25: Install efficient irrigation systems which minimize runoff and evaporation and maximize the water which would reach the plant roots. Methods such as drip irrigation, soil moisture sensors, and automatic irrigation systems may be employed to increase irrigation efficiency.

PS26: Use pervious paving materials whenever feasible to reduce water surface runoff and aid in ground water recharge.

PS27: Sprinklers for landscaping would be automated to operate during nighttime or early morning hours.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS19 through PS27 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

Police Protection Services

Impact: No significant adverse impacts are anticipated.

Mitigation Measures: Although no significant adverse impacts are anticipated, the following mitigation measures should be implemented to ensure safety for students, faculty, staff, and visitors to the campus:

- PS28: The university should ensure that proper security is provided in the vicinity of the construction sites to ensure public safety is maintained.
- PS29: Entryways, stairways, elevators, and parking areas should be well-illuminated and designed with minimum dead space to eliminate areas of concealment.
- PS30: All walkways and common space areas should be well-illuminated and open to public view.
- PS31: The architects for each building should consult with a LAPD crime prevention representative on design and implementation of a security plan for each new building.
- PS32: Upon completion of each building, the university should provide the LAPD and the University Police with a diagram of the building. The diagram would include access routes, room/office numbers and any information that might facilitate police response.
- PS33: Private security guards should be employed by the individual tenants of the north campus developments to monitor and patrol the north campus area.

Finding: CSU finds that Mitigation Measures PS28 through PS33 should be adopted, although the impact is less than significant.

SECTION 5. STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision maker to balance the benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks in determining whether to approve the project. If the benefits outweigh the unavoidable adverse effects, those effects may be considered acceptable (state CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[a]). However, CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are infeasible to mitigate. Such reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final Master EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (state CEQA Guidelines Section 15093[b]). The agency's statement is referred to as a Statement of Overriding Considerations.

The CSU Board of Trustees is proposing to approve the California State University, Northridge Campus Master Plan and has prepared and certified a Final Master EIR that satisfies CEQA requirements. The following adverse impacts of the project are considered significant and unavoidable, both individually and cumulatively, based on the Draft Master EIR, Final Master EIR, Mitigation Monitoring Program (MMP) and the findings discussed previously in Section 3 of this document:

- Traffic conditions at 11 intersections would not be mitigated to a level of insignificance after the implementation of Phase II of the Master Plan, however, four of these intersections would operate at acceptable levels.

- Increased NOx concentration levels during project construction.
- Operational project emissions, including both stationary and mobile source emissions, would have a significant adverse impact on CO, ROC, and NOx levels. The project would contribute to exceedances of local air quality standards, and sensitive receptors in the project vicinity would be subject to adverse conditions resulting from increases in pollutant concentrations.
- Increased noise levels during project construction. Noise levels would exceed acceptable levels for residential uses.
- Sewage generated from the site would incrementally add to the adverse cumulative impacts anticipated for existing sewer lines and wastewater treatment facilities.
- Solid waste generated from the site would contribute to the ultimate exhaustion of the lifespan of the Calabasas Landfill.

CSU finds that the economic, educational, social, and other considerations of the CSUN Campus Master Plan outweigh the unavoidable environmental impacts identified above; these considerations are described below both with respect to considerations that apply to the whole project and later considerations relating to particular impacts.

The benefits include the following specific goals to be accomplished by the adoption of the CSUN Campus Master Plan:

Main Campus

1. Strengthen the central quadrangle and campus open space;
2. Improve pedestrian and vehicular circulation and establish campus gateways;
3. Clarify the perimeter;
4. Develop building locations and projects; and
5. Develop college quadrangles, courts and gardens.

North Campus

1. Develop a public-private partnership;
2. Develop strong academic ties and facilities spanning a broad range of CSUN's colleges and departments;
3. Provide a source of steady, predictable, and safe revenue with no risk to the University; and
4. Provide an economic stimulus to the San Fernando Valley and surrounding region.

In addition, the proposed north campus development is to meet the adopted objectives of the Board of Trustees of the California State University (CSU) system. Specifically, the board has adopted a policy that directs each CSU campus, such as CSUN, to develop public/private partnerships to further the educational mission of the university. To this end, the north campus development's proposed biotech and entertainment-industry uses will provide academic facilities and provide a source of

revenue to CSUN to support the university's educational mission. The proposed biotech uses will have academic linkages to several CSUN colleges/departments including, but not limited to, the following:

- College of Engineering and Computer Science
 - bio-medical engineering
 - biomechanics
 - assistive technology
- College of Health and Human Development
 - communicative disorders and sciences
 - physical therapy
 - radiologic technology
 - nursing
 - assistive technology applications
 - therapeutic programs for the physically disabled
- College of Science and Mathematics
 - bio-remediation research
 - molecular genetics of human diseases
 - molecular biology of human parasites
 - genetic counseling
 - environmental interactions of the immune systems
 - biotechnology (cellular, molecular and immunological techniques)
 - medical technology
 - mathematical modeling
- College of Extended Learning

The plans for the development of the North Campus have been based on the following objectives adopted by the CSUN North Campus/University Park Development Corporation:

- Public-private partnership for the development of the North Campus: The CSU Board of Trustees has directed each CSU campus to develop its real estate assets through public-private partnerships for the purpose of providing additional revenue to achieve the university's academic mission.
- Development of strong academic ties and academic facilities spanning a broad range of CSUN's colleges and departments: The biotechnology park will provide opportunities for students and faculty to be linked to the real-world of biotech research and development. The biotech complex will include classrooms, labs and other academic facilities to ensure this link is maximized. The entertainment-related facilities will also provide opportunities for students and faculty to be linked to the real-world of the entertainment industry. The entertainment complex will include classrooms and other academic facilities to ensure this link is maximized.
- Provides a steady, predictable and safe source of revenue with no financial risk to the university: The three part development of the north campus — biotech park, athletic facilities and entertainment industry uses — will be through a public-private partnership. The university will not pay for site development costs, nor off-site improvements. Ground lease revenue will provide a steady source of revenue to support CSUN's educational programs.

- Responds to community suggestions regarding potential land uses that will provide an economic stimulus to the San Fernando Valley and the surrounding region: Local and Valley business leaders have suggested the CSUN seek uses that will contribute to the economic growth of the Valley. The biotech and entertainment aspects of the north campus development will provide opportunities for new employment in these industries and provide training opportunities for students to enter these industries upon graduation.
- Will be designed to be environmentally sensitive to existing uses in the area in terms of lighting, noise, air quality, traffic and other environmental issues: The proposed uses will be evaluated as part of the Master EIR for CSUN's proposed campus wide Master Plan. At this stage, it is possible to incorporate into the design of the specific uses measures to reduce potential land use conflicts and to reduce or eliminate environmental impacts.
- Provides a comprehensive plan for the entire 65-acre north campus site: Residents in the area and others concerned with the future of the north campus have urged the university to prepare a single, comprehensive plan for the ultimate development of the north campus. This three part development plan responds to community suggestions in a positive and forward thinking manner.

In making this finding of overriding considerations, CSU has balanced the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable environmental impacts and has determined that even with the remaining adverse environmental impacts, the project benefits justify going forward with the project as proposed.

TRANSPORTATION CONSIDERATIONS

Implementation of the proposed mitigation measures would mitigate traffic impacts at 12 of the 18 intersections affected by Phase I of the proposed Campus Master Plan and 8 of the 19 intersections affected by Phase II of the proposed Campus Master Plan. Traffic conditions at 11 intersections would not be mitigated to a level of insignificance after the implementation of Phase II of the Master Plan, however, 4 of these intersections would operate at acceptable levels (i.e., LOS D or better). These four intersections include:

Reseda Boulevard and State Route 118 Freeway eastbound ramps
Reseda Boulevard and Devonshire Street
Zelzah Avenue and Devonshire Street
I-405 Freeway southbound ramps/Blucher Avenue and Devonshire Street

Commuter transit incentives for employees of north campus uses will be provided by the project occupants to relieve traffic congestion during peak periods. Provision of bicycle lanes, transit shelters, and alternative work schedules, would occur with facility development and operation. The combination of physical improvements and implementation of a transportation demand management program would help to reduce traffic-related impacts resulting from project implementation. Although the area will experience higher traffic volumes, the educational, economic and social benefits expected to result from the CSUN Campus Master Plan will have a positive effect on the community and outweigh the adverse traffic impacts at 7 of the 21 intersections evaluated in the traffic analysis.

AIR QUALITY AND NOISE CONSIDERATIONS

Implementation of the CSUN Campus Master Plan would contribute to the city's existing air quality problems through traffic generation. Air quality impacts will continue as with any new development. Until relief can be provided by light rail service, electric vehicles, and implementation of TSM approaches, air quality impacts will continue.

Impacts on air quality and noise due to project construction would be temporary, short-term, and with respect to noise, intermittent. These impacts will not have a long-term effect on the surrounding area and do not outweigh the benefits of project development.

PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES CONSIDERATIONS

Although the project is projected to generate 549,920 gallons of sewage per day, this amount would represent less than a 0.4 percent increase in the sewage treated at the Donald C. Tillman facility, which currently has surplus capacity of over 39 million gallons per day. Thus, an additional 156,000 gallons of project-generated sewage is not expected to have a significant impact on the Donald C. Tillman Reclamation Plant. In addition, the City of Los Angeles Bureau of Engineering Valley District office has determined that the Zelzah and Lindley Avenue sewer lines, which would most likely serve the north campus facilities, have adequate capacity remaining to fully manage the sewage generated by the implementation of the Campus Master Plan. Thus, the project's contribution to the cumulative impact on existing facilities does not outweigh the benefits created by project development.

Although the project is projected to generate 273,400 pounds of solid waste per day, it is anticipated that private haulers will continue to adequately service the main and north campus areas. The project's contribution to the cumulative impact on the city's long-term disposal capacity does not outweigh the benefits created through project development.

CONCLUSION

CSU finds that the educational, economic and social considerations of the California State University, Northridge Campus Master Plan outweigh the unavoidable environmental impacts identified above. These considerations include benefits such as campus revitalization (both in terms of function and appearance), job opportunities, work-study and internship programs, and steady revenue. The project provides a beneficial mix of academic and professional uses which will serve not only the CSUN community, but communities throughout the San Fernando Valley and surrounding region as well. Therefore, the CSU Board of Trustees has adopted this Statement of Overriding Considerations.

SECTION 6. CITATIONS

PRINTED REFERENCES

The information contained in this document is based, in part, upon prior plans, environmental documentation, and technical studies which include the project site. The following documents are incorporated by reference:

California State University Northridge. CSUN Campus Master Plan Update, Draft Master Environmental Impact Report. January 1998. Environmental consultants: Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates, Inc., Pasadena, CA.

California State University Northridge. CSUN Campus Master Plan Update, Final Master Environmental Impact Report. April 1998. Environmental consultants: Parsons Harland Bartholomew & Associates, Inc., Pasadena, CA.

California State University Northridge. Traffic Study for CSUN Campus Master Plan Update, Master Environmental Impact Report. April 1998. Environmental consultants: Kaku Associates, Inc.

These documents are all available for public review at: California State University, Northridge, Office of Facilities Planning, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, CA 91330.

**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan for
California State University, Northridge—Campus Master Plan Revision**

1. The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation and any revisions to this plan.
2. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report based on the attached Environmental Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Summary shall be prepared for this project by campus staff until project completion or until compliance with the required mitigation measures is complete, whichever occurs first. The report shall be on file in Physical Planning and Development, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720, and the Office of Facilities Planning, California State University, Northridge, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, California 91330. The report shall describe the status of all mitigation measures for the project adopted by the Board of Trustees.
3. Once significant construction is begun and under way at the site, monitoring of the mitigation measures associated with construction shall be included in the responsibilities of the designated university construction supervision staff, who shall prepare or cause to be prepared reports of such monitoring no less than once a year until the project is complete and occupied.
4. Any substantive change in the monitoring and reporting plan made by campus staff shall be reported in writing to the senior vice chancellor, business and finance. Reference to such changes shall be made in the annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

The board finds this plan adequate to meet the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.

2
ATTACHMENT D
CPB&G—Item 5
May 12-13, 1998

**The California State University
California State University, Northridge
Campus Master Plan Revision
Mitigation Monitoring Table**

See the printed Agenda to view the ten-page table.

BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 6
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director
Physical Planning and Development

Summary

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

1. California State University, Northridge—Biotech Development, Phase I
2. Sonoma State University—Student Apartments II

Recommended Action

Approval of the resolutions.

ITEM

2

Agenda Item 6
May 12-13, 1998

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Schematic Plans

1. Approval of Schematic Plans—California State University, Northridge— Biotech Development, Phase I

Project Developer: Alfred Mann for MiniMed, Advanced Bionics, MRG, and the
Alfred Mann Foundation

Project Architect: Hill-Pinckert

Background

The Board of Trustees approved a resolution at the March 1998 meeting supporting CSU Northridge's proposal to develop a portion of the university's north campus for biotech (research and development) uses. The campus is ready to proceed with the first phase of the development.

Scope

The CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project will provide academic facilities that will enable students, faculty and staff to work with private sector tenant(s) on a variety of biotech research and development projects. The initial phase of the development includes a 150,000-gross-square-foot two-story building and a 65,000-gross-square-foot conference center/central plant. The project also includes adjacent parking that will provide 432 spaces.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Working Drawings	May 1998
Construction Start	June 1998
Occupancy	April 1999

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	215,000 square feet
---------------------	---------------------

Cost Estimate—Cost Index ENR 5734

Project Cost, including Design, Construction, Equipment, and Parking	\$18,000,000
--	--------------

Funding Data

The proposed project will be financed from private funding provided by Alfred Mann and several of his biotech companies, including MiniMed, Advanced Bionics, MRG, and the Alfred Mann Foundation. The specific development program, master ground lease and sublease necessary for the project will be separately approved by the trustees.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A Final Master Environmental Impact Report (Final MEIR) for the CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision, including the Biotech Development, Phase I project, was filed with the State Clearinghouse on February 3, 1998. The 45-day public review period ended on March 20, 1998. A request for approval by the Board of Trustees of the Final MEIR will be presented at the May 1998 meeting. A copy of the Final MEIR will be available at the meeting. Several letters from organizations and individuals expressed concerns regarding development of the north campus project in general and biotech facilities in particular, as well as the overall master plan update. A number of the comments relate to (1) traffic, circulation, parking, and noise impacts resulting from development of the north campus project; (2) lack of full disclosure regarding uses within the biotech "light-industrial" development; and (3) intrusion of industrial-type uses into the residential neighborhood.

The Draft MEIR contains information that mitigates many of the public concerns. It states that there will be no hazardous materials used or stored on the site other than "rubbing alcohol" (isopropyl). The primary use of the biotech facilities will be research and development. Approximately 25 percent of the total building space will be used for manufacturing. The majority of space in the project is designed to accommodate future academic and administrative uses. A mitigation measure has been added to the Final MEIR project resolution that requires a public hearing by the Board of Trustees before any subsequent leases are executed after the current leases expire. These measures will ensure that future activities in the north campus project will be consistent with activities approved by the Board of Trustees.

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 MEIR prepared for the CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project, the board finds that:

WHEREAS, The Final MEIR for the CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with the approval of the Master Plan Revision, including the north campus development, and all discretionary actions related thereto; and

WHEREAS, The Final MEIR for the CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision (State Clearinghouse No. 97121003) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the state CEQA Guidelines; and

WHEREAS, Section 21081 of the Public Resources Code and 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); and

WHEREAS, This board has adopted and hereby incorporates by reference the findings of fact and overriding considerations contained in Attachment C to Agenda Item 5 of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds; and

WHEREAS, Even with the implementation of the mitigation measures in Attachment C to Agenda Item 5 of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, the proposed project will have certain significant and unavoidable effects on the environment; and

WHEREAS, This board has adopted a Statement of Overriding Considerations contained in Attachment C, Agenda Item 5 of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which sets forth specific benefits and factual statements that outweigh the remaining unavoidable significant impacts associated with the approval of the CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project; and

WHEREAS, No additional mitigation measures are feasible other than those hereby adopted and incorporated by reference, which would further mitigate or entirely avoid the remaining unavoidable significant impacts; and

WHEREAS, The findings in Attachment C to Agenda Item 5 of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which are hereby adopted by this board and incorporated by reference, include specific findings of fact related to the CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project and applicable mitigation measures; now, be it further

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

1. A Final MEIR has been prepared for the CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision, which also addresses the environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with the approval of the CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act;
2. Prior to certification of said Final MEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above mentioned Final MEIR in relation to the CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project. The board hereby certifies the Final MEIR for the CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision as complete and adequate in relation to the Biotech Development, Phase I project, in that the Final MEIR 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. Draft MEIR for the CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision;
 - B. Comments received on the Draft MEIR and responses to these comments (as provided in the Final MEIR);

- C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the May 1998 CSU Northridge, Master Plan Revision and subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at the meetings;
- D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents specified in 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 and the Office of Facilities Planning, CSU Northridge, 18111 Nordhoff Street, Northridge, California 91330.

And, be it further

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures and implementation of recommended improvements contained in Attachment C, Agenda Item 5, of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds are hereby adopted and incorporated by reference as part of this approval of the CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan included as Attachment D to Agenda Item 5 of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is requested, under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the CSU Northridge, Biotech Development, Phase I project; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the schematic plans for the CSU Northridge Biotech Development, Phase I project are approved at a project cost of \$18,000,000 at ENR 5734.

2. Approval of Schematic Plans—Sonoma State University—Student Apartments II

Project Developer: BDM Construction Company, Inc.

Project Architect: TWM Architects

Background

Sonoma State University currently has housing units that accommodate 911 students. The campus is master planned to house 1,500 students. Increased pressures from enrollment growth, along with the lack of available housing in the surrounding neighboring communities, have prompted the campus to prepare a Request for Proposal (RFP) soliciting a design-build project to construct an additional 604 beds in an apartment complex.

In April 1998 the university received proposals to design and construct on-campus student apartments. The proposals assume a financing plan dependent on the sale of tax-exempt CSU revenue bonds. The proposals were evaluated by a committee of university staff. The committee made their selection based on the qualification and experience of the developer, the ability of the proposal to meet all requirements set forth in the RFP, the cost of the project, and the aesthetic and functional design compatibility of the site and dwelling units.

The committee selected the proposal submitted by BDM Construction Company, Inc.

Scope

The proposed development will provide accommodations for 604 students. The project includes 147 four-bedroom units with four bathrooms, living room, dining room, and kitchen, plus sixteen studio apartments. The project also includes a small multipurpose community building and associated site development on twelve acres located in the southwest corner of the campus.

The apartments will be wood frame construction with stucco exterior. Roofing materials will continue the established pattern of the existing residence halls complex using a lightweight concrete tile. Security lighting, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicle access will be provided throughout the project site as well as access for the physically disabled.

Timing (Estimated)

Completion of Working Drawings	August 1998
Construction Start	September 1998
Occupancy	May 2000

Basic Statistics

Gross Building Area	251,381 square feet
Assignable Building Area	218,701 square feet
Efficiency	87 percent

Cost Estimate—Cost Index ENR 5734

Building Cost including Design (\$85.66 per gross square foot)	\$21,534,000
Fees and Contingency	<u>2,166,000</u>
Total Project Cost (\$94.28 per gross square foot)	\$23,700,000
Group II Equipment	<u>1,500,000</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$25,200,000</u>

Funding Data

This housing project will be financed by the sale of revenue bonds as described in an agenda item being considered by the Committee on Finance.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

An initial study has been completed and a Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act. It was filed for public review with the State Clearinghouse on October 14, 1997. The 30-day public review period ended on November 14, 1997. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting. No adverse comments were received.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, upon consideration of the information provided in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for the Sonoma State University, Student Apartments II (on-campus housing) project, the board finds that:

1. The Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for the project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. With the implementation of the mitigation measures in Attachment A to Agenda Item 6 of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. The project will benefit The California State University; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures and implementation of recommended improvements are hereby adopted as part of this approval of the Sonoma State University, Student Apartments II project; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan included as Attachment B to Agenda Item 6 of the May 12-13, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is requested, under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the Sonoma State University, Student Apartments II project; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is authorized to enter into necessary agreements and other documents to permit construction for the housing project; and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the schematic plans for the Sonoma State University, Student Apartments II project are approved at a project cost of \$25,200,000 at ENR 5734.

**Mitigation Measures to Be Adopted as Part of the Approval of Schematic Plans for
Sonoma State University—Student Apartments II**

1. Project design and construction will comply with the provisions of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations and the Uniform Building Code pertaining to exposure of people or property to geologic hazards and disruptions, displacements, compaction or covering of soils or change in ground surface relief associated with excavation, foundations, and structures.
2. Project construction contracts will specify that dust and emissions from construction be minimized through enforcement of applicable mitigation measures and air quality standards for control of construction related impacts.
3. Construction contract specifications will specify that construction minimize effects from sedimentation and erosion on water quality. Temporary vegetation or mechanical methods for cover will be used to stabilize exposed areas where construction staging activities must be carried out prior to placement of permanent cover.
4. Construction contract specifications will specify that construction activities be limited to the hours of 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., that construction equipment be required to be muffled or controlled and engine-driven equipment fitted with appropriate noise mufflers that meet applicable noise standards, and that loading and unloading of construction materials would be scheduled so as to minimize disruptions to on-campus activities where feasible.

**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan for
Sonoma State University—Student Apartments II**

1. The chancellor or his designee has delegated responsibilities for implementation and any revisions to this plan.
2. Sonoma State University facilities services director will require special conditions in the contract documents of the project assuring that the project will implement all mitigation measures set forth in Attachment A. SSU facilities services director will also monitor construction activities to ensure compliance with all mitigation measures and contract conditions.
3. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report shall be prepared for this project by campus staff to include all related development activities. The report shall be on file in Physical Planning and Development, Office of the Chancellor, The California State University, 4665 Lampson Avenue, Los Alamitos, California 90720 and the Office of Facilities Services, Sonoma State University, 1801 East Cotati Avenue, Rohnert Park, California 94928. The report shall describe the status of all mitigation measures for the project adopted by the Board of Trustees.
4. Once significant construction is under way at the site, monitoring of the mitigation measures associated with construction shall be included in the responsibilities of the appropriate university construction supervision staff, who shall prepare or cause to be prepared reports of such monitoring no less than once a year until the project is completed and occupied.
5. Any substantive change in the monitoring and reporting plan made by campus staff shall be reported in writing to the senior vice chancellor, business and finance. Reference to such changes shall be made in the annual Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring Report.

The board finds this plan adequate to meet the requirements of Public Resources Code Section 21081.6.