

## AGENDA

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**Meeting:** 9:15 a.m., Wednesday, September 16, 1998  
**Auditorium**

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
William D. Campbell  
Ronald L. Cedillos  
Bob Foster  
Harold Goldwhite  
James H. Gray  
Eric C. Mitchell  
Maridel Moulton  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Michael D. Stennis

#### **Consent Items**

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 14, 1998

1. California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report, *Information*
2. Final Report on the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded, *Information*

#### **Discussion Items**

3. Certify a Final Environment Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University, *Action*
4. Certify a Final Environment Impact Report for California State University, Channel Islands and Approve a Concept Long Range Development Plan, *Action*
5. State and Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program 1990/00, *Action*; Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 Through 2003/04, *Information*; Previous Five-Year Funding Program 1994/95 Through 1998/99, *Information*
6. Approval of Revised Project Budget—California State University, Chico—Bell Memorial Union/Food Services Expansion/Renovation and New Bookstore, *Action*
7. Approval of Revised Project Budget—San Francisco State University—Student Union Terrace Renovation and Expansion, *Action*
8. Approval of Schematic Plans, *Action*

**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**

**July 14, 1998**

**Members Present**

Ali C. Razi, Chair  
Stanley T. Wang, Vice Chair  
William D. Campbell  
William Hauck, Chairman of the Board, ex officio  
Harold Goldwhite  
Maridel Moulton  
Joan Otomo-Corgel  
Charlie B. Reed, Chancellor, ex officio  
Michael D. Stennis

**Members Absent**

Ronald L. Cedillos  
Bob Foster  
James H. Gray  
Eric C. Mitchell

**Other Trustees Present**

Martha C. Fallgatter  
Alice S. Petrossian

**Chancellor's Office Staff**

June M. Cooper, Senior Vice Chancellor and Interim Chief of Staff  
David S. Spence, Executive Vice Chancellor  
Richard P. West, Senior Vice Chancellor, Business and Finance  
Douglas X. Patiño, Vice Chancellor, University Advancement  
Christine Helwick, General Counsel  
Bruce M. Richardson, Deputy General Counsel  
Jon H. Regnier, Senior Director, Physical Planning and Development  
Samuel A. Strafaci, Interim Senior Director, Human Resources

**Presidential Liaisons**

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

Chair Razi greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 3:52 p.m.

Chair Razi deferred to Senior Vice Chancellor Richard P. West who announced the retirement of Senior Director Jon H. Regnier. He indicated that Deputy Senior Director Patrick Drohan will assume the responsibility for the day-to-day operation of Physical Planning and Development until the recruitment for Jon's replacement is completed. Senior Vice Chancellor West asked everyone present to join him in thanking Jon for over thirty years of outstanding service to the California State University. A formal recognition of Senior Director Regnier's retirement will be made at a future Board of Trustees' meeting.

### **Approval of Minutes**

The minutes of the May 12, 1998, meeting were approved as submitted.

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

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Razi presented agenda item 1 as a consent item.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-98-11).

### **Professional Appointments**

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

### **CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report**

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

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-98-12).

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

Chair Razi introduced Jon H. Regnier, senior director, physical planning and development, to present the item.

Referring to the status report handout, Senior Director Regnier briefly reviewed the information as shown.

### **Draft of the Capital Outlay Program 1999/2000 and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1999/2000 Through 2003/04, State and Nonstate Funded**

Senior Director Regnier outlined the item as presented in the agenda. The slide presentation was an overview of (1) the basis of the capital outlay program, (2) the categories and criteria for the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, (3) the draft 1999/00 State and Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program priority lists, (4) a summary of the previous six-year capital outlay programs, and (5) the calendar for the capital outlay program. In addition, Senior Director Regnier reviewed the information included in the draft Capital Outlay Program 1999/00 and Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 Through 2003/04, State and Nonstate Funds.

### **Approval of Schematic Plans**

A pictorial overview was provided of the schematic plans for San Jose State University—Public Safety/Parking Department Facility and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo—Advanced Technology Laboratory. Senior Director Regnier stated that the appropriate environmental documentation has been prepared and staff recommends approval.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-98-13).

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:12 p.m.

**BRIEF**

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 1  
September 15-16, 1998

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

**California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

**Summary**

This information item presents the annual report on California State University's compliance actions required by the California Environmental Quality Act; changes made by staff on the format of Environmental Impact Report agenda items, as requested by the Board of Trustees; and background discussion on long-term CEQA process issues, particularly related to public-private, joint-venture development projects.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 1  
September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report**

The Board of Trustees is required to carry out the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) as it applies to all California State University (CSU) development projects. The chancellor is delegated responsibility for implementation of all necessary compliance procedures.

As required by the board, an annual summary of CSU CEQA compliance actions is provided in Attachment A, and is summarized below:

- Eight Negative Declarations were certified and most included a number of mitigation measures.
- Twenty Categorical Exemptions were filed for capital projects.
- One Environmental Impact Report was certified.

No significant amendments to the basic statutes were enacted during the 1997/98 legislative session. The CEQA guidelines that administratively implement the law have been updated to reflect legislative changes from 1996 through 1997, and to clarify some aspects of the guidelines.

While not reflected in this 1997 calendar year report, there have been a number of significant EIRs for major new campus master plans and master plan revisions presented to the board for approval, including this meeting, during the 1998 calendar year. At the request of the board, staff has streamlined and focused the agenda format for these major and sometimes controversial action items in an attempt to clearly and concisely present essential issues. Significant, potentially controversial issues are now clearly identified in an executive summary in the agenda brief. The executive summary provides a direct and early statement of the most critical information for board consideration. The bulk of legally required findings and statements of fact regarding mitigation measures are now found in a separate attachment simplifying the basic agenda item content and resolution.

As part of the decentralization and reorganization of the capital project planning and construction process, CSU CEQA compliance procedures are being realigned to give campuses increased authority and responsibility. However, the board will retain primary responsibility to consider and certify EIRs. By law, the trustees cannot delegate approval of the EIR so long as the trustees retain the authority to approve the project. In CEQA terminology the trustees are the "decision making body" that is responsible for certifying EIRs. Many capital projects are either statutorily or categorically exempt from further CEQA compliance and do not require board consideration (e.g., minor capital outlay or renovations). These projects do not warrant detailed analysis because they generally do not have any environmental effects requiring public review. Many other projects do not require an EIR, but do require CEQA compliance in the form of a Negative Declaration. This is a simpler type of analysis that does require evaluation of potential environmental effects and noticed public review. Approval of a Negative Declaration document simply certifies that there will be no serious negative impacts from the project.

Over the last several years, campuses have expanded revenue generating opportunities through public/private joint venture projects. The surrounding city and county jurisdictions have taken a greater interest in exercising some level of land-use regulatory jurisdiction and in securing local fees and taxation revenues to offset perceived impacts on local infrastructure. In many instances, this has led to increased levels of public debate and controversy as part of the EIR public review process for certain large-scale campus master plan changes and some individual major capital projects. When CEQA was enacted, one of the primary purposes was to ensure public review of actions by government agencies in approving projects that affect the physical environment.

Much of the concern and interest from local surrounding jurisdictions can be traced to funding challenges faced by these cities and counties since enactment of Proposition 13. This and more recent statewide budget shortfalls have forced local jurisdictions to reduce available funding for infrastructure improvements, particularly streets and highways that may serve CSU campuses. Many of these public improvements are the subject of analyses in the EIR process and are typically carried out through fees and exactions levied against private development projects as part of their land-use entitlement. By law, the CSU is not subject to most of these typical private developer requirements. However, these background issues make the consideration of EIRs and specific project approvals that come before the board subject to public controversy.

With the inclusion of an executive summary as requested by the board, staff is presenting controversial capital projects and related significant issues in a more focused format that will provide the trustees with the information necessary to make informed decisions that best serve the mission of CSU.

**THE CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY  
 CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT REPORT (CEQA)  
 January 2,1997 through December 31, 1997**

**CEQA Action Prepared**  
**MIT. BOT NOD**  
**EXEMPT N.D. N.D. E I R ACTION FILED**

CHANCELLOR'S OFFICE

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD  
 Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade

√

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, CHICO

Bookstore  
 Bell Memorial Union Seismic and ADA Upgrade  
 Student Housing Convert Apartments

√

√

√

9/17/97 9/18/97

7/16/97 7/19/97

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS

California Academy Math & Science-Master Plan Revision  
 California Academy Math & Science-Schematic Plans  
 Temp. Admin. Facilities (Financial Management) Two Modular Units  
 Theater Building Seismic Upgrade  
 Educational Resources Center Seismic Upgrade

√

√

√

√

√

3/19/97 4/7/97

9/17/97 9/18/97

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO

Renovate McLane Hall

√

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

Library Seismic Upgrade Phase II

√

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, HAYWARD

Field House Seismic Upgrade  
 West Gym Seismic Upgrade

√

√

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES

CALIFORNIA MARITIME ACADEMY

Utility Infrastructure Upgrade

√

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade  
 Fine Arts Building Demolition Replacement

√

√

6/17/97 6/20/97

CALIF. STATE POLYTECHNIC UNIVERSITY, POMONA

Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade

√

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO

Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade  
 Softball Stadium Upgrade

√

√

9/29/97 9/30/97

2  
 ATTACHMENT A  
 CPB&G—Item 1  
 September 15-16, 1998

	CEQA Action Prepared				
	EXEMPT	MIT. N.D.	N.D. E I R	BOT ACTION FILED	NOD FILED
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN BERNARDINO Visual Arts Seismic Upgrade	√				
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY					
SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY					
Tiburon Center Bldg. 36 Renovation	√				
SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY Central Plant, Telecommunications, Utilities		√		1/21/97	3/24/97
Master Plan Revision and Property Acquisition		√		9/17/97	9/18/97
CALIF. POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN LUIS OBISPO Sports Complex Site Plan				√	3/19/97 3/25/97
Electric Substation Upgrade	√				
Engineering West Underground Electrical Repair	√				
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SAN MARCOS Minor Master Plan Revision Running Track	√				
SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY Stevenson and Darwin Halls Seismic Upgrade	√				
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, STANISLAUS Telecommunications Infrastructure Upgrade	√				

EXEMPT - Categorical Exemption  
 MIT. N.D. - Mitigated Negative Declaration  
 EIR - Environmental Impact Report  
 BOT - Meeting Date Action Taken (or delegated approval)  
 NOD - Date Notice of Determination Filed with OPR

BRIEF

**Information Item**

Agenda Item 2  
September 15-16, 1998

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

**Final Report on the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

**Summary**

This item presents the final report on the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 2

September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Final Report on the 1998/99 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded**

The 1998/99 state budget was signed by the governor and included \$221,547,000 for twenty-seven CSU capital outlay projects, three more than proposed in the governor's budget. The three additional projects are for the completion of working drawings and construction for the San Bernardino Social and Behavioral Sciences Building (\$29,365,000), the San Marcos Academic Complex II—Buildings 26/27 and 37 (\$26,879,000), and feasibility and planning funds for the Fresno Events Center (\$4,000,000).

The above changes increased the capital outlay budget from \$161,303,000 to \$221,547,000. The program will be funded from a combination of old general obligation bond funds, old revenue bond funds, capital outlay general funds, and proposed new general obligation bond funds.

Attachment A includes the final list of projects and approved funding.

See the printed Agenda to view the Attachment.

## BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 3  
September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University**

##### **Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

##### **Brief**

This item requests Board of Trustees' certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approval of a revised campus master plan for San Diego State University (SDSU). The campus master plan revision proposes the construction of a multi-level parking structure (parking structure 5); a new athletic track and soccer field to be located on the top deck of the parking structure (sports deck); ancillary parking management and building storage facilities; and related pedestrian, traffic and utility improvements.

This item also requests Board of Trustees' approval to delete the "no charge" parking mitigation measure that was adopted by the Board of Trustees on January 15, 1991. The mitigation measure was part of the board's decision to approve construction of a new student activity center and parking garage located on the SDSU campus.

The FEIR has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed SDSU parking structure 5 project and the change in the parking mitigation measure previously adopted by the Board of Trustees. This is in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines. The Board of Trustees must certify that the FEIR is adequate and complete under CEQA in order for the board to approve the proposed project, including revisions to the campus master plan.

Included in this item are the proposed campus master plan with the revisions indicated in hexagon 1 (Attachment A) and the previously approved campus master plan dated September 1991 (Attachment B). The FEIR is included in the agenda mailout.

##### *Executive Summary*

At the request of the Board of Trustees, agenda items for EIR projects now include an executive summary to identify issues that may be the subject of opposition to the project, with CSU responses provided.

##### **Remaining Potential Contested Issues Raised Public Participation and CSU Responses**

**(1) Access and Traffic Issues.** Some comments questioned traffic access in and out of the proposed parking structure from Montezuma Road with u-turns at 55th Street. **(Concerns expressed by the College Area Community Council (CACC), representing residents in neighborhoods adjacent to the university campus. The City of San Diego also requested additional technical data regarding the traffic analysis and information addressing the city's concerns was provided in the FEIR response to comments section.)**

**CSU Response:** For safety reasons, there are two entrance/exit points necessary for the proposed parking structure 5. The entrance/exit to be located on Montezuma Road would be a right-in/right-out only access point. The u-turn on eastbound Montezuma Road (to westbound) was considered under all traffic scenarios for the proposed project. As shown in the FEIR, Section 3.5, the Montezuma Road/55th Street intersection, including the u-turn movement, would operate at an acceptable level of service with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

**(2) Noise Issues.** Concern was expressed that the public address system for the proposed sports deck (to be located on the top deck of the parking structure) be controlled to prevent excessive noise spillover. **(Concerns expressed by CACC, representing residents in neighborhoods adjacent to the university campus.)**

**CSU Response:** As stated in the FEIR, pages 3.7-13 and 3.7-14, the noise level of the public address system is within City of San Diego noise ordinance standards. Although the height of the proposed sports deck would be increased by approximately ten feet, the noise level should be about the same as existing conditions. However, mitigation is provided to control this less-than-significant impact as much as possible by requiring that the public address system be designed to minimize any unnecessary dispersion of sound.

**(3) Parking Mitigation Measure - Legality of Deleting Measure.** Objections were stated that the FEIR for the proposed SDSU parking structure 5 project should not be used to delete a mitigation measure from another previously approved project. **(Concerns expressed by residents in neighborhoods adjacent to the university campus.)**

**CSU Response:** The proposed project consists of two related components: (a) construction of a multi-level parking garage, sports deck, and related improvements; and (b) the proposal to delete a parking mitigation measure. These two components are related because parking and measures to charge for event parking are all part of the same set of operational decisions required to be made by the university in managing facilities on campus.

Nothing in CEQA prohibits the trustees from approving a decision to delete a previously adopted mitigation measure from a prior project as long as substantial evidence is presented to justify the decision. In this case, a new draft EIR has been prepared and circulated for public review, which addresses the university's proposal to delete the parking mitigation measure. The FEIR, Section 3.9, includes substantial evidence supporting a finding that the adopted mitigation measure is no longer necessary as a means of preventing traffic or parking impacts to local streets or residential neighborhoods based on actual arena operations. The FEIR also reflects the university's recommendation to include in the events management plan whether or not to institute a separate parking charge for campus events. The CACC has tentatively approved the recommended measure of having changes to the "no charge" parking mitigation measure for the Cox Arena be implemented through the events management plan process, which has been demonstrated to be an effective program.

Although the CACC has expressed concerns as noted above, it is supportive of the parking structure 5 project in the proposed location.

### **Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

3

Agenda Item 3  
September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for San Diego State University**

##### **Background**

To meet the demand for parking on the west side of the San Diego State University campus, the university proposes construction of parking structure 5. The project will accommodate from 1,100 to 1,500 new parking spaces; a new athletic track and soccer field to be located on the top deck of the parking structure (sports deck); ancillary parking and building storage facilities; and related pedestrian, traffic, and utility improvements. The proposed site is approximately 6.5 acres and is located on the present AzTrack site, an existing track and soccer field area west of 55th Street and north of Montezuma Road in the southwest quadrant of the campus. A recent study identified the southwestern quadrant of the SDSU campus as the area requiring additional parking to address existing and projected parking demands. The proposed project would meet the campus parking needs and provide enhanced track and soccer field facilities on the top deck of the proposed parking structure.

The parking structure 5 project also includes the proposal to delete a parking mitigation measure adopted by the Board of Trustees on January 15, 1991. The measure was part of the board's decision to approve construction of a new student activity center, including an indoor arena and a parking garage, located on the campus. In the final environmental documentation for the previously approved student activity center project, the trustees found that the student activity center and associated parking garage (parking structure 4) would increase on-campus parking. Therefore, parking impacts from the project were determined to be reduced to an insignificant level. However, certain community members were concerned that the arena component of the student activity center would attract persons who would park off-campus in the neighborhoods surrounding the university. As part of the supplemental environmental documentation for the student activity center, the traffic consultant recommended parking-related mitigation measures despite findings that such measures were not necessary to reduce parking impacts to an insignificant level. One of the parking mitigation measures included the recommendation that parking for student activity center events be either free or that parking costs be included in the ticket price for such events. The Board of Trustees will be asked to delete this adopted parking mitigation measure associated with the student activity center project on the grounds that circumstances have changed sufficiently since trustees' approval of the student activity center project to justify deleting the "free" parking measure associated with that project. The deletion of the parking mitigation measure would allow the university to charge for event parking on campus as one method under consideration to defray the costs of construction for the new parking garage, as well as provide revenue to pay for annual campus parking operations costs.

For a detailed discussion of the proposed project, please refer to the FEIR, Section 1.0, Introduction and Executive Summary, and Section 2.0, Project Description.

##### **Master Plan Summary**

Attachment A illustrates the revisions to the SDSU campus master plan. The plan shows the proposed location of parking structure 5 and the sports deck (hexagon 1) in the present location of the existing AzTrack facility on the campus. This is the only change in the master plan proposed by this revision.

The existing SDSU campus master plan (Attachment B), approved in September 1991, depicts the campus boundaries, the physical facilities, and the master plan student enrollment of 25,000 full-time equivalent students.

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

Comments were received in response to both the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study process and the Draft EIR for the proposed SDSU parking structure 5 project. The comments included concerns about: (a) traffic access into the proposed parking structure; (b) potential elimination of the “no charge” parking mitigation measure for the student activity center project; (c) construction-related dust, traffic, and noise; (d) general geotechnical concerns; (e) parking structure stability and aesthetics; and (f) traffic at the 55th Street/Montezuma Road intersection. The FEIR includes written responses to all of the comments received. For complete copies of all further information regarding the comments and written responses, please refer to the Response to Comments section of the FEIR. In summary, the most significant comments are as follows:

- (a) **Traffic Issues** - Some comments questioned traffic access in and out of the proposed parking structure from Montezuma Road with u-turns at 55th Street.

**Response:** For safety reasons, there are two entrance/exit points associated with the proposed parking structure (parking structure 5). The entrance/exit to be located on Montezuma Road would be a right-in/right-out only access point. This access is necessary to provide efficient loading and unloading of vehicles parked in the proposed parking structure. It would also be necessary for safety reasons to provide a second entrance/exit to and from the proposed structure. This entrance/exit must be a right-in/right-out only because the distance from the Montezuma Road/55th Street intersection is too short to allow another traffic signal, which would be necessary if traffic were to cross lanes to enter and exit the parking structure.

The u-turn on eastbound Montezuma Road (to westbound) was considered under all traffic scenarios for the proposed project. The u-turn would be allowed under the proposed project with proposed intersection widening mitigation. As shown in the FEIR, Section 3.5, the Montezuma Road/55th Street intersection, including the u-turn movement, would operate at an acceptable level of service with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures.

- (b) **Noise Issues** - Some comments stated that the public address system for the proposed sports deck (to be located on the top deck of the parking structure) must be controlled to prevent excessive noise to the west and south of the campus.

**Response:** As stated in the FEIR, pages 3.7-13 and 3.7-14, the noise level of the public address system is within City of San Diego noise ordinance standards. Although the height of the proposed sports deck would be increased by approximately ten feet, the noise level should be about the same as existing conditions. However, mitigation is provided to control this less-than-significant impact as much as possible. As described in the FEIR, page 3.7-15, the recommended mitigation requires that

the reinstalled track include a public address system designed to minimize any unnecessary dispersion of sound transmitting to areas outside the seating area and playing field of the facility through installation of equipment that directs sound to the field area and “shields” areas outside.

(c) **Parking Mitigation Measure - Legality of Deleting Measure** - Some comments stated that the EIR for the proposed SDSU Parking Structure 5 project could not be used to delete a mitigation measure from another previously approved project.

**Response:** The university disagrees with this general comment. The proposed project consists of two related components: (a) construction of a multi-level parking garage, sports deck, and related improvements; (b) and the proposal to delete a parking mitigation measure, which was adopted by the trustees as part of its decision to approve the SAC/Cox Arena project located on the SDSU campus. These two components are related because the new proposed parking structure (parking structure 5) is intended, in part, to accommodate event parking at the SAC/Cox Arena. The previously adopted parking mitigation measure was adopted because of community perceptions that the SAC/Cox Arena would cause traffic and parking to “intrude” into neighborhoods surrounding the university. Since that mitigation measure was adopted, the SAC/Cox Arena is now a fully constructed facility that has been continuously operating since June 1997. During that time, the events management plan adopted by trustees in January 1991 has been field-tested against actual events held at the SAC/Cox Arena. Based on increased parking capacity and the monitoring of actual events, the university has determined that existing traffic and parking control procedures are effective at precluding event attendees from parking or otherwise intruding into surrounding neighborhoods. The proposed construction of parking structure 5 and measures to charge for event parking are all part of the same set of operational decisions required to be made by the university in managing educational facilities, recreational facilities, and university support facilities on campus.

In addition, nothing in CEQA or the CEQA guidelines prohibits the trustees from approving a decision to delete a previously adopted mitigation measure from a prior project as long as substantial evidence is presented to justify the decision. In this case, a new Draft EIR has been prepared and circulated for public review that addresses the university’s proposal to delete the parking mitigation measure, which was adopted by the trustees as part of the SAC/Cox Arena project. The FEIR, Section 3.9, includes substantial evidence supporting a finding that the adopted mitigation measure is no longer necessary as a means of preventing traffic or parking impacts to local streets or residential neighborhoods based on actual arena operations.

(d) **Parking Mitigation Measure - Changed Circumstances** - Several comments stated that “several years” of major event programming is required at the SAC/Cox Arena before the trustees could consider the university’s request to delete the adopted parking mitigation measure from the SAC/Cox Arena project.

**Response:** The university disagrees with the general opinions expressed in these comments. As stated in the Draft EIR, Section 3.9, a factual basis exists to support the trustees' decision to delete the previously adopted parking mitigation measure. Section 3.9 identified the primary circumstances that have changed since adoption of the mitigation measure in January 1991. For further discussion of these changed circumstances, please refer to the FEIR, Section 3.9, and FEIR Appendix 3.9 and the responses to comments relating to this issue.

(e) **Parking Mitigation Measure - Events Management Plan** - Some comments stated that it would be more appropriate to "move" the decision to delete the parking mitigation measure into the adopted events management plan.

**Response:** At a meeting of the events management advisory committee on July 21, 1998, the university stated that it was willing to request that the trustees delete the parking mitigation measure, but include the issue of instituting a separate parking charge for campus events as a component of the adopted events management plan. In this way, the issue of instituting a parking charge for campus events would be subject to further review, advice and recommendations of the events management advisory committee, with the final decision of whether or not to charge for parking being left to the discretion of the president of the university.

The FEIR has been amended to reflect the university's request to the trustees to delete the parking mitigation measure, and to then include the issue of whether or not to institute a separate parking charge for campus events in the events management plan. For further information, please see the FEIR, Section 3.9.

In addition to the above concerns, the City of San Diego has sent a letter of comment requesting SDSU conduct further traffic related studies, among other comments. In the Response to Comments section of the FEIR we have identified which studies have been done and which, because they are not required by this project, are not being done.

### **Fiscal Impact**

A fiscal analysis has estimated the nonstate supported financial resources needed to implement the proposed project.

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

An FEIR has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The Final EIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. This item also requests approvals required to implement the proposed project: (a) revision of the SDSU campus master plan approved September 1991 to reflect the new parking structure 5; the sports deck; ancillary parking management and building storage facilities; and related traffic, pedestrian, and utility improvements; (b) approval of the deletion of the previously adopted parking mitigation measure from the student activity center project to allow SDSU to make the operational decision of whether or not to charge a parking fee for event parking on campus.

To determine the scope of the environmental topics to be addressed in the Draft EIR, a Notice of Preparation (NOP) and an Initial Study was prepared and circulated to interested public agencies, organizations, community groups and persons in order to receive input on the proposed project. In addition, SDSU held a public information meeting on February 26, 1998, and obtained public input on both the proposed project, and the scope and content of the FEIR. Several interested parties attended this public information meeting and provided important input. For further information regarding the NOP/Initial Study and the public information meeting, please refer to Appendices I and Appendices II of the FEIR.

Based on the NOP/Initial Study process, the FEIR addresses the following environmental topics:

- (a) Geotechnical and Soil Resources;
- (b) Water Quality/Hydrology;
- (c) Biological Resources;
- (d) Visual Quality;
- (e) Traffic/Access;
- (f) Parking;
- (g) Noise;
- (h) Air Quality; and
- (i) Events Management and Monitoring.

In addition to these sections, other important information is incorporated in the FEIR. As required by CEQA, the Draft EIR includes: (a) a description of the proposed project, including a description of the existing setting in the vicinity of the proposed project; (b) an alternatives section that describes and analyzes alternative plans that could reduce the proposed project's environmental impact potential; and (c) sections that generally summarize the cumulative, long-term, irreversible, and growth-inducing effects associated with the proposed project, as well as those effects found to be either not significant or unavoidably significant after implementation of the recommended mitigation measures identified in the FEIR.

The Draft EIR was made available for public and agency comment for a 45-day review period. During the review period, written comments concerning the adequacy of the Draft EIR were submitted by interested public agencies, organizations, community groups and persons to SDSU, Office of Facilities Planning and Management. In addition, notice of the availability of the Draft EIR was published in newspapers of general circulation, and the draft EIR was made available for public review during the 45-day period at the university and two libraries.

A public meeting was also held on the SDSU campus at Cox Arena on June 24, 1998, for purposes of receiving additional public comment on the adequacy of the information presented in the Draft EIR. The public and agency comments and responses to those comments have been incorporated in the FEIR for the proposed project. The public review period ended on August 3, 1998.

A complete listing and discussion of the significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed project and the proposed mitigations are included in the FEIR. In addition, the FEIR includes the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, and accompanying matrix, describing the procedures the university and others will use to implement the mitigation measures to be adopted in the event that

the Board of Trustees approves the proposed project. For further information regarding the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, please see the FEIR, Section 11.0.

### **Analysis of Environmental Impacts**

Based on the FEIR, no significant environmental effects are anticipated with implementation of the proposed project regarding biological resources, parking, events management and monitoring, cumulative impacts and growth inducing impacts. Mitigation measures are recommended for adoption with respect to geotechnical and soil resources, water quality/hydrology, visual quality, traffic/access, noise and air quality. With implementation of these mitigation measures, no significant environmental impacts are anticipated with respect to geotechnical and soil resources, water quality/hydrology, traffic/access and noise. However, even with implementation of the recommended mitigation measures, the proposed project, if implemented, would result in the following significant unavoidable impacts:

- (a) **Visual Quality:** The loss of green space for residential views from south of Montezuma Road is a significant unavoidable visual impact associated with the proposed project; and
- (b) **Cumulative Air Quality:** The San Diego air basin is designated as a non-attainment basin for state and federal air quality standards. Although, from a regional perspective, the emissions contribution of the proposed project to air pollution may be marginal, the cumulative air quality impact of the project in conjunction with related development in the region must be considered significant because regional emissions in the San Diego air basin continue to exceed state and federal standards.

In connection with this agenda item, the Board of Trustees will be asked to balance the benefits of the proposed project against its unavoidable visual and cumulative air quality effects, and to adopt Findings of Fact and a Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment C) to the effect that the remaining significant unavoidable visual and cumulative air quality effects are acceptable due to overriding benefits associated with the proposed project.

### **Alternatives**

The FEIR includes an analysis of various alternatives to the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The preferred alternative is the proposed project, including the revisions to the SDSU campus master plan, as proposed by San Diego State University. The alternatives analyzed in the FEIR include:

- (a) **Alternative 1, The No Project Alternative:** This alternative is required by CEQA and it compares the present existing condition of the project site against the significant effects that would result from implementation of the proposed project. This alternative would not meet project objectives.
- (b) **Alternative 2, PG610/620 Alternative:** This alternative would allow construction of parking structure 5 in the present location of the two existing

play fields west and north of the existing AzTrack site, PG610 and PG620. This alternative is rejected because it reduces recreational field space on campus.

- (c) **Alternative 3, U Lot Alternative:** Under this alternative, parking structure 5 would be built at the current location of Parking Lot U, north of Remington Road and west of 55th Street.
- (d) **Alternative 4, U Lot Alternative:** This alternative would allow construction of parking structure 5 at the current location of Parking Lot W, north of Parking Structure 4 and west of Aztec Circle Drive.

Both alternatives (c) and (d) are rejected because they would occupy and thereby reduce the total available parking on campus.

For a detailed discussion of the alternatives to the proposed project, please see Section 5.0 of the FEIR. A chart summarizing the comparison of alternatives is provided in the FEIR in Section 5.0, Table 5.0-1.

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

A proposed resolution is presented below with respect to the Board of Trustees' certification of the FEIR and approval of the proposed project. The FEIR, including comments and responses, is included in the agenda mailout. Referenced in this resolution as attachments to this item are the CEQA required Findings of Fact and the Statement of Overriding Considerations (Attachment C), and the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan (Attachment D).

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 (Volumes I and II), prepared by San Diego State University, Office of Facilities Planning & Management, for the SDSU campus master plan revision for the parking structure 5 project and the deletion of the "no charge" parking mitigation measure, the board finds that:

**WHEREAS**, The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 98021065) was prepared to address the potential significant environmental effects, mitigation measures, and project alternatives associated with the approval of the proposed campus master plan revision for SDSU parking structure 5 project, which consists of the following components: (1) a revision to the SDSU campus master plan; (2) construction of a multi-level parking garage (parking structure 5), a new athletic track and soccer field to be located on the top deck of the parking garage (sports deck), ancillary parking management and building storage facilities, and related pedestrian, traffic, and utility improvements; (3) the proposal to delete the parking mitigation measure, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees as part of its decision in January 1991 to approve construction of the new student activity center located on the SDSU campus; and (4) all discretionary actions relating to the proposed project; and

**WHEREAS**, The FEIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the state CEQA Guidelines; and

**WHEREAS**, This board, by this resolution, certifies 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 make 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 C, Agenda Item 3 of the September 15-16, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures, and which are incorporated by reference; and

**WHEREAS**, The findings in Attachment C, which are 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**

The FEIR has been prepared to address the significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures, project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with approval of the proposed project, including the revision to the SDSU campus master plan, pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines;

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

Prior to certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the FEIR, and finds that the FEIR reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The board hereby certifies the FEIR as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all significant environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines. For purposes of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines, the record of the proceedings for the project is comprised of the following:

- A. The Draft EIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision and parking structure 5 project;
- B. The FEIR, including comments received on the Draft EIR and responses to those comments;
- C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at such proceedings; and

- D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents 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 San Diego State University, Office of Facilities Planning and Management, Administration Building, Room 130, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, California 92182-1624.

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board adopts the findings set forth in Attachment C, Agenda Item 3 of the September 15-16, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, including the rejection or modification of mitigation measures and the other findings presented in Attachment C. The board specifically finds that the rejected or unmodified mitigation measures were not feasible for the reasons stated in the FEIR, and describes the reasons for modifying these measures in Attachment C; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board hereby certifies the FEIR for the SDSU campus master plan revision and parking structure 5 project; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees of The California State University hereby adopts the revised SDSU campus master plan, dated September 1998; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees of The California State University approves deletion of the previously adopted “no charge” parking mitigation measure associated with the trustees’ approval of the student activity center project on the SDSU campus; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Matrix incorporated in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan which is Attachment D, Agenda Item 3 of the September 15-16, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, and which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6); and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the FEIR for the proposed project.

See the printed Agenda to view Attachment A & B.

ATTACHMENT C  
CPB&G—Item 3  
September 15-16, 1998

**San Diego State University  
Campus Master Plan Revision for the Parking Structure 5 Project**

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

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

Final Environmental Impact Report  
State Clearinghouse Number 9802106

Project Files May be Reviewed at:

San Diego State University  
Office of Facilities Planning & Management  
5500 Campanile Drive  
San Diego, CA 92182-1624

CEQA Findings, Findings of Fact and Statement of Overriding Considerations  
Regarding the Final Environmental Impact Report for the  
SDSU Campus Master Plan Revision for the Parking Structure 5 Project

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Statutory Requirements for Findings

The California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) (Pub.Res.Code §21081), and the CEQA Guidelines (“the Guidelines”) (14 Cal. Code Regs. §15091) require that no public agency approve or carry out a project for which an EIR has been certified which identifies one or more significant effects of the project unless the public agency makes one or more written findings for each of those significant effects, accompanied by a brief explanation of the rationale of each finding. The possible findings, which must be supported by substantial evidence in the record, are:

- (1) Changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant effects on the environment.
- (2) 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 project alternatives identified in the EIR.

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

The Final Environmental Impact Report (“FEIR”) for the San Diego State University (“SDSU”) parking structure 5 project (“the project”) identified a number of potentially significant effects that could result from implementation of that project. However, the Board of Trustees of California State University (“Board of Trustees”) finds that the inclusion of certain mitigation measures as part of the project approval will reduce most, but not all, of those potential significant effects to a less than significant level. Those impacts which are not reduced to a less than significant level are identified and overridden due to specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other feasibility considerations. As required by CEQA, the Board of Trustees, in adopting these findings, also adopts a Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the project. The Board of Trustees finds that the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, which is incorporated by reference and made a part of these findings as Attachment D, meets the requirements of Public Resources Code §21081.6 by providing for the implementation and monitoring of measures intended to mitigate potentially significant effects of the project.

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

## 1.2 Organization/Format of Findings

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

## 2.0 THE PROJECT

The project analyzed in the Final EIR consists of two components: (1) construction of a new parking garage (parking structure 5), a new athletic track and soccer field on the top deck of the parking structure (sports deck), ancillary parking management and building storage facilities, and related traffic, pedestrian, and utility improvements; and (2) the proposal to delete a parking mitigation measure, which was adopted by the Board of Trustees for the SAC/Cox Arena project.

### 2.1 SDSU Parking Structure 5 and Sports Deck

This component of the project includes a multi-level parking garage and a new athletic track and soccer field to be located on the top deck of the parking structure in the southwestern quadrant of the SDSU campus (in the location of the existing AzTrack site). This portion of the project would involve demolition of the existing AzTrack track and soccer field; construction of a new parking structure (parking structure 5) which would be partially below grade at the existing AzTrack site; installation of a new track and soccer field on the top deck of the parking structure (sports deck); and related traffic, pedestrian, and utility improvements.

For a detailed discussion of parking structure 5 and the sports deck, the Board of Trustees incorporates by reference Section 2.0 of the Final EIR.

### 2.2 The Parking Mitigation Measure Adopted As Part of the SAC/Cox Arena Project

In conjunction with the project, SDSU is requesting that the Board of Trustees approve the university's proposal to delete the parking mitigation measure adopted by the Board of Trustees as part of its decision to approve the SAC/Cox Arena project. The final environmental documentation for the SAC/Cox Arena project found that the SAC would actually increase on-campus parking supply because the project included the construction of a new parking garage (parking structure 4).

Therefore, parking impacts resulting from the SAC/Cox Arena project were determined to be reduced to an insignificant level. However, community members were concerned that event attendees would park off-campus in the neighborhoods surrounding the university. The potential for event attendees to park in surrounding neighborhoods was characterized by certain community members as a “neighborhood intrusion” issue requiring environmental review. As part of the supplemental environmental documentation for the SAC/Cox Arena project, the traffic consultant recommended parking-related mitigation measures, despite findings that such measures were not necessary to reduce parking impacts to an insignificant level. One of the parking mitigation measures included the recommendation that parking for SAC/Cox Arena events be either free or that parking costs be included in the ticket price. The adopted Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for the SAC project included the following mitigation measure:

“Continue the current practice of not making a separate ‘at the gate’ charge for on-campus parking for SAC events.”

As discussed below, in connection with the project, the Board of Trustees has considered the Final EIR, and has determined that circumstances have changed since approval of the SAC/Cox Arena project to justify deleting the adopted parking mitigation measure.

For a detailed discussion of the proposal to delete the adopted parking mitigation measure for the SAC/Cox Arena project, the Board of Trustees incorporates by reference Sections 2.0 and 3.9 of the Final EIR.

### 2.3 Project Objectives

The Board of Trustees has considered the statement of the objectives sought by the project as found in Section 2.7 of the Final EIR. The Board of Trustees hereby adopts those objectives as part of the project.

## 3.0 SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS THAT CANNOT BE MITIGATED TO A LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVEL

The Final EIR identified the following significant impacts that cannot be mitigated to a less than significant level even though the Board of Trustees finds that all feasible mitigation measures have been identified and incorporated into the project: (a) visual quality impacts; and (b) cumulative air quality impacts. This section includes the Board of Trustees’ findings with respect to the visual quality impacts of the project. The Board of Trustees’ findings with respect to the significant cumulative air quality impacts of the project are addressed in Section 6.0, below.

### 3.1 Visual Quality

3.1.1 Unavoidable Significant Impact: The project site is visible from Montezuma Road and 55th Street, and to adjacent properties, but the bordering vegetation, buildings and topography limit its visibility from further distances. The project site is viewed primarily by motorists passing by, residents in the adjoining homes (both students and non-students), and people involved in sporting and athletics activities on the site or in the adjacent athletics building and playfields.

Although mitigation is proposed to reduce the loss of open green space (see, Final EIR, Mitigation Measure 4.1), this loss would still be significant to the limited number of viewers who can observe the AzTrack facility from their residences, or in their commute to and from their residences.

3.1.2 Mitigation Measure: Mitigation is proposed for the loss of viewable green space due to construction of the parking structure component of the project (see, Final EIR, Mitigation Measure 4.1). Please refer to Section 4.2, below, the further information.

3.1.3 Finding: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation is feasible, is adopted, and will reduce the identified visual quality impact of the project. Accordingly, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the significant visual quality impact as identified in the Final EIR. However, the loss of viewable green space due to the project is unavoidable and remains significant even after implementation of all feasible mitigation measures (see, Final EIR, Mitigation Measure 4.1). However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that this impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see, Section 8.0, below).

#### 4.0 EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE MITIGATED TO LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT LEVELS

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

##### 4.1 Geotechnical and Soil Resources

4.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: As with most of the state of California, development associated with the project must take into account geologic hazards, seismic hazards, seismicity, liquefaction, non-seismic hazards, and grading/foundation practices.

4.1.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the geotechnical and soils-related impacts of the project will be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

1. Prior to construction, the contractor shall comply with the geotechnical consultant's foundation design considerations, as contained in the April 3, 1998, geotechnical report.
2. Prior to commencement of grading, the contractor shall comply with the geotechnical consultant's grading considerations, as contained in the April 3, 1998, geotechnical report.

3. Incorporate standard design measures and comply with 1997 UBC standards to ensure that geologic-related impacts are minimized.

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

## 4.2 Visual Quality

4.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts: The project may result in significant visual impacts upon implementation without the adoption of mitigation measures.

4.2.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the visual quality impacts of the project will be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

1. To mitigate the loss of open green space in the view of the adjacent single-family residents south of Montezuma Road, the landscaping plan will provide a buffer between the street and the parking structure.
2. If an undercrossing is used for pedestrian access across 55th Street, this crossing will be as broad and well lighted as possible, fostering an atmosphere of security and safety.
3. The parking structure will be constructed in such a way that headlights are not directed onto adjacent residential properties, either at exits or from within the structure. Light sources within the parking structure will be shielded to reduce visibility from outside the structure. Lighting at the entrances and exits will be sufficient for security and safety, but will not be directed onto adjacent properties.
4. Appropriate street lighting will be incorporated into the project, in accordance with the guidelines of the City of San Diego and SDSU. The city's "dark sky" ordinance and other lighting restrictions will be incorporated into the project design.
5. The portion of the project visible from the intersection of Montezuma Road and 55th Street will be consistent with the various policies related to this campus entry/gateway. The intersection will read as a major entry point to the university, and be highly visible and clear.

6. The portions of the project bordering 55th Street will be designed to continue the sense of entry. The street will be developed in such a way that it is identifiable with the university. If a pedestrian overcrossing is used, it will emphasize the gateway theme.
7. The building and plant material palettes for the campus entry/gateway area will be compatible with that of the campus edge concept.
8. The Montezuma Road side of the proposed project will be designed to be consistent with the various policies related to the campus edge. The designs will establish a character that is identifiable with the university.
9. Horizontal fenestration and other elements on the Montezuma Road facade will be compatible with the horizontal designs in the adjacent retaining walls (to the west).
10. Graffiti-resistant coating will be used on surfaces accessible to such vandalism.
11. Landscaping, furnishings, and lighting for the proposed project will be compatible with design guidelines established for such elements in the SDSU Physical Master Plan.
12. Street trees used will be consistent with the themes established by the university, the city of San Diego, and the College Area Redevelopment Project. The size, spacing and care of these trees will be consistent with City of San Diego policies.
13. The landscape plan will provide scale and comfort to the pedestrian environment. Where possible, landscaping should provide a buffer between pedestrian areas and streets.
14. The transit stop on Montezuma Road west of 55th Street will be retained or relocated in accordance with San Diego Transit.
15. Where possible, signs, utility poles, light poles and other vertical features will be integrated to reduce confusion and disorder.
16. During construction, the building site will be screened from view from Montezuma Road and 55th Street to the maximum extent possible using opaque materials. On the northern side of the project area, screening material will provide appropriate viewing areas so that future users of the sports deck component of the project and the athletics department can view the project during construction.

4.2.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures, as modified, are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the visual quality impacts of the project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the visual quality impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR. However, please refer to Section 3.1, above, for the Board of Trustees' findings with respect to the one significant unavoidable visual impact associated with the project.

#### 4.3 Traffic/Access

4.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the Final EIR, the project would have an impact on two intersections: Montezuma Road/55th Street and 55th Street/Hardy Avenue. (Only those intersections that exceed the City of San Diego's Level of Service ("LOS") standard "D" were considered for mitigation purposes.) During the pre-Event Peak Hour and the Event Peak Hour, LOS E and F conditions would occur at six of the intersections studied. Although this LOS exceeds the City of San Diego's LOS D standard, the Board of Trustees has determined that this condition is not considered a significant impact because the conditions analyzed for the events would occur infrequently, and most of those impacted by the LOS E and F conditions at those intersections would be expected to be event attendees, not local residents.

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

As seen by comparing the LOS results ( FEIR Figures 3.5-10, 3.5-15, 3.5-20 and 3.5-25), the proposed alternatives would have an impact at the two intersections described below. The City of San Diego's desirable LOS is LOS D.

1. Montezuma Road and 55th Street: LOS would deteriorate from LOS D to LOS E in the AM Peak Hour under any of the three proposed alternatives. As mentioned earlier, two movements would contribute to this LOS deterioration: the eastbound left-turn movement and the westbound through/right-turn movements. The eastbound left-turn movement currently has dual left-turn lanes. As a result, the room for mitigation of this impact is minimal. Instead, this impact can be mitigated to LOS D in the AM Peak Hour with the addition of an exclusive right-turn lane to the westbound approach. The existing westbound through/right-turn lane must wait for a green light to move. With an additional right-turn lane, turning traffic could move continuously, even when the light is not green (free right turn). The right-turn queues would be reduced, allowing reduction of the amount of green time for the westbound movements, and extension of the green time for eastbound, left-turn movements. As a result, the intersection would operate at LOS D.

2. 55th Street and Hardy Avenue: This intersection under the No Build Alternative is unsignalized and uninterrupted. Due to a new traffic signal at this intersection under any of the proposed alternatives, the Event Peak-Hour traffic would experience LOS F delays under either the Proposed Project Alternative or the New North/South Street Alternative. The One-Way Reversal Alternative would enable the subject intersection to operate at acceptable LOS conditions (LOS D). The LOS F condition is mainly attributable to very heavy northbound through/right-turn volumes. The addition of an exclusive northbound right-turn lane would allow this intersection to operate at acceptable LOS (LOS D).

Although there are other intersections that would operate at LOS F conditions during the Event Peak Hour under the proposed project, these conditions would also occur under the future no-build conditions, as shown on FEIR Figure 3.5-10. They would not result from implementation of the project.

To address event-related traffic, the campus events management plan for Aztec Bowl Arena (SDSU 1997) is hereby revised to take into consideration the changed arrival and departure situations that would be presented by the addition of parking structure 5. This plan specifies different methods of handling traffic depending upon the predicted size of the event. Several methods of handling traffic and parking are particularly appropriate for proposed project during a large event (defined as over 7,500 expected attendance):

3. At unsignalized intersections, such as Lindo Paseo Avenue and Campanile Drive, have traffic controllers take control of the intersection movements by directing the traffic similar to traffic movements under a signalized environment. Controllers can allow specific movements for a specific amount of assumed cycle time rather than allowing vehicles on a first-come/first-served basis.
4. At signalized intersections, such as Montezuma Road and 55th Street, have traffic controllers take control of the intersection movements by turning off the signals and directing the traffic to allow longer or shorter cycle time as demanded by the queuing traffic.
5. Using signs and traffic controllers, direct all westbound traffic departing Parking Structure 5 (headed for westbound Montezuma Road, westbound I-8, etc.) onto Montezuma Road via right-turn-only exit.
6. Using signs, cones, and traffic controllers, provide a second turn lane onto Aztec Circle Drive from 55th Street to improve traffic flow between 55th Street and parking structure 4. Recent street-widening improvements to Aztec Circle Drive make this proposed change feasible.

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

#### 4.4 Noise

4.4.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the Final EIR, traffic noise would not result in a significant impact because the increased noise (over the no-build condition) would be less than 3 dBA. In addition, the public address system may be noticeable to surrounding properties, but it would not be a significant impact because the system does not exceed the City of San Diego's noise standards. Nevertheless, mitigation is proposed to ensure that there are no conflicts with surrounding land uses. Noise generated by construction activities would result in short-term increases in ambient noise levels at the project site on an intermittent basis; however, as discussed below, mitigation is proposed for construction-related noise impacts.

4.4.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the noise impacts of the project will be reduced to a less than significant level by implementation of the following mitigation measures:

1. The public address (PA) system for the reinstalled AzTrack will be designed to minimize any unnecessary dispersion of sound transmitting to areas outside the seating area and playing field of the facility.
2. The project shall comply with the City of San Diego Noise Ordinance, Section 59.5.040, Construction Noise, which regulates the level of noise that may be generated as a result of construction activity. Construction activity is permitted between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 7:00 p.m., Monday through Saturday. Construction is prohibited on Sundays and holidays. Construction noise, when permitted, cannot cause a 12-hour average sound level greater than 75 dBA at or beyond the property limits of any property zoned residential.
3. The contractor will be required to prepare a noise control plan to demonstrate compliance with the City of San Diego Noise Ordinance. The plan will include a detailed description of the noise control measures that the contractor will use to mitigate short-term construction noise impacts on existing noise-sensitive land uses. The contractor shall use equipment with effective noise-suppression devices and employ other noise-control measures, such as enclosures and barriers, necessary to protect the public. The contractor shall schedule and conduct operations in a manner that will minimize, to the greatest extent feasible, the disturbance to the public in areas adjacent to the construction activities and to occupants of buildings in the vicinity of the construction activities.

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

#### 4.5 Air Quality

4.5.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the Final EIR, the project would result in four violations of state and federal eight-hour standards for carbon monoxide. This condition is considered a significant air quality impact. No significant impacts would result from fumes or noxious odors in the parking structure component of the project because it is designed to be naturally ventilated. Construction may result in short-term air quality impacts relating to fugitive dust and mobile source emissions (construction vehicles).

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

1. Operational Impacts. As previously discussed, either the Proposed Project Alternative and the One-Way Reversal Alternative would cause four violations of the eight-hour average CO standards at the intersection of Montezuma Road and 55th Street during the morning commute. These violations, however, can be prevented by adding an exclusive right-turn lane for the westbound approach. This mitigation measure would improve the overall performance of the intersection with reduced vehicle delays and queues. FEIR Table 3.8-5 shows the mitigated eight-hour CO concentrations for receptors that would experience violations under either of the proposed project alternatives.
2. Construction Impacts. Because the project is in a PM<sub>10</sub> and ozone nonattainment area, all of the proposed particulate control measures related to construction activities should be followed to minimize the amount of construction emissions. They are as follows:

##### 2.1 Site Preparation.

- (a) Minimize land disturbances;
- (b) Use watering trucks to minimize dust;
- (c) Cover trucks when hauling dirt;
- (d) Stabilize the surface of dirt piles, if not removed immediately;

- (e) Use windbreaks to prevent any accidental dust pollution; and
- (f) Limit vehicular paths and stabilize temporary roads.

2.2 Construction.

- (a) Cover trucks when transferring materials;
- (b) Use dust suppressants on traveled paths which are not paved;
- (c) Minimize unnecessary vehicular and machinery activities; and
- (d) Minimize dirt track-out by washing or cleaning trucks before leaving the construction site.

2.3 Post-Construction.

- (a) Revegetate any disturbed land not used;
- (b) Remove unused material; and
- (c) Remove dirt piles.

4.5.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above mitigation measures are feasible, are adopted, and will reduce the air quality impacts of the project to a less than significant level. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid the air quality impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR. However, please refer to Section 6.1, below, for the Board of Trustees' findings with respect to the significant unavoidable cumulative air quality impacts of the project.

4.6 Events Management and Monitoring

The purpose of this section is to document the Board of Trustees' findings that circumstances have changed sufficiently to warrant a decision by the trustees to eliminate a parking mitigation measure that was previously adopted by the trustees in conjunction with its approval of the SAC/Cox Arena project. Based on a review of the information in the Final EIR, a factual basis exists to support the trustees' decision to delete the adopted parking mitigation measure from the SAC/Cox Arena project. The principal circumstances that have changed since adoption of the parking mitigation measure include:

- (a) The SAC/Cox Arena is a fully constructed facility, which has been in continuous operation from approximately June 1997 to the present. During that time, the adopted events management plan, including the traffic and parking control procedures, has been "field-tested" against actual events held

at the SAC/Cox Arena. The data compiled from actual operations show that adequate parking capacity is available during regulated events and that event vehicles do not park in surrounding neighborhoods causing neighborhood intrusion.

- (b) SDSU, Department of Public Safety, has regularly monitored special events held at SAC/Cox Arena during 1997 and 1998. After each event, SDSU issued brief event-by-event reports regarding the effectiveness of the traffic and parking control procedures (see, EIR Appendix 1). Based on those reports, SDSU determined that the existing traffic and parking control procedures were effective at precluding event attendees from parking or otherwise intruding into surrounding neighborhoods.
- (c) In addition, SDSU retained an independent consultant (Parsons Brinckerhoff) to monitor the traffic and parking controls that were used for a representative concert held at the SAC/Cox Arena on December 12, 1997. Based on a review of safety reports and the monitoring of an actual event held at the SAC/Cox Arena, the consultant prepared the Event Management Monitoring Study, which includes findings and conclusions confirming the adequacy and effectiveness of the events management plan traffic and parking controls. Specifically, the consultant determined that, for the most part, event attendees do not park their vehicles in surrounding neighborhoods due to specific events management plan traffic and parking controls in place for SAC/Cox Arena events.
- (d) The results of the survey conducted by Nelson Communications Group for the Associated Students showed a strong indication that residents in the College Area Community believe SDSU is doing an above average job managing traffic in their neighborhoods on an event-by-event basis.
- (e) The SDSU parking structure 5 project, which has been proposed since the SAC/Cox Arena was constructed, includes features that would beneficially affect both campus parking and event parking, and further reduce the likelihood that event attendees will park in surrounding neighborhoods. For example, the parking structure component would not generate any additional traffic to and from the campus, and it would add from 1,100 to 1,500 new parking spaces to the campus parking inventory. The proposed parking structure would provide direct pedestrian access via a new pedestrian grade-separated crossing over or under 55th Street to the SAC/Cox Arena, and be in reasonably close proximity to the campus core via the West Plaza Mall. The proposed parking structure would also not result in the loss or displacement of any parking during the construction phase of the proposed project. Based on these project features, the parking structure 5 project itself is anticipated to accommodate the need for additional parking facilities in response to projected demand, and supplement available parking for event attendees at the SAC/Cox Arena, Tony Gwynn Stadium, and other campus venues, all of which are expected to reduce the potential for campus-related traffic and parking impacts into local streets and residential neighborhoods.

4.6.1 Potential Significant Impacts: The SAC/Cox Arena has been evaluated to determine if there are any significant impacts occurring under existing operational conditions. Based on the information in the Final EIR, no significant impacts occur under existing operational conditions. In addition, the project will result in an improvement to the traffic flow and parking capacity on campus; for those reasons, there would not be any significant impacts relating to events management and monitoring.

4.6.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the parking mitigation measure component of the proposed project would not result in significant campus-related traffic or parking impacts to local streets and residential streets surrounding the university. Therefore, the currently adopted parking mitigation measure is no longer necessary as long as the events management plan (“EMP”) traffic and parking controls remain in place, and as long as minor changes are made to existing procedures in a continuing effort to improve the success of the adopted EMP (see Mitigation Monitoring Plan, page 15). In addition, the Final EIR has been amended to reflect the Board of Trustees’ decision to delete the parking mitigation measure from the SAC/Cox Arena project, and to hereby include the issue of whether or not to institute a separate parking charge for campus events in the adopted EMP without any further action or actual or further amendment to the EMP. In this way, the issue of instituting a parking charge for campus events would be subject to further review, advice, and recommendations of the events management advisory committee (“EMAC”), with the final decision of whether or not to charge for parking being left to the sole discretion of the president of the university without any need for further environmental review. Allowing parking charges will provide potential revenue benefits and a better allocation of costs to users. It will also allow the campus to better operate within the CSU self-funded parking program.

4.6.3 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that the above measures are feasible, and are adopted as part of the approval of this project. Accordingly, the Board of Trustees finds that, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project which mitigate or avoid any event traffic or parking impacts associated with SAC/Cox Arena events as identified in the Final EIR.

## 5.0 EFFECTS DETERMINED TO BE NOT SIGNIFICANT OR LESS THAN SIGNIFICANT

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

### 5.1 Water Quality/Hydrology Impacts

5.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the Final EIR, construction of the parking structure and related improvements will not result in significant impacts to: (a) surface water (there is no surface water on or in the vicinity of the project site, and surface water does not drain onto the project site because it is higher in elevation when compared to surrounding areas); (b) groundwater (the depth of the regional water table in the vicinity of the project site is inferred to be several hundred feet below ground surface, based on topographical

considerations, and the groundwater is not used by the city of San Diego to supplement its existing domestic water supplies); or (c) flooding (the project site is located at a high point, with water draining away from, rather than on to, the site, and the site is not located within a defined floodplain).

5.1.2 Mitigation Measures: The “water quality/hydrology” mitigation measures found below, while not required to mitigate any potential significant impact, are nevertheless recommended as part of the project approval to ensure that the parking structure component of the project will not result in any water quality/hydrology, flooding, erosion, or sedimentation impacts upon implementation of the project. The Board of Trustees finds that the following mitigation measures are feasible and will ensure that the water quality/hydrology impacts as identified in the Final EIR remain at a less than significant level:

1. Demolition materials that could potentially contaminate receiving waters shall be removed from the construction site as soon as possible, and prevented from contaminating surface water and groundwater through use of physical barriers or covers.
2. All portions of the work shall be kept free of standing water at all times during construction. Where required, temporary drainage ditches, berms or pumping systems shall be constructed to divert drainage water away from the construction site, and the resultant water shall be carried to the nearest water course and disposed of without erosion to the surrounding area. Care shall be taken to prevent silting of water sources. Silt, which is deposited as a result of the work in this project, shall be removed and disposed of by the contractor to the satisfaction of the university or its designee. The contractor must also follow the practices and procedures set forth in Caltrans’ *Handbook of Practices, Storm Water Pollution Practice*, as amended.
3. Water materials resulting from the process of clearing and construction shall be disposed of as follows:
  - (a) Both combustible and incombustible refuse and debris resulting from construction shall be removed from the property; and
  - (b) Solvents, oils, and any other material which may be harmful to plant life shall be disposed of in containers and removed from the property. At completion of the work, replace any contaminated soil from the property with new soil.
4. During construction, maintain buildings, premises, and property free from accumulations of waste materials and rubbish. Dispose of such waste, rubbish, and debris at reasonable intervals off the property.
5. A six-foot chain link construction fence is required around the perimeter of the project site. Barricades will be erected at street entrances to the project site. Appropriate warning shall be erected at 100-foot intervals along the project boundary.

6. The contractor shall provide clean, sanitary, and adequate drinking water facilities for the entire period of construction.
7. Provide positive surface drainage away from structures at 2.0 percent minimum to a collector pipe or paved surface. Concentrated runoff shall be piped. Ponding anywhere on the site will not be acceptable.
8. The storm drainage system shall be properly coordinated with surrounding properties to ensure that runoff does not cause damage to other properties. Storm drains and culverts shall be sized appropriately. Inlets shall be hydrologically designed to admit design quantities.
9. Storm drainage shall be carried in pipes, lined channels and/or paved swales wherever necessary to prevent soil erosion. Rip-rap energy dissipaters are required at each discharge point to unlined drainage courses.
10. Storm runoff shall be controlled on university property during the entire period of construction. Sand bags, temporary diversion ditches, and similar measures shall be used as required to provide acceptable drainage.
11. The water system including fire hydrant location and fire truck access shall be approved by the State Fire Marshal and the City of San Diego Fire Department and shall meet all applicable requirements of the Uniform Fire Code.
12. Contractor shall comply to all waste discharge requirements for discharges of storm water runoff associated with construction activities, per State Water Resources control Board Order No. 92-08-DWQ, National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“NPDES”) General Permit No. CAS000002. Contractor is required to implement best management practices (“BMP”) to control and abate the discharge of pollutants in storm water discharges. Requirements will include the following tasks: (a) reduce excessive erosion potential; (b) minimize excessive sedimentation; (c) prevent hazardous materials used at a construction site from causing off-site contamination; (d) eliminate non-storm water discharges from construction sites; and (e) install appropriate measures to reduce impacts on waterways from the finished projects. Contractor shall provide a workplan describing how contractor intends to comply with the above requirements.
13. If isolated groundwater lenses are encountered during construction, standard dewatering techniques shall be employed in compliance with the Uniform Building Code (UBC).
14. Any hazardous materials stored or used on the project site during construction shall be stored so as to minimize potential impacts to surface water and groundwater. Appropriate techniques to employ include storing materials inside or under cover on paved surfaces, secondary containment, regular inspections, and training of

subcontractors and construction workers. The period of time that such materials are stored on the site shall be kept to a minimum. After construction is complete, the contractor shall dispose of remaining hazardous or toxic materials appropriately, according to local, state, and federal regulations.

5.1.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the water quality/hydrology impacts of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

## 5.2 Parking Impacts

5.2.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the Final EIR, construction of the parking structure component of the project would not generate any new parking space demand, but rather would produce 1,100 to 1,500 new parking spaces to meet existing and projected parking needs on the SDSU campus. No existing parking spaces would be lost or displaced due to construction of the parking structure component of the proposed project.

5.2.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the parking impacts associated with the parking structure component of the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

5.2.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid any parking impacts associated with the project as identified in the Final EIR. In fact, as compared to the “no project” condition, the project would respond to the need for additional parking facilities on the west side of the SDSU campus, thereby off-setting projected parking shortages, and supplement available parking for event attendees at the SAC/Cox Arena, Tony Gwynn Stadium, and other campus venues, as well as reduce the potential for campus-related parking to impact local streets and residential neighborhoods.

## 5.3 Biological Resource Impacts

5.3.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the Final EIR, construction of the parking structure and related improvements would not result in significant impacts to: (a) sensitive vegetation (all of the on-site vegetation is introduced turf grass and landscaping); (b) sensitive wildlife (the project site includes only urban-adapted wildlife); (c) sensitive species (there were no regularly occurring sensitive species on or around the project site); and (d) wetlands (the project site is an upland, with water draining off the site, and the topography precludes wetlands from occurring on or near the project site).

5.3.2 Findings: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the biological impacts associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

#### 5.4 Other Impacts

5.4.1 Potential Impacts: The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, that the following potential impacts associated with the project have been identified in the Final EIR as not resulting in significant impacts and, therefore, no mitigation is required or recommended:

- (a) Land Use and Planning. The university is located on state property, which is not subject to general plan regulations, zoning laws, zoning ordinances, or local land use plans. Based on site visits to the project site by environmental consultants, and a review of the project site's local and regional setting, the project would not adversely impact surrounding properties, nor adversely affect agricultural resources or operations, or disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the community surrounding the SDSU campus. In addition, the project would not conflict with any adopted environmental plans and goals of the surrounding community.
- (b) Population and Housing. No project-specific population increases would result from implementation of the project. The project would not alter the density or growth rate of the human population in the area surrounding the university, nor affect the existing housing stock, or create a demand for additional housing that exceeds adopted regional or local population projections. In addition, the project would not add to the total student enrollment on the campus.
- (c) Energy and Mineral Resources. Based on a review of the design and construction features of the project by both the university and the consultants, the project would not consume sufficient amounts of energy or resources to create significant adverse impact on existing energy sources. The project also would not create any known conflicts with any adopted energy conservation plans. Non-renewable energy resources would not be utilized during construction in a wasteful or inefficient manner due to contractual obligations between the University and the contractor that would require the contractor to perform construction work in a clean, efficient, and economical manner, and pursuant to Uniform Building Code requirements. In addition, the contract documentation for construction of the proposed project would incorporate, if appropriate, energy conservation measures in accordance with Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations.
- (d) Environmental Hazards. Based on a review of the design and construction features of the project by both the university and the consultants, hazardous materials use or generation is not anticipated to result from project implementation. Therefore, the project would not result in hazards to people, animals, or plant populations in or near the project site. Anticipated potentially hazardous cleaning and maintenance supplies that would be expected to be used on the project site are similar to those already present on campus, and would be used, disposed of, and transported in accordance with applicable regulations.

- (e) **Public Services.** As described in Section 2.0 of this EIR, the project would provide from 1,100 to 1,500 new parking spaces, and address the need for additional parking on the west side of the campus. In addition to meeting the need for additional student parking, the project would increase availability of event parking spaces in proximity to a majority of the event-generating facilities on the campus (i.e., Tony Gwynn Stadium, SAC/Cox Arena at Aztec Bowl, Peterson Gymnasium, Aztec Recreation Center, etc.). The provision of additional parking on the west side of the campus is not anticipated to result in a net increase in the visitor population to the campus as the ongoing programming capacity for campus events would remain unchanged. The provision of additional parking may result in a reallocation of visitor parking currently parking elsewhere on the campus, enabling visitors to park in closer proximity to the event attended. Potential traffic impacts of this reallocation are addressed in the Final EIR, Section 3.5. The project also would not increase total student enrollment on the campus.

Based on a review of the design and construction features of the project by both the university and the environmental consultants, the parking structure would be designed to include appropriate levels of lighting, telephones, fire alarms, fire hydrants, and other features to ensure pedestrian and vehicular safety. Routine patrol services and ongoing maintenance of the proposed parking structure would be the responsibility of the university after construction is completed.

- (f) **Utilities and Service Systems.** Electricity would be routinely provided by San Diego Gas & Electric Co. from existing transmission lines located on or in the vicinity of the project site. The project would not result in the need for water treatment or distribution facilities, and there are no known septic tanks located on site. The existing project site is currently served by public services and utilities, and no substantial alteration or increase in demand on those services or utilities is expected to occur due to project implementation.
- (g) **Cultural Resources.** The project would be constructed in a previously developed area of the campus. Prehistoric or historic archeological sites are not located within or in proximity to the project site. No alteration to a prehistoric building or a historic building, structure, or object would occur with project implementation. Therefore, no impacts to cultural resources are anticipated to occur.
- (h) **Recreation.** Based on the Draft EIR, Section 2.0 the sports deck component of the proposed project would enhance existing campus recreational opportunities. For that reason, no impacts to campus recreation are anticipated to occur due to project implementation.

5.4.2 **Mitigation Measures:** The Board of Trustees finds that, based upon substantial evidence in the record, the above impacts associated with the project are less than significant and no mitigation is required or recommended.

5.4.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid any of the above impacts associated with the parking structure component of the project as identified in the Final EIR.

## 6.0 SIGNIFICANT CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

### 6.1 Cumulative Air Quality Impacts:

6.1.1 Potential Significant Impacts: Based on the information in the Final EIR, the cumulative air quality impacts of the project are expected to be unavoidably significant. The San Diego air basin is designated as a non-attainment basin for state and federal air quality standards. Although, from a regional perspective, the emissions contribution of the project to air pollution is marginal, the cumulative air quality impact of the project with related development in the region must be considered significant because regional emissions in the San Diego air basin continue to exceed state and federal standards.

6.1.2 Mitigation Measures: The Board of Trustees finds that there are no feasible measures available to mitigate the cumulative air quality impacts identified in the Final EIR. As described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, however, the Board of Trustees has determined that this impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations.

6.1.3 Findings: Pursuant to Section 21081(a)(1) of the Public Resources Code, changes or alterations have been required in, or incorporated into, the project that mitigate or avoid the significant air quality impacts as identified in the Final EIR. However, cumulative air quality impacts of the project in conjunction with related development in the region must be considered unavoidably significant because regional emissions in the San Diego air basin continue to exceed state and federal standards even after implementation of all feasible air quality mitigation measures (see, Final EIR, Mitigation Measures 5.1 and 5.2). However, pursuant to Section 21081(a)(3) of the Public Resources Code, as described in the Statement of Overriding Considerations, the Board of Trustees has determined that this cumulative air quality impact is acceptable because of specific overriding considerations (see, Section 8.0, below).

## 7.0 FEASIBILITY OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES AND MITIGATION MEASURES

### 7.1 Project Alternatives

The Final EIR, Section 5.0 Alternatives, contains an analysis of the alternatives to the project, including the “No Project” alternative. The following alternatives were considered and analyzed in the Final EIR:

- (a) No Project Alternative: This alternative is required by CEQA, and it compares the present existing condition of the AzTrack site against the impacts that would result from the proposed project alternative.

- (b) Alternative 2, PG610/620 Alternative: This alternative would allow construction of parking structure 5 in the present location of the two existing playfields west and north of the existing AzTrack site, PG610 and PG620.
- (c) Alternative 3, U Lot Alternative: Under this alternative, parking structure 5 would be built at the current location of parking lot U, north of Remington Road and west of 55th Street.
- (d) Alternative 4, W Lot Alternative: This alternative would allow construction of parking structure 5 at the current location of parking lot W, north of Parking Structure 4 and west of Aztec Circle Drive.

The Final EIR, Table 5.0-1, provides a comparative analysis of each of the alternatives against the proposed project. This table is incorporated by reference in these findings.

The Final EIR does not analyze off-campus site alternatives because the Board of Trustees finds that provision of additional parking on the west side of the campus in close proximity to sports and recreational uses, athletic buildings, and on-campus event facilities is an important project objective. In addition, the Board of Trustees finds that off-campus parking does not address the existing and projected demand for additional parking on the west side of the campus. The Board of Trustees also finds that acquisition of an off-campus site to develop this project would be expected to substantially increase project costs due to land acquisition requirements. Minimizing project costs is another important project objective.

In addition, the Board of Trustees finds that a smaller project alternative should not have been analyzed in this EIR because one of the important project objectives was to respond to the parking needs on campus with a parking structure capable of accommodating from 1,100 to 1,500 new parking spaces. The Board of Trustees finds that a smaller footprint for the proposed parking structure would likely increase the cost per parking space, which would substantially impede the project's ability to meet several important project objectives (e.g., maximize the number of new parking spaces, minimize project costs, use campus land resources as efficiently as possible, etc.).

In general, the "No Project" alternative has been identified as the environmentally superior alternative; however, the Board of Trustees finds that this alternative would not meet the objectives of the project. The Board of Trustees also incorporates the discussion in the Final EIR, Section 5.0 Alternatives, with respect to the consideration and rejection of each alternative to the project.

Finally, the Final EIR addressed the "No Project" alternative for the parking mitigation measure component of the project. For this project component, the "No Project" alternative consists of maintaining the university's current practice of not charging a parking fee for on-campus event parking. No significant environmental effects would result from this "No Project" condition; however, circumstances have changed since the parking measure was adopted for the SAC/Cox Arena project. Due to those changed circumstances (see, Final EIR, pages 5.0-6 - 5.0-7), the Board of Trustees finds that the parking mitigation measure should be deleted from the mitigation requirements of the SAC/Cox Arena project as long as the events management plan traffic and parking controls remain

in place, and as long as minor changes are made to existing procedures in a continuing effort to improve the success of the adopted events management plan (see, Mitigation Monitoring Plan, page 15). In response to community comments, the Board of Trustees finds that the parking mitigation measure should be deleted from the previously approved SAC/Cox Arena project and that the issue of whether or not to institute a separate parking charge for campus events should be, and is hereby, included in the previously adopted events management plan without any further action, or any actual or further amendment to the events management plan. By taking this action, the Board of Trustees will ensure that the issue of instituting a separate parking charge for campus events will be subject to further review, advice, and recommendations of the events management advisory committee with the final decision of whether or not to charge for parking being left to the sole discretion of the president of the university without the need for any further environmental review.

## 7.2 Mitigation Measures

The Board of Trustees has considered all of the mitigation measures recommended in the Draft EIR for the project. None of the recommended measures have been rejected by the Board of Trustees; however, a few mitigation measures were either added (in response to public comment) or modified. The added mitigation is contained in the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan, page 15, relating to events management and monitoring. The modified measures are also reflected in the final Mitigation Monitoring Plan. The Board of Trustees finds that most of the modifications to the mitigation measures are minor clarifications that do not substantially affect any environmental issue associated with the project. The only possible exception is the following mitigation measure from the Draft EIR, Section 3.4 Visual Qualities:

- “14. The transit stop on Montezuma Road west of 55th Street will be retained and integrated into the parking structure design or replaced in kind with similar amenities.”

This mitigation measure was revised in the Final EIR, Section 3.4, as follows:

- “14. The transit stop on Montezuma Road west of 55th Street will be retained or relocated in accordance with San Diego Transit.”

The Board of Trustees finds that the revised mitigation measure is required because of current uncertainties with respect to the final design and engineering of the parking structure component of the project. The uncertainties arise because the project is a “design and build” proposal, and the plans and specifications are not yet final. For that reason, the Board of Trustees finds that it is infeasible for the university to determine at this time whether or not the transit stop can be “integrated into the parking structure design” or “replaced in kind with similar amenities.” On that basis, the Board of Trustees adopts the modified mitigation measure to allow the university the flexibility of either retaining the existing transit stop or relocating it in accordance with the requirements of San Diego Transit.

In addition, the following mitigation measures were contained in the Draft EIR, Section 3.2 Water Quality/Hydrology:

- “8. The storm drainage system shall be properly coordinated with surrounding properties to ensure that runoff does not cause damage to other properties. Storm drains and culverts shall have a minimum diameter of 18 inches. Smaller pipe sizes (8 inches minimum) may be used for small area drains - where length of pipe does not exceed 50 feet. Inlets shall be hydraulically designed to admit design quantities.”
  
- “11. The water system including fire hydrant location and fire truck access shall be approved by the State Fire Marshal and the City of San Diego Fire Department and shall meet all applicable requirements of the Uniform Fire Code, latest edition, as amended.”

These mitigation measures were revised in the Final EIR, Section 3.2, in the following manner:

- “8. The storm drainage system shall be properly coordinated with surrounding properties to ensure that run-off does not cause damage to other properties. Storm drains and culverts shall be sized appropriately. Inlets shall be hydraulically designed to admit design quantities.”
  
- “11. The water system including fire hydrant location and fire truck access shall be approved by the State Fire Marshal and the City of San Diego Fire Department and shall meet all applicable requirements of the Uniform Fire Code.”

The Board of Trustees finds that the revised mitigation measure relating to the sizing of storm drains (Mitigation Measure No. 8) is appropriate because the project is a “design/build” proposal and the plans and specifications are not yet final. As a result, it is too early to determine the precise sizing of the storm drains at this time. In addition, the Board of Trustees notes that the Draft EIR did not find any significant water quality or hydrology related impacts resulting from the project. Nevertheless, however, mitigation measures were recommended based on good design and construction practice. The Board of Trustees adopts these recommended mitigation measures, as modified, to ensure good design and construction practice, but not because such mitigation is required by law or regulation. As to the revised mitigation measure relating to the Uniform Fire Code (Mitigation Measure No. 11), the Board of Trustees finds that the university’s contracting documents for the project have included provisions specifying the applicable Uniform Fire Code requirements. To avoid any conflict between the contract documents and the environmental documents, the Board of Trustees finds that this mitigation measure, as modified, is appropriate for the reasons stated. In addition, this measure is adopted as a matter of good construction practice, not because of any significance findings relating to water or hydrology related impacts.

In addition, the following mitigation measure was contained in the Draft EIR, Section 3.5 Traffic/Access:

“Using signs and traffic controllers, direct all westbound traffic departing Parking Structure 5 (headed for westbound Montezuma Road, westbound I-8, etc.) onto Montezuma Road via right-turn-only exit. Direct other traffic (eastbound, northbound, or southbound) to depart via the 55th Street/Hardy Avenue exit, directly onto Hardy Avenue.”

This mitigation measure was revised in the Final EIR, Section 3.5, as follows:

“Using signs and traffic controllers, direct all westbound traffic departing Parking Structure 5 (headed for westbound Montezuma Road, westbound I-8, etc.) onto Montezuma Road via right-turn-only exit.”

The Board of Trustees finds that the revised mitigation measure is more appropriate because, according to university staff, it is not feasible to direct departing traffic directly onto Hardy Avenue. This avenue is currently a one-way street with traffic flowing in the opposite direction. For that reason, the Board of Trustees finds the initial mitigation measure is infeasible, and adopts the revised mitigation measure in its place.

## 8.0 STATEMENT OF OVERRIDING CONSIDERATIONS

CEQA requires the decision-making agency to balance, as applicable, the economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project against its unavoidable environmental risks when determining whether to approve a project. If the specific economic, legal, social, technological, or other benefits of the project outweigh the unavoidable adverse environmental effects, those effects may be considered “acceptable.” (CEQA Guidelines §15093(a).) CEQA requires the agency to support, in writing, the specific reasons for considering a project acceptable when significant impacts are not avoided or substantially lessened. Those reasons must be based on substantial evidence in the Final EIR or elsewhere in the administrative record (CEQA Guidelines §15093(b)).

In accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines, the Board of Trustees finds that the mitigation measures identified in the Final EIR and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan, when implemented, avoid or substantially lessen virtually all of the significant effects identified in the Final EIR. Nonetheless, certain significant impacts of the project are unavoidable even after incorporation of all feasible mitigation measures. These significant unavoidable impacts are: (a) visual quality impacts (the loss of viewable green space for residential viewers from south of Montezuma Road); and (b) cumulative air quality impacts regional emissions in the San Diego air basin exceed state and federal standards).

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

Cumulative Air Quality. Regional air emissions associated with development of the SDSU campus remain significant and unavoidable. However, measures that the university will be required to implement to mitigate the air emissions of the project are contained in the Final EIR, Mitigation Measures 5.1 and 5.2. These measures are anticipated to reduce air emissions of the project; however, it is not considered possible to reduce regional emissions below the thresholds established by state and federal standards.

From a regional perspective, development in the area surrounding the university (i.e., the College Area Community) has been required to adopt mitigation measures for construction and transportation-related emissions. For example, the College Community Redevelopment Project Final Program EIR (SCH No. 92091036) included construction, transportation-related and energy conservation measures to reduce short-term and long-term air quality impacts associated with that project. (See, College Community Redevelopment Project Program EIR, July 1993, Section 5.2, pages 5.2-1 - 5.2-9.) In addition, the Mission Valley East Transit Improvement Project, while not yet under construction, has been approved and calls for improvements to transit service in the eastern portion of Mission Valley, between Interstate 15 and the Grossmont area, in San Diego County. One of the study segments of the transit corridor comprises the SDSU campus and surrounding neighborhoods. This project is also anticipated to result in slightly beneficial effects associated with the reduction in vehicle miles of travel (“VMT”), and improvements to localized carbon monoxide production due to specific traffic impact mitigation measures. (See, Mission Valley East Corridor Project Final EIS, June 1998, Section 4.9, pages 4-130 - 4-142.)

For these reasons, the SDSU parking structure 5 project, in conjunction with development in the area, is not anticipated to hinder timely attainment of emission standards within the San Diego air basin.

Visual Quality Impact. The only other significant unavoidable impact associated with the project is the loss of open green space to the residents south of Montezuma Road. Although mitigation is proposed to reduce this impact (see, Final EIR, Mitigation Measure 4.1), the loss of this viewable green space would still be significant to the limited viewers who can see it from their residences, or in their commute to and from their residences. As discussed below, this visual impact has been balanced against the specific benefits of the project.

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

- (a) The project increases the parking availability on the west side where demand for parking has been determined to be needed.
- (b) The project improves the vehicular and pedestrian circulation at gateways into the SDSU campus.
- (c) The project utilizes campus land resources as efficiently as possible.

- (d) The project will not result in the loss or displacement of any parking during construction of the new parking facilities.
- (e) The project maximizes the use of existing campus resources and infrastructure, thereby providing the most cost-effective opportunities for meeting existing and future higher education needs.
- (f) The project minimizes project costs and, at the same time, improves overall campus design, architectural character, image, and identity.
- (g) The project may encourage carpooling and the use of public transportation in the event that the university elects to institute a parking fee charge for campus events.
- (h) The project maintains campus green space and at the same time enhances athletic facilities.
- (i) The project will provide for enhanced track and field and soccer facilities.
- (j) The project is the result of input from both the campus and surrounding communities, and responds to their concerns and desires for the university.

In addition to these project benefits, some of the comment letters on the Draft EIR expressed support for the project and its goals. For example, the Associated Students stated that the proposed project is of critical importance to the students of San Diego State University, and that it will provide the much-needed addition of new parking spaces to the existing parking inventory. In addition, the Associated Students noted that, by locating the parking structure under the existing AzTrack facility, the additional parking facility will best serve the growing needs of event parking on the west and southwest side of the SDSU campus. Finally, the Associated Students expressed support for the proposal to delete the parking mitigation measure from the SAC/Cox Arena project to allow the university to institute a separate parking charge for campus events.

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

**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan for  
San Diego State University  
Campus Master Plan Revision for the Parking Structure 5 Project**

1. The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation and any revisions to this plan.
2. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measure 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, San Diego State University, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, California 92182. 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 Measure Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

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

See the printed Agenda to view pages 2 through 15 of Attachment D.

## BRIEF

Action Item

Agenda Item 4  
September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report for California State University, Channel Islands and Approve a Concept Long-Range Development Plan**

##### **Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

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

This item requests Board of Trustees' certification of a Final Program Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) which evaluates the establishment and long-term buildout of a university campus on the site of the former Camarillo State Hospital in Ventura County and approval of a concept long-range development plan (Attachment A). The trustees will consider acceptance of the property under a separate agenda item. The concept plan refers to the proposed development by the California State University of the entire 634-acre site as detailed in Section 3.0 Project Description of the FEIR. The plan is a blueprint for the future development of the campus to provide for the educational needs of 15,000 full time equivalent students (FTES). To meet the space and facilities needs for a full four-year university, the existing buildings of the former Camarillo State Hospital would be renovated and reused for academic and related purposes. As part of the long-term growth plan for the campus, the plan provides for the construction of several new buildings and development of university-related space within the main campus core. The plan also provides for the development of residential and research space that would support the primary campus activities.

The FEIR has been prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed CSU Channel Islands project in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR must be certified as adequate and complete under CEQA by the Board of Trustees to approve the proposed project and accept the transfer of control and possession of the property to CSU.

The FEIR is included in the agenda mailout. The item includes the concept long-range development plan map (Attachment A), CEQA Findings of Fact and Overriding Considerations (Attachment B), and a proposed Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (Attachment C).

##### *Executive Summary*

At the request of the Board of Trustees, agenda items for EIR projects now include executive summaries that identify issues that may be the subject of opposition to the project, with CSU response provided.

##### **Remaining Potential Contested Issues Raised in Public Participation, and CSU Responses**

1. Traffic and funding for needed road improvements has been raised as an important issue due to the project site's reliance on access roads that have historically served agricultural uses and the former hospital, and will require physical roadway infrastructure expansion. Particular 2

concerns have been raised about Lewis Road, a regional highway that connects the site to State Highway 101 (Ventura Freeway). **(Concern of County of Ventura, Ventura County Transportation Commission)**

**CSU Response:** Mitigation of off-site traffic impacts for the revenue-generating development will be through cooperation between the CSU Channel Islands university administration, County of Ventura, local cities, and Caltrans. The CSU Channel Islands Site Authority will also be a partner in funding some level of mitigation for traffic impacts both on and off-site. Additional mitigation, in terms of trip reduction measures and distance learning programs, are recommended in the FEIR. The FEIR describes what level of onsite and offsite mitigation measures would resolve traffic impact issues.

2. Reuse of the site by the university could create the potential for growth-inducing impacts because of the location of the site outside of the urban centers contained within Ventura County. **(Concern of local area residents, Ventura County Office-Environmental Defense Center, County of Ventura)**

**CSU Response:** County and city land use designations for areas adjacent to the campus will determine patterns of property development surrounding the campus. The County of Ventura has in place specific guidelines intended to control growth within unincorporated areas such as surrounding the project site. CSU will develop the campus master plan with an on-site mix of uses that will serve the campus population for convenience needs as a way of reducing local trip generation. In addition, the FEIR contains specific mitigation measures intended to further reduce growth-inducing effects on adjacent properties.

3. The conversion of agricultural land to urban uses. **(Concern of County of Ventura)**

**CSU Response:** Roadway infrastructure modifications may result in the conversion of approximately 11 acres of prime farmland. Cumulative growth in the region along with buildout of the campus may cause the loss of not more than 20 additional acres. However, the use of the hospital site eliminates use of the 260-acre Orchard Site, which will now remain in active agricultural production. In addition, the mitigation measures related to growth-inducement will ensure that additional surrounding agricultural land will not be converted as a direct result of activities at the project site.

4. Biological resource issues and habitat preservation. **(Concern of Environmental Defense Center-Ventura County Office; Conservation Chair-Sierra Club, Los Padres Chapter)**

**CSU Response:** The project site is at the west end of the Santa Monica Mountains, an important and biologically significant open space area. The concerns were addressed in the Draft EIR and further discussed in the responses. The most valuable habitat at the project site occurs on the steep hillside areas that surround the flat lands upon which all of the site modification and expansion will occur. Therefore, important resources located on the hillsides would not be 2

significantly affected by any planned development. Where impacts to wetlands may occur in low-lying areas as a result of later phases of development, they will be mitigated by CSUCI through established methods working with appropriate resource agencies. Additional mitigation measures were included in the FEIR to address biological effects. Also, CSUCI has committed to working with a neighboring water district and other agencies in providing expanded wetland habitats adjacent to the planned Santa Barbara Avenue extension.

5. Impacts to regional air quality resulting from the travel patterns that would be associated with the site. (**Concern of Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, the Sierra Club-Los Padres Chapter**)

**CSU Response:** These issues are directly related to the concerns over the number of vehicular trips described above. The FEIR combines and expands the list of optional trip reduction strategies included in the Draft EIR traffic analysis into the Trip Reduction Plan mitigation measure in the air quality analysis. Potential strategies to be used include carpool incentive programs, parking fees that discourage single-occupancy trip travel; transit passes for students, preferred parking and recharge equipment for low-emission vehicles, and the preparation of a bicycle plan for on-campus travel. Cooperation with Ventura County Transportation Commission and a commitment to distance learning strategies, explained in the FEIR, also underscore the CSUCI's commitment to working within the region to address air pollution.

### **CEQA Decision-Making Issues**

The Board of Trustees of The California State University must determine if the proposed reuse of the former Camarillo State Hospital meets the needs and objectives of the university system, and if the proposed university educational and cultural services are compatible with the surrounding land uses and the Ventura County community.

If the trustees accept the property and the proposed concept for a long-range development plan is approved, the trustees must also determine if the recommended mitigation measures adequately reduce the impacts associated with university use of the project site, and if the measures are reasonable. To the extent presently determinable, the trustees would also make determinations regarding the responsibility for implementation of mitigation measures and make findings regarding those impacts that are considered unavoidably significant and those impacts that are significant but mitigable.

### **Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

**Please Note:** The item and Attachments A, B, and C will be mailed under separate cover.

## ITEM

4

Agenda Item 4

September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### **Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report for California State University, Channel Islands and Approve a Concept Long-Range Development Plan**

##### **Background**

The California State University (CSU) has been in the process of establishing a new university campus within Ventura County for many years. The demand for a four-year campus in the county was originally established in the 1960s. In 1971 the Education Code was amended to include a Ventura County campus among the list of CSU campus sites (1971 Stats., Ch. 1620). The CSU obtained 425 acres of agricultural land in the county in 1969 for the purpose of establishing a Ventura County campus. In March 1976 the sale of the 425 acres was authorized.

Following the adoption of SB 1103 in 1985, the CSU prepared an assessment of the demand for higher education in Ventura County and evaluated the viability of expansion and relocation of the CSUN Off-Campus Center (OCC). The study findings, published in March 1986, identified the Ventura-Oxnard and Camarillo area as the preferred area for the proposed expanded OCC.

Between 1986 and 1989, the CSU specifically examined seven different potential sites in detail for location of an expanded OCC and future four-year campus. Negotiations were entered into with the representatives of two sites, but neither site was acquired because of economic, environmental, and other practical reasons.

In April 1990 the CSU established the CSU Ventura Site EIR Advisory Committee for the purposes of working with the CSU in the identification of alternative sites for analysis in an EIR. At that time, the Camarillo State Hospital was not an available site. The Advisory Committee included representatives of local jurisdictions in the county, state legislators, affected agencies, interested community groups, and other interested parties. The Advisory Committee considered a total of 40 potential sites, from which three sites were ultimately studied in detail. These three sites included the Sudden Ranch in the east end of the City of San Buenaventura, the Donlon Site on the east side of the city of Oxnard, and the Chaffee/Duntley Site located westerly of the city of Camarillo.

After certification of the EIR in 1993, the CSU selected and acquired the Chaffee/Duntley Site (now referred to as the Orchard Site). This 260-acre agricultural parcel is located west of the city of Camarillo and 7 miles northwest of the current subject site. However, a constraint to the development of this site or any other site is the lack of funding for capital improvements of a new state university campus. In 1996 the California State Developmental Hospital at Camarillo was closed. In response to popular public support, the governor established a task force that studied reuse options for the site. The recommendation of the task force was for reuse of the facility as a CSU campus. Subsequently, Senate Bill 623 was passed, which permits transfer of the site to the CSU and the sale or lease of real property at this site that is not needed for campus purposes, to generate revenues for campus growth and maintenance (§89009 of the Education Code, Stats. 1997, c. 914).

### **Project Objectives**

Each CSU campus is a statewide institution serving the instructional mission of providing access to higher education for a broad spectrum of the population. Location of campuses in, or close to, population concentrations throughout the state provides the important element of regional access, which is most critical to students who are least mobile and who otherwise would not have the opportunity to complete their college education. This group includes students who have low incomes (or whose families have low incomes), who are first generation in their family to attend college, who are transfers from local community colleges, who attend part-time because they have work or family responsibilities, and who are older than typical college aged students.

Regional access considerations have led the CSU to seek a potential campus site in Ventura County. The CSU has expressed a number of specific objectives to be met in undertaking the proposed project. These include:

- To develop a CSU-owned site for the Off-Campus Center (OCC);
- To provide sufficient land for the eventual transition of the OCC to a full-service, four-year university campus;
- To meet the intent and spirit of Senate Bill 1103 (Hart 1985) and §89001 of the Education Code, which is to provide expanded educational opportunity to the citizens of Ventura County;
- To provide increased opportunity for eligible high school graduates and community college transfer students in the region;
- To provide an educational, cultural, and recreational facility that will serve all of the citizens of the region, including those currently underrepresented in the CSU;
- To provide for increased capacity within the CSU to meet projected statewide needs (Tidal Wave II population growth forecasts);
- To provide for beneficial reuse of an existing major state facility;
- To maintain the historic nature of the on-site buildings; and
- To provide an alternative funding mechanism per §89009 of the Education Code to support the university in meeting the above objectives.

The CSU Board of Trustees has named the proposed facility CSU Channel Islands. Full buildout of the proposed concept plan would provide facilities to accommodate 15,000 FTES, with 11,950 FTES served onsite and the remainder through distance learning facilities. The need to provide this space is based on the current lack of regional access to convenient higher education. Ventura County has one of the lowest four-year university participation rates of any major county in California. Less than 5 percent of all high school graduates from Ventura County attend a four-year university.

The statewide average is 9 percent. The local population base for the existing CSU Northridge OCC and future CSU Channel Islands consists of Ventura, western Los Angeles, and southeastern Santa Barbara Counties. The two counties graduated 10,800 students from high school in 1990, and are projected to graduate 11,426 by 2000. This equates to a demand for about 3,000 FTES if only incoming first-year students are considered. Almost 5,690 students from Ventura County attended CSU campuses in 1996/97. Of this total, 2,900 students went to CSUN, with 1,220 (637 FTES) upper division and graduate students attending the OCC. CSUN is projected to reach its enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTES by the Year 2002. The second largest destination campus for Ventura County students (744) is at San Luis Obispo, which already exceeds its enrollment ceiling of 15,000 FTES. The proposed CSUCI would provide for these students within Ventura County, thereby alleviating overcrowding at other CSU campuses. Because of the limitations on the availability of funding for the CSU system, the trustees have stated the objective that the proposed project should provide some level of funding for physical development of the campus. Under consideration is a special site authority (SB 1923) that would have certain powers that include the ability to mitigate environmental impacts attributable to long-term development of the campus and assist in development of public-private partnerships for on-campus business initiatives. If the site authority is not approved, the university would have fewer resources available to mitigate impacts.

Following are some of the objectives for the ancillary public-private development that would provide financial assistance to support physical development of the site.

- To provide joint facilities for research and development;
- To provide employment opportunities for students;
- To provide an opportunity for student, staff, and faculty housing;
- To provide for development that has links to and will enrich the university experience;
- To provide for the continued economic vitality of the region through productive reuse of the site consistent with the educational mission of the university.

### **Project Description**

The CSU is proposing to adaptively reuse the former state hospital facilities for (a) initially relocating the Ventura OCC and (b) eventually developing a 15,000 FTES university campus. Reuse of these facilities allows the OCC to move out of inadequate leased office space in the city of Ventura and also re-directs the planning effort for the four-year university from the 260-acre agricultural parcel (Orchard Site). Phased growth of the campus would be guided by a future campus master plan, approved by the Board of Trustees, which would be based on the concept long-range development plan (LRDP) as proposed in this agenda item. This item does not propose adoption of a precise campus master plan at this time.

Legislation has been forwarded to the governor (SB 1923) that would allow the formation of a regulatory authority including the County of Ventura and the CSU that would assist in the future 5

development of university-related facilities within the CSUCI site. If SB 1923 is not adopted, the CSU would still implement a trustee-approved campus master plan. In either case, if the site is approved by the CSU for implementation of the university, the CSU and the county have agreed to develop a Specific Plan that would provide guidelines for the development of those facilities that are not part of the instructional core. This plan would ultimately be presented to the Board of Trustees and the County Supervisors.

### **Project Scope (LRDP)**

Currently the site contains approximately 1,600,000 total gross square feet (gsf) of developed structures. About 1,270,000 gsf are in the central area of the campus, with most of the remainder consisting of dormitories and a variety of attached and detached housing units (totaling approximately 400 units). The 634-acre site provides adequate area for the university and compatible university support uses. These uses at full buildout of the campus master plan would include a variety of facilities related to the university and its academic programs. Proposed uses include a public elementary school, daycare center, academic enhancement center, research/office space (340,000 gsf) for academic partnership-oriented research and science and technology firms, food service and related university support space, and recreational facilities. Housing for faculty, staff, and students is currently planned, along with potential military family housing and senior facilities, which would range from units for retirement and independent living to full-time elder-care units. Student housing within the existing main campus buildings would serve up to 1,000 students at campus build-out, while 900 residential units would be developed within the project site. Adjacent to the residential units would be recreation/open space. However, based on environmental conditions, the use of this recreation/open space for a golf course is no longer under consideration. Reuse of the hospital for the OCC is proposed to begin with 1,500 FTES as early as August 1999, with plans for expansion to 3,250 FTES in 3-8 years (2001/2002 to 2006/2007). This initial phase of development will involve the renovation of 12 buildings, yielding approximately 100,000 gsf and 170,000 gsf of space proposed for use by science and technology firms. As the student population increases and additional reusable space becomes available through renovation, the campus would grow in accordance with the concept LRDP into a four-year university serving 15,000 FTES (11,750 FTES onsite) and approximately 1,500 faculty and staff. It is anticipated that full buildout would occur after Year 2025.

This FEIR will serve as the environmental documentation for the concept LRDP intended as the basis for future development of a precise master plan for the campus. In addition, this FEIR will serve as the final environmental review for specific near-term projects expected to be constructed prior to 2005. These projects were analyzed in the FEIR at a programmatic level to allow future development with minimal further environmental review.

### **Public Participation**

The university has carried out an extensive public outreach and participation program. On March 9, 1998, and during the required 30-day review period of the Notice of Preparation of a Draft EIR, the CSUCI held an optional open house and EIR scoping meeting. Approximately 400 people toured the campus site, and approximately 150 of those attended the scoping meeting. Twenty-four agencies

and individuals submitted written comments about the scope of the DEIR. Each of the concerns raised has been addressed in the FEIR. During the preparation of the DEIR, university officials and the EIR consultants met on numerous occasions with public agencies and citizen groups to better understand their concerns. The 45-day public review period for the DEIR commenced on June 4, 1998. On June 30, 1998, the university held a second open house and DEIR public review meeting. Over 200 people attended the open house segment, and about 150 stayed for the public review meeting. Of those, 24 spoke about the content of the DEIR. The DEIR review period closed on July 21, 1998. Twenty-six agencies and individuals provided written comments. The comments and responses to comments are provided in the FEIR. Eleven letters were submitted by public agencies, and 15 were submitted by community groups and individuals. Letters submitted included comments from the U.S. Navy, the National Park Service, various agencies of the County of Ventura, the cities of Camarillo and Thousand Oaks, the Environmental Defense Center, the Sierra Club, and private citizens. Significant issues raised in these letters focused primarily on land use authority and the consistency of revenue-generating uses with local plans, the question of fee payment by the revenue-generating development, the financing of roadway infrastructure expansion, the growth-inducing impacts to surrounding agricultural and open space lands, impacts to cultural and biological resources, and traffic impacts on the rural roadway network that provides access to the site, and air quality impacts associated with travel to the campus.

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

A summary of the most significant issues follows:

a. *Traffic Impacts and Trip Reduction*—A number of community-based groups and individuals have expressed concerns relative to the large increase in vehicular trips to the site and the lack of any existing transit or alternative transportation options.

**Response:** As a result of air quality impacts analyzed and disclosed in the DEIR, a mitigation measure was included that requires CSUCI to develop a Trip Reduction Plan. The traffic analysis in the DEIR included a detailed list of possible trip reduction measures for university consideration. In response to the comments of the DEIR, the FEIR combines and expands the list of strategies into the Trip Reduction Plan. In addition, CSUCI has already initiated discussions with the Ventura County Transportation Commission, the region's primary transportation agency, to develop a series of transportation alternatives to the campus. Finally, the FEIR elaborates on CSUCI's commitment to distance learning strategies.

b. *Road Infrastructure Finance*—Related to the land use issue described below, the County of Ventura and the Ventura County Transportation Commission commented that the CSU should pay a pro-rata share of the off-campus roadway infrastructure expansion capacity costs that development of the university will affect.

**Response:** The DEIR explains the legislative requirements set forth in Government Code Section 54999 to establish the CSU's authority to pay for offsite costs. The DEIR analysis establishes the physical modifications that would mitigate impacts to roads and intersections, and the Mitigation 5

Monitoring and Reporting Plan establishes the jurisdictional responsibilities for implementing the work. However, implementation of the mitigation cannot be assured and therefore the impact remains significant and unavoidable (refer to Overriding Considerations). To further address this concern, CSUCI has initiated a discussion with the County of Ventura regarding terms of a Development Agreement. This agreement would assign mitigation responsibilities relative to paying the cost of the regional infrastructure impacts to the extent allowed by law. The terms and costs have yet to be determined. The intended agreement will set forth the specific mitigation commitments and the manner in which they will be exercised, thereby facilitating mutually beneficial development and planning.

c. *Land Use Authority and Consistency with Ventura County General Plan*—The County of Ventura, community-based organizations, and several individuals expressed concerns about the nature of the land use authority regarding the revenue-generating uses of the site. Community-based organizations and individuals expressed concern that the plan’s revenue-generating uses may not be consistent with the Ventura County General Plan land use designation “State or Federal Facility.”

**Response:** The land use authority will be under the purview of the Site Authority if it is established by special legislation, and will be governed by a Specific Plan that would be approved by the County of Ventura. 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 that will be held by the Site Authority if it is established. The county would amend its General Plan concurrent with the adoption of the Specific Plan by the Site Authority. It was further clarified that the residential uses in the east campus area are not a new category of actual use, but rather a use that has historically occurred at the site.

d. *Growth Inducement on Surrounding Agricultural and Open Space Lands*— The U.S. Navy, the National Park Service, and numerous community-based organizations and individuals expressed concerns about the potential for the university to induce growth on surrounding agricultural and open space land.

**Response:** These issues are addressed in the county’s own Guidelines for Orderly Development, which do not allow urbanization outside established cities. Mitigation measures have been included in the FEIR, which commit the university to strengthening these regulations by cooperating with land or easement purchases and by disallowing extension of urban infrastructure through university lands.

e. *Biological Resources*—The National Park Service, the City of Thousand Oaks, the Environmental Defense Center, and the Sierra Club raised concerns over the impact to a range of biological resources. The concerns were addressed in the DEIR and were reiterated in the responses.

**Response:** The most valuable habitat at the site occur in the steep hillside areas that surround the flat lands upon which all of the site modification and expansion will occur. Therefore, resources 5 located there will not be significantly affected. Where impacts to wetlands may occur in low-lying

areas as a result of later phases of development, they will be mitigated by CSUCI through established methods working with appropriate resource agencies. A range of mitigation measures has been included to address biological effects. In addition, CSUCI has committed to working with a neighboring water district and other agencies in providing expanded wetland habitats adjacent to the planned Santa Barbara Avenue extension.

f. *Air Quality Impacts Due to Travel to the Campus*—The Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, the Sierra Club, and a number of individuals raised concerns about the impacts to regional air quality resulting from the travel patterns that the analysis presents.

**Response:** These issues are directly related to the concerns over the number of vehicular trips that is presented above. The FEIR combines and expands the list of trip reduction strategies included in the DEIR traffic analysis into the Trip Reduction Plan mitigation measure in the air quality analysis. The measures include carpool incentive programs, parking fees that discourage single-occupancy trip travel, transit passes for students, preferred parking and recharge equipment for low-emission vehicles, and the preparation of a bicycle plan for on-campus travel. Cooperation with Ventura County Transportation Commission and a commitment to distance learning strategies, explained in the FEIR, also underscore the CSUCI's commitment to working within the region to address air pollution.

g. *Commercial Development and Related Fees*—The County of Ventura has commented that commercial development by CSUCI that is not directly related to the educational mission of the university is subject to local land use authority and applicable fees.

**Response:** The DEIR acknowledges that these types of revenue-generating uses would be subject to the Site Authority's land use jurisdiction as regulated by the Specific Plan and related fees and exactions established in the Specific Plan.

h. *Cultural Resources*—The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and one individual commented on the precise extent of the adaptive reuse of the National Register-eligible structures.

**Response:** The DEIR summarizes a detailed Historic Resources Inventory, and establishes a commitment to adapt and enhance the majority of structures in the core campus area, and to continue to consult with the SHPO as the project proceeds through its phases. Historic buildings that might be demolished would be properly documented prior to such action. No major concerns were raised regarding the archaeological resources known to exist at the site, indicating the DEIR was clear in disclosing how such resources would be safeguarded.

### **Fiscal Impact**

Senate Bill 1923 will create the CSU Channel Islands Site Authority. The Site Authority will have an important role in the fiscal viability of the campus. The Site Authority will be empowered to retain a portion of taxes and fees generated on campus. It will provide tax incentives to prospective tenants and provide the ability to finance capital development through the sale of bonds. Site development is planned to be under the Site Authority, particularly the public/private development

of the residential and research and development facilities. This development at full buildout will generate an annual estimated income of approximately \$4 million. Use of these funds will support a portion of the capital development costs of the campus.

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

The FEIR 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 FEIR evaluates the impact of establishing the university campus on the proposed site and overall LRDP of the campus, as well as construction level impacts of near-term projects.

The university has carried out an extensive public outreach and participation program. On March 9, 1998, and during the required 30-day review period of the Notice of Preparation (NOP) of a DEIR, the CSUCI held an optional open house and EIR scoping meeting. An Initial Study and NOP of an EIR was prepared in March 1998 for the proposed project. In addition, a public scoping session was conducted by the university on March 9, 1998. 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 June 4, 1998, and to other responsible agencies. Notice of the availability of the DEIR and 45-day public review period was concurrently published. Business associations and other interested agencies and individuals were provided a copy of the DEIR along with the notice of public review. The public review period ended July 21, 1998. A public meeting was held 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 buildout of the plan as well as the near-term projects. The DEIR identified the following resources with potentially significant impacts, for which mitigation measures are included in the proposed resolution herein:

- Geology and soils
- Biotic resources
- Cultural resources
- Aesthetics
- Traffic and circulation
- Air quality
- Public services
- Land use (agricultural land loss)
- Noise
- Water quality

A complete listing and discussion of impacts and proposed mitigations 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. The preferred alternative is the LRDP, as proposed, without a golf course option. The alternatives shown

below were analyzed and compared to the project identified in the project description. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified.

A range of reasonable alternatives to the proposed plan is required to be evaluated within an EIR per the state CEQA Guidelines §15126(d). The alternatives addressed in this document are those that could feasibly attain the basic objectives of the project, with the discussion focusing on the comparative merits of the alternatives relative to environmental effects (without consideration of economic effects) and on alternatives that could substantially reduce or eliminate significant adverse impacts. Alternatives addressed in this FEIR in Section 7.0 include:

#### No Project Alternative

- No Additional Reuse
- Correctional Institution
- Office

#### Alternative Project Sites

- Donlon Site
- Chaffee/Duntley (Orchard) Site
- Sudden Ranch Site

#### Alternative Site Plan Concepts

- No Santa Barbara Avenue Extension
- 25,000 FTES Campus
- No Redevelopment of East Campus
- No Golf Course

**No Project Alternative:** The “environmentally superior” alternative is that which would cause the least amount of adverse change in the physical environment, which in most cases is the “no project” alternative. In this case, the “no project” alternative would either include no reuse of the facility (continued shutdown), or reuse and redevelopment of the former Camarillo State Hospital since it can be expected that the State of California would institute a productive use of the more than 1.6 million square feet of developed space present at the site. If the site remains in its “shutdown” condition, it can be expected that the buildings will ultimately deteriorate as maintenance is not performed and vandalism and the physical elements damage the structures. Since it is economically impractical to continue the “warm shutdown” state, the two alternative uses that are most likely to occur at the site include correctional institution and office. Another consequence of the “no project” alternative is that the university for Ventura County would be developed at another location, probably the Orchard Site (formerly Chaffee/Duntley Site) previously acquired by the CSU for that purpose. Therefore, the “no project” alternative would include not only those impacts associated with long-term deterioration of the site or, alternatively, reuse of the site, but also the impacts of CSU campus development at an alternative site. Site-specific significant impacts associated with reuse of the site under the “no project” alternative include degradation of aesthetic views, increased air pollutant emissions, potential impacts to historic structures, geological hazards relating to strong seismic shaking, solid waste generation, and traffic congestion.

**Alternative Project Sites:** The three alternative sites were previously studied in the CSU Ventura Campus Site Acquisition EIR (1991). As a consequence of this analysis, a 260-acre portion of the Chaffee/Duntley Site was acquired for future university development. Significant impacts were associated with each of the three alternative sites including increased air pollutant emissions, unavoidable loss of farmland, exceedance of local sewer line capacities, solid waste generation, traffic congestion, and others.

**Alternative Site Plan Concepts:** Four alternative design concepts were considered for the site, all of which would include reuse of the campus core by the university. The No Santa Barbara Avenue Extension would possibly reduce the loss of agricultural lands below the county's 5-acre significance criteria at the expense of more traffic congestion at Camarillo Drive or rerouting traffic onto Potrero Road. Routing of additional traffic to Potrero Road may result in farmland losses for road widening purposes, damage to known cultural resources, and increased traffic safety hazards. The 25,000 FTES university would cause the greatest impacts on traffic, air quality, and traffic noise. Since mitigation measures to address traffic impacts would be greater, secondary impacts to agricultural resources would also be higher, since much of the road widening would occur on prime agricultural lands. The No Redevelopment of East Campus alternative would result in a 15 percent reduction in vehicular trips, thereby reducing traffic, air quality, and noise effects. However, these impacts would remain significant to the same degree as the proposed project. This alternative would reduce impacts associated with historic structures and wetland loss and reduce water quality and drainage impacts. Overall, the No Redevelopment of East Campus alternative would be the Environmentally Superior Alternative. It is noted that neither this alternative nor the 25,000 FTES University meets the objectives for the project, particularly that the proposed project should provide a source of funding for development of the campus. These alternatives do not meet the objectives associated with providing alternative funding mechanisms to advance CSU's educational goals. The No Golf Course Alternative would eliminate potential water quality impacts associated with golf courses, which is environmentally superior. This will reduce potential significant negative impacts of the proposed golf course. In consideration of the comments received from the public and the future availability of an 18-hole golf course adjacent to the north of the project site, this alternative is the staff recommendation.

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 FEIR prepared for the California State University, Channel Islands LRDP, the board finds that:

**WHEREAS,** The FEIR for the California State University, Channel Islands LRDP was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures, and project alternatives associated with the approval of the plan and all discretionary actions related thereto; and

**WHEREAS,** The FEIR for the California State University, Channel Islands LRDP (State Clearinghouse Number 98021053) 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 B, Agenda Item 4 of the September 15-16, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, 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 B 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 the FEIR

The 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, Channel Islands LRDP, 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, Channel Islands LRDP 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, Channel Islands LRDP;
- 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 Channel Islands, 1878 South Lewis Road, Camarillo, California 93011.

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the board adopts the findings set forth in Attachment B, Agenda Item 4 of the September 15-16, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, of this resolution including the rejection of mitigation measures presented in Attachment B, the identification of other agencies which are the proper agency responsible for mitigation measures in Attachment C herein, and the other findings regarding agency proposals presented in Attachment B. The board specifically finds that the rejected mitigation measures were infeasible and describes the reasons for rejecting these measures in Attachment B 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 Program Environmental Impact Report for the California State University, Channel Islands LRDP; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the Board of Trustees of The California State University, hereby adopts the California State University, Channel Islands, LRDP; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the California State University, Channel Islands LRDP is adopted with the goal of serving a total enrollment of 15,000 FTES; 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, Channel Islands LRDP, Final Program 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 C, Agenda Item 4 of the September 15-16, 1998, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, and which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resource Code, Section 21081.6).

See the printed Agenda to view Attachments A, B & C.

## **BRIEF**

### **Action Item**

Agenda Item 5  
September 15-16, 1998

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

**State and Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program 1999/00 (Action)**  
**Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 Through 2003/04 (Information)**  
**Previous Five-Year Funding Program 1994/95 Through 1998/99 (Information)**

#### **Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

#### **Summary**

The State Funded Capital Outlay Program for 1999/00, which has been distributed under separate cover, identifies campus needs totaling \$347,797,000. The Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 through 2003/04 shows a total systemwide five-year request of \$2,566,506,000.

Funding for the 1999/00 program is anticipated from a proposed four-year general obligation bond measure to go before the voters at the November 1998 election. The proposed bond measure includes a funding level that equates to approximately \$208 million annually for CSU capital outlay projects beginning in 1998/99.

A 1999/00 revised project priority list will be distributed at the meeting. The priorities include the completion of previously funded projects, seismic safety, renovation, and growth for campuses to meet enrollment demands. In addition, telecommunications infrastructure projects are included in the program consistent with systemwide priorities.

The nonstate program will be funded through housing, campus auxiliary organizations, public/private and public/public partnerships, and donations.

#### **Information**

The final four years (2000/02 through 2003/04) of the State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program and Previous Five-Year Capital Funding Program 1994/95 through 1998/99 are provided for information.

#### **Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 5

September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

**State and Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program 1999/00 (Action)**  
**Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 Through 2003/04 (Information)**  
**Previous Five-Year Funding Program 1994/95 Through 1998/99 (Information)**

#### **Background**

The Board of Trustees adopted the Categories and Criteria for the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program at its March 1998 meeting. A draft of the Capital Outlay Program 1999/00 and the Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 through 2003/04, State and Nonstate Funded, was presented as an information item at the June 1998 Executive Council retreat and the July 1998 Board of Trustees' meeting.

Since the draft program transmittal, the Chancellor's Office has revised the program based on campus requested adjustments, an updated construction cost index, and the cost rise adjustment to midpoint of construction for those projects included under the new streamlined capital process. The priorities for 1999/00 include completion of previously funded projects, seismic safety, renovation and growth projects for campuses to meet enrollment demands. In addition, continuation of telecommunications infrastructure design is included in the program consistent with systemwide priorities.

The State Funded Capital Outlay Program for 1999/00 identifies campus needs totaling \$347,797,000. The Capital Improvement Program 1999/00 through 2003/04 shows a total systemwide five-year request of \$2,566,506,000.

Funding for the 1999/00 program is anticipated from a proposed four-year general obligation bond measure to go before the voters at the November 1998 election. The proposed bond measure includes a funding level providing an average of \$208 million annually for CSU capital outlay projects beginning in 1998/99.

The nonstate program will be funded through housing, campus auxiliary organizations, public/private and public/public partnerships, and donations.

In anticipation of a favorable vote in November, approval by the board is requested in the amount of \$214.8 million for the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program, which will be presented as a handout at the meeting. In order to keep funding options open, the resolution directs staff to negotiate with the Governor's Office during the fall 1998 budget negotiation phase to maximize funding opportunities for the campuses. A summary of the state funded proposal for 1999/00 is on the following page.

**Summary of Proposed State Funded Capital Outlay Program 1999/00 at ENR 3847**

<b>Request</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Percent of Total Request</b>
Funds for Systemwide Benefit (Category 1)	\$ 6,384,000	1.8
Renovation (Category 2)		
A. Funds to Correct Structural, Health and Safety Code Deficiencies	10,612,000	3.1
B. Funds to Make New and Remodeled Facilities Operable	15,923,000	4.6
C. Funds to Meet Campus Deficiency Needs	122,338,000	35.2
Growth (Category 3)	<u>192,540,000</u>	<u>55.3</u>
Grand Total State Funded Request, 1999/00	\$347,797,000	100.0

Approval is also requested for the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program 1999/00 in the amount of \$117,909,000 for fourteen campuses as follows:

**Summary of Proposed Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program 1999/00 at ENR 3847**

<b>Program</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Percent of Total Request</b>
Donor Funding/Grants/Other	\$95,137,000	80.7
Parking Program	<u>22,772,000</u>	<u>19.3</u>
Grand Total Nonstate Funded Request, 1999/00	\$117,909,000	100.0

The State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 1999/00 through 2003/04, totals \$2,566,506,000 and \$734,032,000, respectively. The capital improvement program and the previous State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Funding Program, 1994/95 through 1998/98, by campus, is submitted as an information item.

4

CPB&G

Agenda Item 5

September 15-16, 1998

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the 1999/00 State Funded Capital Outlay Program identified in Attachment A of Agenda Item 5 to be handed out at the September 15-16, 1998, meeting of the trustees' Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds is approved; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the 1999/00 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program including authorization to the chancellor to proceed in 1998/99 with design documents on fast-track projects in the 1999/00 program is approved; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor is requested to explore all reasonable funding methods available and communicate to the governor and the legislature the need to provide funds for the state program totaling \$347,797,000 in order to develop the facilities necessary to serve all eligible students; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor is authorized to make adjustments, as necessary, including priority sequence, scope, phase, project cost, and total budget request for the 1999/00 State Funded Program within the \$347,797,000.

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 6  
September 15-16, 1998

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

**Approval of Revised Project Budget—California State University, Chico—Bell Memorial Union/Food Services Expansion/Renovation and New Bookstore**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

**Summary**

Approval of a revised budget, based on bids received, for the California State University, Chico—Bell Memorial Union/Food Services Expansion/Renovation and New Bookstore project is requested by the campus and endorsed by the Student Union Board of Directors.

The principal factors for the increased project cost are: the current bid climate, the cost escalation due to inflation, and hazardous materials to be abated in the areas to be renovated.

The revised project budget does not require an increase in student fees and will be funded by student union bonds.

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

## ITEM

2

Agenda Item 6  
September 15-16, 1998

### COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

#### Approval of Revised Project Budget—California State University, Chico—Bell Memorial Union/Food Services Expansion/Renovation and New Bookstore

##### Background

The Board of Trustees previously approved the following three separate CSU Chico projects:

1. July 1997—Bell Memorial Union Expansion/Renovation at a project cost of \$8,046,000.
2. September 1997—New Bookstore at a project cost of \$10,084,000.
3. March 1998—Food Services Renovation at a project cost of \$3,470,000.

The current bookstore is located in the basement of the union and will be vacated upon completion of the new bookstore providing space to expand and renovate the food services area into a food court. The union renovation project includes accessibility improvements, code corrections, upgrades to HVAC and electrical systems to reduce energy costs, and seismic retrofitting. The new bookstore includes retail merchandising on the lower floors and the Associated Students' offices and activities on the upper floor. It will be located on a site adjacent to the union building. The campus believed that it would be prudent to combine the projects for bidding purposes given the number of related components. The above projects had a combined construction cost estimate of \$14,779,000 and total project cost estimate of \$21,600,000. The campus bid the project and received a low bid of \$18,913,133 for construction, resulting in a total project cost of \$26,422,000.

##### Cost Estimate

A proposed budget increase in the amount of \$4,822,000 (22 percent) is requested by the campus and supported by the campus Student Union Board of Directors. A principal factor for the increased costs is the current bid climate, which in the Chico geographical region is drawing from a limited number of subcontractors and availability of labor and materials. Two prequalified contractors preferred to bid on other projects in the area and one contractor bidding on the union was also bidding five other projects, a further indication of the bid climate that currently favors the contractor. Cost escalation due to inflation, and hazardous materials present in the existing building (contractor's bid was \$880,000 versus \$80,000 estimated by the surveyor) were also factors.

	<b>Previous Approved Budget <sup>1</sup> ENR 5734</b>	<b>Revised Project Budget ENR 5929</b>
Construction Cost	\$14,779,000	\$18,913,133
Relocation Costs	858,000	858,000
Fees & Contingency	3,988,000	4,675,867
Group II Equipment	1,975,000	1,975,000
Project Cost	<u>\$21,600,000</u>	<u>\$26,422,000</u>
Total Budgeted Funds	\$21,600,000	\$26,422,000

<sup>1</sup> This column is the combined budget of the July 1997, September 1997 and March 1998 approved projects.

Chancellor's Office staff have reviewed the proposed revised nonstate funded budget and determined that the financial plan can support the higher level of funding required. The revised project does not require an increase in student fees.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the revised budget for the California State University, Chico—Bell Memorial Union/Food Services Expansion/Renovation and New Bookstore is hereby approved at a total project cost of \$26,422,000 at ENR 5929.

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 7  
September 15-16, 1998

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

**Approval of Revised Project Budget—San Francisco State University—Student Union Terrace Renovation and Expansion**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

**Summary**

Approval of a revised budget, based on bids received, for the San Francisco State University—Student Union Terrace Renovation and Expansion project is requested by the campus.

The principal factors for the increase in the project cost are: the current bidding climate; a shortage of skilled labor and certain construction materials in the San Francisco area; the cost of construction access and staging; and building security during construction was underestimated.

The revised project budget does not require an increase in student fees and will be funded by student union bonds.

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

**ITEM**

2

Agenda Item 7

September 15-16, 1998

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

**Approval of Revised Project Budget—San Francisco State University—Student Union Terrace Renovation and Expansion**

**Background**

The Board of Trustees approved the project’s schematic design in May 1997. The project replaces the concrete roof slab at the terrace level of the existing student union building and encloses approximately 25,000 gross square feet of existing floor space to provide more usable area. It also renovates approximately 12,000 gross square feet for use by the university bookstore, provides minor remodeling of the existing pyramids at the terrace level, accessibility improvements, correction of code deficiencies and seismic retrofitting to the 115,000 gross square foot building. The union renovation was bid on August 18, 1998. The low bidder, who has withdrawn his bid, was almost two million dollars lower than the other three bidders. The second lowest bid is \$10,335,000. The proposed additive alternates will not be included.

A proposed budget increase of \$2,383,000 is requested by the campus. The principal factors for the increase in the project cost are: the current bidding climate; a shortage of skilled labor and certain construction materials in the San Francisco area; the cost of construction access and staging; and building security during construction was underestimated.

**Cost Estimate**

The following represents the proposed revised budget for the project:

	<b>Previous Approved Budget In May 1997 ENR 5595</b>	<b>Revised Project Budget Total September 1998 ENR 5929</b>
Construction Cost	\$ 8,298,000	\$10,335,000
Fees & Contingency	2,592,000	2,938,000
Group II Equipment	<u>320,000</u>	<u>320,000</u>
Project Cost	\$11,210,000	\$13,593,000
Total Budgeted Funds	\$11,210,000	\$13,593,000

Chancellor’s Office staff have reviewed the revised budget and determined that the financial plan can support the higher level of funding required. The revised project budget does not require an increase in student fees. The student union board supports the increase in budget for the project.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that the revised budget for the San Francisco State University, Student Union Terrace Renovation and Expansion project is approved at a total project cost of \$13,593,000 at ENR 5929.

**BRIEF**

**Action Item**

Agenda Item 8  
September 15-16, 1998

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

**Approval of Schematic Plans**

**Presentation By**

J. Patrick Drohan, Deputy Senior Director  
Physical Planning and Development

**Summary**

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

1. California State University, Northridge—Health and Human Development/Technology Center
2. California State Polytechnic University, Pomona—University Union Improvements, Phase II

**Recommended Action**

Approval of the resolution.

**ITEM**

2

Agenda Item 8  
September 15-16, 1998

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

**Approval of Schematic Plans**

**1. Approval of Schematic Plans—California State University, Northridge—Health and Human Development/Technology Center**

**Project Architect:** AC Martin Partners

**Background**

Damage caused by the 1994 Northridge earthquake resulted in the demolition of the south library building and fine arts building. Prior to the earthquake, the campus technology center was housed in the south library. The fine arts building also housed the family environmental sciences and the Interdisciplinary Program in Child and Adolescent Development, which are part of the College of Health and Human Development. Since the earthquake, the technology center and family environmental sciences have been located in trailers. This project will provide a building to adequately house these functions.

**Scope**

The proposed project is a new 83,500 gross square foot two-story academic and service building located immediately east of the central Oviatt Library, on the northeast corner of the campus main quad. The new building will include facilities for the departments of family environmental science and child development in the College of Health and Human Development, and the campus information technology center. The proximity to three other college departments located in adjacent buildings will promote interdisciplinary programs. The project includes a large lecture hall, classrooms, faculty offices, and laboratories for nutrition and food science. The technology center will accommodate the campus computer center, a faculty and staff training laboratory, and all telecommunications technical staff. The exterior of the building has accents of ceramic tile around the entrance and between windows.

**Schedule**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	November 1998
Completion of Working Drawings	February 1999
Construction Start	May 1999
Occupancy	August 2000

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area	83,500 square feet
Assignable Building Area	60,100 square feet
Efficiency	72%

**Cost Estimate—Cost Index ENR 3722**

Building (\$142 per gross square foot)	\$11,892,000
Site Development	<u>374,000</u>

Construction Cost	\$12,266,000
Fees and Contingency	2,004,000
Total Project Cost (\$171 per gross square foot)	\$14,270,000
Group II Equipment	<u>0</u>
Grand Total	<u>\$14,270,000</u>

### **Funding Data**

The project will be funded by the Federal Emergency Management Agency for earthquake reconstruction and previously appropriated matching funds from the state.

### **California Environmental Quality Act Action**

A Final Master Environmental Impact Report (Final MEIR) was certified by the Board of Trustees on May 13, 1998. The Draft MEIR was distributed for a 45-day public review period, and a public hearing on the Draft MEIR was conducted at California State University, Northridge on February 25, 1998. The Final MEIR evaluated several proposed buildings and related development projects for the California State University, Northridge campus, including the Health and Human Development/Technology Center (see Table III-4 of the certified Final MEIR). No adverse public comments were received relative to the construction of the proposed new Health and Human Development/Technology Center. A copy of the certified Final MEIR, which includes all written and oral comments received by California State University on the Draft MEIR, will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is recommended for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that upon consideration of the information provided in the previously approved Final MEIR prepared for the California State University, Northridge master plan revision; the board finds that:

1. The Final MEIR was prepared to specifically include this project and has been previously approved by this Board of Trustees on May 13, 1998, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved Final MEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment; and
3. Therefore, no additional mitigation measures are necessary, and
4. The project will benefit The California State University; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the mitigation measures and implementation of recommended improvements specified in the Final MEIR for the campus master plan relative to main (academic) campus development projects are hereby adopted as part of this approval of the California State University, Northridge, Health and Human Development/Technology Center; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan previously approved by the Board of Trustees as Attachment D of Agenda Item 5, master plan revision and Final MEIR certification, approved on May 13, 1998, 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 Delegation of Authority by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the California State University, Northridge, Health and Human Development/Technology Center; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the schematic plans for the California State University, Northridge, Health and Human Development/Technology Center project are approved at a project cost of \$14,270,000 at ENR 3722.

## **2. Approval of Schematic Plans—California State Polytechnic University, Pomona—University Union Improvements, Phase II**

**Project Architect:** Kaplan McLaughlin Diaz

### **Background**

The existing university union was completed in 1974. It has housed meeting rooms, multipurpose facilities, dining areas, recreational facilities, and the ASI Business Office. As campus enrollment expanded, additional facilities were needed to house student organizations and their programs plus other university-wide functions. The University Union Improvements, Phase II project will add a connecting 53,266 gross square foot structure (41,588 assignable square feet) and remodel 22,500 gross square feet, approximately half of the existing two-story facility. All of the facilities that are being renovated and expanded were approved by the ASI Facilities and Operations Board and the ASI Senate after an exhaustive study involving a needs assessment survey and programs/facilities review.

### **Scope**

Phase I of the project was completed in January 1998 and included the remodel of a significant portion of the facility's first floor lobby, and a new pizza restaurant, candy store, and retail lease spaces. Additionally, upgrades were completed to the facility's life safety system.

Phase II of the project consists of the continued remodel of the first floor to house additional retail lease space and food court dining area; the full remodel of the facility's second floor for meeting rooms, student organization offices, and administrative offices; and all exterior areas of building 35 will be repainted. The new two-story expansion will include food court, special events room, lounges, and fitness center. The facility's new first floor "main entrance" is strategically placed to function as the link between the new and existing buildings. The entrance is through a fully glazed wall which "opens up" the facility to the exterior via expansive views to the active plaza, the original Kellogg horse stables (the Union Plaza, building 26) and beyond to the San Gabriel Mountains. The first level of the fitness center, food court and retail lease spaces are directly adjacent to this entry.

The topography of the site is such that each of the two floors is accessible from “ground level.” On the active first level, the site improvements include an exterior “piazza,” performance stage area, and dining terrace. On the quiet second level, the new main entrance is to the lounge/gallery. Directly adjacent are the special events room, dining terrace, and the second level of the fitness center, as well as access to the remodeled second level of the existing building.

**Schedule**

Completion of Preliminary Drawings	December 1998
Completion of Working Drawings	April 1999
Construction Start	October 1999
Occupancy	September 2001

**Basic Statistics**

Gross Building Area (new)	53,266 square feet
Gross Building Area (approx. existing 2nd level)	22,500 square feet
Assignable Building Area (new)	41,588 square feet
Efficiency	78%

**Cost Estimate—Cost Index ENR 3722**

New Building (\$171 per gross square feet)	\$9,086,000
Existing Building (\$71 per gross square feet)	1,591,000
	<hr/>
Construction Cost	\$10,677,000
Fees and Contingency	3,280,000
Landscape	1,616,000
	<hr/>
Total Project Cost (\$206.00 per gross square feet)	\$15,573,000
Group II Equipment	1,000,000
	<hr/>
Grand Total	<u>\$16,573,000</u>

**Funding Data**

Funding for this project will be provided through Student Union Revenue Bonds.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

An initial study has been completed and a Mitigated Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on June 25, 1998. Pursuant to the provisions of the California Environmental Quality Act, the 30-day public review period ended on July 25, 1998, and no adverse public comments were received. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting.

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 California State Polytechnic University, University Union Improvements, Phase II project, the board finds that:

1. The Mitigated Negative Declaration was prepared for this project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act; and
2. With the implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the Mitigated Negative Declaration prepared for this project and specifically identified in Attachment A herein, 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 said mitigation measures and implementation of recommended improvements are hereby adopted as part of this approval of the California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, University Union Improvements, Phase II project; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the mitigation measures shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the plan included as Attachment A herein which meets the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6); and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the chancellor or his designee is requested, under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees, to file the Notice of Determination for the California State Polytechnic University, Union Improvements, Phase II project; and, be it further

**RESOLVED**, That the schematic plans for the California State Polytechnic University, University Union Improvements, Phase II project are approved at a project cost of \$16,573,000 at ENR 3722.

**Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Plan for  
California State Polytechnic University, Pomona  
University Union Improvements, Phase II**

1. The chancellor or his designee is delegated responsibility for implementation and any revisions to this plan.
2. An annual Environmental Mitigation Measure 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 Capital Planning and Project Development, California State Polytechnic University, Pomona, 3801 West Temple Avenue, Pomona, California 91768. 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 Measure Monitoring Report prepared by the campus staff.

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

Environmental Mitigation Measures and Monitoring Program  
 University Union Improvements, Phase II

Number	Mitigation Measure	Method of Verification	Timing of Verification	Responsible Party
1.	The contractor shall erect temporary barriers no less than eight (8) feet in height placed around the perimeter of active construction areas to contain dust and to block or deflect noise away from adjacent areas.	Construction plan review and site inspection	Prior to start of construction; ongoing during construction	CPPD* construction management staff
2.	The contractor will muffle and shield intakes and exhausts, shroud and shield impact tools, and use electric-powered rather than diesel-powered construction, where feasible, to reduce air pollutant emissions and noise. Compressors will be of low-noise design.	Staff inspection	Ongoing during construction	CPPD construction management staff
3.	If necessary, the children's summer day camp that currently uses the university union will be temporarily relocated to another campus location for the duration of construction.	Staff review and determination	Prior to start of construction and ongoing during construction as needed	CPPD construction management staff
4.	As needed for the duration of high dust-generating demolition and construction activity, the university will use filters with removal efficiency of 99.9% for particulates of 10 micrometers or less in size in ventilating systems at the university union and adjacent facilities, to minimize the amount of particulate matter in interior air. Filters will be inspected weekly and changed as necessary.	Staff review and determination	Ongoing during construction as needed	CPPD construction management staff

\* Capital Planning and Project Development

<b>Number</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure</b>	<b>Method of Verification</b>	<b>Timing of Verification</b>	<b>Responsible Party</b>
5.	Travel of large and bulky construction vehicles through the campus will be restricted to certain hours as determined necessary and appropriate by the university.	Staff review and determination	Prior to start of construction; ongoing during construction	CPPD construction management staff
6.	Construction equipment and vehicles will use travel routes as determined by the university.	Staff review and identification of travel routes	Prior to start of construction; ongoing during construction	CPPD construction management staff
7.	Temporary covered walkways will be provided for pedestrians to access the university union, adjacent bookstore, and any other facility as needed. In the event that such a walkway needs to be closed for more than two days, an alternate access route shall be provided. A walkway accessible to handicapped persons will be provided and appropriately marked.	Construction plan review and site inspections	Prior to start of construction; ongoing during construction	CPPD construction management staff
8.	As necessary, an alternate handicapped access to the bookstore will be provided. This may include the addition of a bookstore route to the existing tram service (this may require equipping the tram with handicapped access); use of the university electric vehicles to provide handicapped transportation to the bookstore upon request; provision of temporary ramps, paths, and handicapped parking at appropriate locations; and/or other measures as determined appropriate by the university.	Staff review and determination	Ongoing during construction as needed	CPPD construction management staff
9.	If needed, an alternate route for Cal Poly High School students will be provided as determined appropriate by the university.	Staff review and determination	Ongoing during construction as needed	CPPD construction management staff