AGENDA

COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Meeting: 8:00 a.m., Wednesday, September 17, 2003
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Ralph R. Pesqueira, Chair
Anthony M. Vitti, Vice Chair
Murray L. Galinson
Alice A. Huffman
Kathleen E. Kaiser
M. Alexander Lopez

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of July 15, 2003

1. Amend the 2003/2004 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded, Action
3. California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report, Information

Discussion Items

7. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Student Housing North Project at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Action
8. Approval of Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Faculty and Staff Housing H-8 at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Action  (Item Deferred)
9. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision at California State University, Fullerton, Action (Item Deferred)
10. Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Initial Campus Master Plan for the San Diego State University, Imperial Valley Off-Campus Center, Brawley and the Campus Master Plan Revision for the Imperial Valley Off-Campus Center, Calexico, Action
11. Approval of Schematic Plans, Action
Chair Pesqueira greeted the audience and called the meeting to order at 2:35 pm.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes of May 13, 2003, were approved as submitted.
Amend the 2003/2004 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 1 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-03-09).

California Environmental Quality Act Annual Report

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

Annual Report on Active Capital Projects

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 3 as a consent information item. Chancellor Reed mentioned to the committee that currently the CSU is managing slightly over two billion dollars worth of construction.


With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 4 as a consent information item. He reminded the committee that funding for the program, totalling approximately $200 million was approved by the voters in Proposition 47.

Certify Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision at California State University Long Beach

With the concurrence of the committee, Chair Pesqueira presented Agenda Item 5 as a consent action item. The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolution (RCPBG 07-03-10).

Approval of Schematic Plans

This item proposed the approval of schematic plans for the Cal Poly Pomona—University Village Phase III and CSU Sacramento—Parking Structure III projects.

With the use of an audio-visual presentation, Mr. J. Patrick Drohan, Assistant Vice Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design, and Construction presented the items as printed in the agenda. Mr. Drohan also mentioned that CEQA action on all projects has been completed.
Lieutenant Governor Cruz Bustamante asked Mr. Drohan if parking revenue funds used to construct parking structures could be used for classrooms and other facilities. Mr. Drohan stated that campus-parking projects are funded from bond proceeds under the State University Revenue Bond Act of 1947, and paid for from parking fees collected from students, faculty, and staff. Connected with the source and use of the funds, the Education Code restricts the use of fees collected for debt service repayment for projects funded from the State University Revenue Bond Act.

The committee recommended approval by the board of the proposed resolutions (RCPBG 07-03-11)

Public Comments

The board heard comments from Mr. John Stogel, a student from Humboldt State University. Mr. Stogel voiced a concern about the CSU’s facility design approach and whether enough attention was being given to energy efficient and green building design components. He also raised an issue regarding the use of campus funds for campus management of capital projects in the face of budget shortfalls. Mr. Drohan responded that since 1978, the Board of Trustees has had an energy conservation program that has addressed use of alternate energy resources, and both active and passive energy efficient design. As far as the green building design, Mr. Drohan indicated to the committee that it was the intent of Capital Planning, Design and Construction to bring a proposed resolution to the board in January 2004 that will outline the CSU’s Energy and Green Building Design Approach that closely parallels the Leeds Certification Program. Mr. Drohan also clarified that management of major capital outlay projects are covered by fees contained in the capital budget for the project.

Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2003/2004 Capital Outlay Program, Nonstate Funded

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 2003/04 nonstate funded capital outlay program to include the following projects:

1. **California State University, Fresno**
   - International Center for Water Technology PWC $1,327,000
   
   CSU Fresno wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the International Center for Water Technology, a test facility that will provide independent testing and performance certification for pumps and other irrigation equipment. The project will expand the mission of the existing Center for Irrigation Technology, which has been working with local industry to highlight the wide range of irrigation products manufactured in the San Joaquin Valley. The test facility will also be an educational tool for the students in the College of Agriculture Sciences and Technology and the College of Engineering and Computer Science. Two unused structures currently on the project site will be demolished to accommodate the new facility as shown on the campus master plan (#296). The university is scheduled to begin construction in May 2004 and complete construction in December 2004. Funding will be provided by a Federal Proposition 13 Water Bond allocation and a grant through the Center for Irrigation Technology.

2. **California State University, Fullerton**
   - Student Recreation Center PWC $26,998,000
   
   CSU Fullerton wishes to proceed with the design and construction of the Student Recreation Center. The 90,000 gross square foot project will include the following: gymnasium with three basketball courts, multiple use court, indoor jogging track, weight training area, cardio fitness training area, multipurpose rooms, shower and locker rooms, outdoor pool and administrative office suite. The project will be located on the site of the existing campus parking lot B and the displaced parking will be absorbed in Parking Structure II. The campus is scheduled to begin construction in June 2005 and complete construction in June 2007. The students approved a referendum in May 2001 to increase student union fees to fund the debt service for the building.
The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED**, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2003/04 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include: 1) $1,327,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the California State University, Fresno, International Center for Water Technology; and 2) $26,998,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction and equipment for the California State University, Fullerton, Student Recreation Center.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Amend the 2003/2004 Capital Outlay Program, State Funded

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This agenda item requests approval to amend the 2003/04 state funded capital outlay program to include the following project:

Humboldt State University
Energy Conservation Project

PWC $4,808,000

Humboldt State University wishes to proceed with the design and construction of five conservation measures that will reduce energy costs and improve facility efficiencies: (1) Long life-cycle motors and variable speed drives, (2) Hot water boilers, (3) High efficiency cogeneration with hot water distribution, (4) Lighting controls, and (5) Laboratory fume hood controls. These projects are efficiency measures that will install equipment to continue aggressive energy efficiency practices, promote utility cost savings, and develop power generation capability. The project cost and estimated utility cost avoidance of $340,500 was the result of a preliminary assessment completed in June 2003. This comprehensive project will be funded through avoided energy/utility costs. The project will start in October 2003 and is scheduled to be completed in July 2004.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the 2003/04 State Funded Capital Outlay Program be amended to include $4,808,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings and construction for the Humboldt State University, Energy Conservation Project.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

California State University Seismic Review Board Annual Report

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This information item presents the CSU Seismic Review Board Annual Report.

Seismic Policy and Review Board

The California State University has addressed the seismic hazard posed by its buildings and is in the process of completing their mitigation. In 1993 the CSU Board of Trustees adopted the following policy:

It is the policy of the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that to the maximum extent feasible by present earthquake engineering practice, to acquire, build, maintain, and rehabilitate buildings and other facilities that provide an acceptable level of earthquake safety for students, employees, and the public who occupy these buildings and other facilities at all locations where CSU operations and activities occur. The standard for new construction is that it meets the life-safety and seismic hazard objectives of the pertinent provisions of Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations; the standard for existing construction is that it provides reasonable life-safety protection, consistent with that for typical new buildings. The California State University shall cause to be performed independent technical peer reviews of the seismic aspects of all construction projects from their design initiation, including both new construction and remodeling, for conformance to good seismic resistant practices consistent with this policy. The feasibility of all construction projects shall include seismic safety implications and shall be determined by weighing the practicality and cost of protective measures against the severity and probability of injury resulting from seismic occurrences. [Approved by the Board of Trustees of the California State University at its May 19, 1993 meeting (RCPBG 05-93-13).]

CSU initiated the assessment of the seismic hazards posed by CSU buildings as directed by Governor Deukmejian’s executive order and legislative provisions. The CSU Seismic Review Board (SRB) was established to advise and assist in determining the condition of CSU buildings, and to technically oversee the program.
The SRB is comprised of:

- Charles Thiel Jr., Ph.D., President, Telesis Engineers and Consulting
- John A. Martin Jr., S.E., President, John A. Martin and Associates
- Greg Brandow, Ph.D., President, Brandow and Johnson, Adjunct Professor USC
- Ted Zsutty, Ph.D., S.E., Professor, San Jose State University, Retired
- James Hill, S.E., President, James Hill and Associates
- Sven Nielson, S.E., Principal, Johnson and Nielsen Associates
- John Egan, G.E., Geomatrix Consultants

Seismic Mitigation and Plan

As of September 2002, the majority of CSU buildings identified as posing a life-safety hazard to the students, staff and faculty have been mitigated. The CSU plan has four elements:

1. Mitigate significant life-safety threats posed by falling hazards as a priority. All such hazards at all 23 campuses and off-campus centers have been mitigated.

2. Identify those buildings that pose a significant life-safety threat and mitigate these hazards as soon as practical. Of the over 200 buildings identified as potentially highly hazardous since inception, most have been retrofitted, and only 8 priority buildings remain to have retrofit design initiated.

3. Systematically raise the level of seismic safety for deficient buildings whenever any structural modification, alteration or addition to the structure is undertaken. This is through application of Division VI-R requirements for all construction; particularly those circumstances identified as warranting action.

4. Assure that all CSU new construction and modification of existing structures have independent, technical peer review of the earthquake performance aspects of the plans. Review continues through construction.

2002-2003 SRB Activities

The following are notable activities by the SRB in the year since the last report to the Board of Trustees:

1. Revised and distributed widely the CSU Seismic Requirements, adopted December 8, 2000, and revised April 2003. This includes the specific seismic requirements for all construction work in CSU and establishes the minimum seismic coefficients to be used with the California Building Code provisions. Additions have been made that cover moment frame structures,
particularly when used in parking structures, reduced requirements for small projects, and requirements for approval and stamping of approved plans.

2. Maintained the CSU priority list for seismic retrofits. The list was revised to contain two parts: first, those projects that are priority actions that should be undertaken solely because of the seismic hazard posed by the building; and second, those buildings that have significant seismic issues that need to be recognized when the campus is contemplating alterations or modifications of the building. The latter is to assist in planning so that the planning stage for such modifications recognizes the seismic issues of the building. These problems are to be resolved notwithstanding the possibility that the California Building Code, Division VI-R may not administratively require.

3. Provided technical support in reaching a resolution to the hazards posed by the Residence Apartment Building at San Francisco State University and provided peer review of the modifications proposed by the contractor as part of the mediated settlement of the lawsuit. A seismic retrofit plan has been developed and approved by the SRB Peer Reviewer after considerable effort on the part of both the designers and the SRB, including development and evaluation of a number of different structural approaches. The modified building is expected to meet the seismic performance requirements of the university and Title 24, Division VI-R, consistent with the terms of the settlement.

4. Worked with the Pomona campus to implement actions to accommodate the San Jose fault trace that passes through the campus and has an identified trace. Of the 22 Pomona buildings within the fault trace, only a limited number pose a significant life-safety hazard during fault rupture. These were added to the seismic retrofit priority list as appropriate. Development of seismic retrofit plans for these specific buildings is underway under the review of the SRB.

5. The SRB is preparing additions to the *CSU Seismic Requirements* to address temporary structures (e.g. trailers), light metal frame construction, and selected issues in wood construction, all of which are not treated adequately in the California Building Code. Division VI-R will be revised to reflect the recently adopted NFPA Building code as the basis for the CBC. The SRB is taking the lead to develop a common lease policy to be used by state agencies (Department of General Services), and the University of California. The goal is to develop a common method of reporting seismic requirements to be used by all that provides a basis for decision making and can be customized to meet the individual circumstances.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS


Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

The governor signed the 2003/04 state budget on August 2, 2003. It included $199.5 million, funded from the General Obligation Bond approved by the voters in November 2002, for California State University capital outlay projects. This was previously reported to the Board of Trustees at the July 2003 meeting and contained in Attachment A.
## Final State Funded Capital Outlay Program 2003/04 Priority List

Cost Estimates are at *Engineering News Record* California Building Construction Cost Index 4019 and Equipment Price Index 2564

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank Order</th>
<th>Cat.</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Project Title</th>
<th>Trustees' Request Phase Dollars</th>
<th>April 1 Governor's Budget Amendment Phase Dollars</th>
<th>Legislative Analyst Office Phase Dollars</th>
<th>Senate Phase Dollars</th>
<th>Assembly Phase Dollars</th>
<th>Final Budget Phase Dollars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Statewide</td>
<td>Minor Capital Outlay Program</td>
<td>PWCE 12,000,000</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000 (a)</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000</td>
<td>PWCE 6,194,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Fresno</td>
<td>Science II Replacement</td>
<td>1,440 E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
<td>E 1,958,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Chico</td>
<td>Student Services Center</td>
<td>0 WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
<td>WC 32,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Stanislaus</td>
<td>Science II Replacement Bldg. (Seismic)</td>
<td>680 WC 46,401,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000 (b)</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
<td>WC 45,696,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>San Bernardino</td>
<td>Science Buildings Reno./Add., Phase II</td>
<td>0 PWC 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWC 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWC 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWC 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWC 21,786,000</td>
<td>PWC 21,786,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Sonoma</td>
<td>Renovate Darwin Hall</td>
<td>288 PWC 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWC 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWC 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWC 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWC 26,012,000</td>
<td>PWC 26,012,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>Maritime Academy</td>
<td>Land Acquisition</td>
<td>N/A A 1,301,000</td>
<td>A 1,301,000 (c)</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
<td>A 1,301,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Soc. Scis./Art Gallery/Prkg. Struct. 8</td>
<td>948 PWC 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWC 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWC 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWC 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWC 25,384,000</td>
<td>PWC 25,384,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>Sacramento</td>
<td>Infrastructure Upgrade, Phase 2</td>
<td>N/A PWC 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWC 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWC 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWC 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWC 18,691,000</td>
<td>PWC 18,691,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>San Jose</td>
<td>Joint Library - Secondary Effect</td>
<td>1,731 PWC 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWC 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWC 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWC 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWC 19,633,000</td>
<td>PWC 19,633,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$206,006,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,495,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,495,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,495,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,495,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$199,495,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: **GOVERNOR'S PROPOSAL**

(a) Amount reduced to fund bond reserve.
(b) Amount budgeted for inflation reduced.
(c) Recommendation subsequent to receipt of additional information.

Categories:  
I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure  
   A. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies  
   B. Modernization/Renovation  
II. New Facilities/Infrastructure

◊ This project is dependent upon state and nonstate funding.

A = Acquisition    P = Preliminary plans    W = Working drawings    C = Construction    E = Equipment
Summary

The Board of Trustees annually adopts categories and criteria that are used in setting priorities for the state funded capital outlay program. Attachment A contains the proposed CSU 2005/06–2009/10 categories and criteria, which includes changes to those approved by the board last year. Campus administrative staff has reviewed the proposed categories and criteria.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that the Categories and Criteria for the State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program, 2005/06–2009/10 in Attachment A of Agenda Item 5 of the September 16-17, 2003 meeting of the trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds be approved; and be it further

RESOLVED, That the chancellor is directed to use these categories and criteria to prepare the CSU State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program and is delegated authority to adjust the number of campus projects submitted if this results in an “action year” (2005/06) request beyond reasonable expectation of available funding.
Categories and Criteria to Set Priorities
2005/06–2009/10 State Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program

General Criteria

A campus may submit a maximum of one project for the 2005/06 budget year, and one project for the 2006/07 planning year, including health and safety projects. A campus may submit a maximum of three projects per year, including health and safety projects, for the 2007/08 through 2009/10 planning years. Exceptions to this limit will be considered on an individual project basis. Equipment and seismic strengthening projects are excluded from this limit. Seismic strengthening projects will be prioritized according to recommendations from the CSU Seismic Review Board.

Campuses are to prepare their project requests for the five-year program using PWC lump sum funding for all new project starts. Campus requests for preliminary plan (P) phase funding separate from the working drawing and construction (WC) phases will be considered on an individual project basis. Approval of a phased project will require the project to be completely funded (PWC) within the expected bond cycle. Requests for remaining projects in the five-year program that received an initial phase of funding should use the lump sum method for the balance of funds required to complete the projects with the exception of equipment funds.

Current trustee-approved campus physical master plan enrollment ceilings apply to on-campus enrollment only. These numbers are to be used as the basis of comparison for justifying capital projects that address enrollment demand to be accommodated on campus. Enrollment estimates that exceed these figures should be accommodated through distributed learning and other off-campus instructional means. Proposed renovation projects are expected to include additional instructional capacity (a minimum of 10% increase in the building’s existing capacity) as a means to address enrollment demand in these types of projects. Projects that increase capacity will receive higher priority consideration than renovation projects without enrollment capacity increases.

Individual Categories and Criteria

I. Existing Facilities/Infrastructure

A. Critical Infrastructure Deficiencies

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

B. Modernization/Renovation

These funds make new and remodeled facilities operable by providing group II equipment, and replacing utility services and building systems to make facilities and the campus infrastructure operable. These funds also meet campus needs by modernizing existing facilities or constructing new replacement buildings in response to academic, support program needs and enrollment demand as appropriate.

II. New Facilities/Infrastructure

These funds eliminate instructional and support deficiencies, including new buildings and their group II equipment, additions, land acquisitions, and site development.
Summary

This item requests approval of the final 2004/05 through 2008/09 state and nonstate funded five-year capital improvement program totaling $3.6 billion and $1.2 billion respectively. The 2004/05 action-year requests totals $509.3 million for state projects and $31.7 million for nonstate projects. The 2004/05 through 2008/09 capital program document is included with the agenda mailing.

Background

The Board of Trustees approved the Preliminary State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2004/05 through 2008/09 at the March 2003 meeting. Assembly Bill 16 (Hertzberg) provided voters the opportunity to support the use of general obligation bond funds for Kindergarten-University education facilities in 2002 and 2004.

Pursuant to provisions contained in AB 16, funding for the 2004/05 and 2005/06 state funded programs is to be included in a new general obligation bond measure that will be voted on in 2004. The proposed $12.3 billion general obligation bond measure will provide $10 billion for K-12 and $2.3 billion for the three segments of higher education. The California State University and the University of California’s G.O. bond portion totals $690 million each, while the California Community Colleges’ portion will be $920 million.

Funding sources for the nonstate five-year program include campus auxiliary organizations; partnerships; donations; grants; and the student union, housing and parking programs.
The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The final State and Nonstate Funded Five-Year Capital Improvement Program 2004/05 through 2008/09 totaling $3,628,924,000 and $1,203,626,000 respectively are approved.

2. The 2004/05 State Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program distributed with the agenda is approved at $509,260,000.

3. The 2004/05 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program included in the five-year program distributed with the agenda is approved at $31,712,000 and the chancellor is authorized to proceed in 2003/04 with design documents for fast-track projects in the 2004/05 nonstate program.

4. 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 CSU state funded plan in order to develop the facilities necessary to serve all eligible students.

5. The chancellor is authorized to make adjustments, as necessary, including priority sequence, scope, phase, project cost and total budget request for the 2004/05 State Funded Capital Outlay Program within the $509,260,000.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Amendment to the Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program and Schematic Plans for the Student Housing North Project at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo (Cal Poly):

- Certification of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
- Approval of an Amendment to the 2003/04 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program
- Approval of Schematic Plans for the Student Housing North Project

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

On March 11, 2003, the CSU Board of Trustees approved the conceptual plan in which Cal Poly would enter into a public-private partnership agreement that would enable construction of much needed student housing on campus land, and provide new land and facilities that would enable additional educational benefits to be developed in support of the university’s mission. The resolution also authorized the chancellor to enter into negotiations for agreements as necessary to facilitate the development of campus land to the housing/parking site development.

The proposed Student Housing North project will consist of 2,710 beds in apartment residences available for full occupancy in Fall 2006. The project will also include approximately 1,900 parking spaces, 25,710 square feet of common space for grocery/food service, retail space, administrative offices, and recreation/fitness center, and swimming pool. As part of the agreement, Cal Poly will acquire about 1,254 acres approximately five miles from the campus core that will help mitigate the loss of agricultural lands to the housing/parking site development.
Purpose of the EIR

The FEIR is tiered from the March 2001 Master Plan EIR and is a Project Level EIR for the Student Housing North project. The concept of “tiering” refers to the analysis of environmental issues at a “program-level” in the Master Plan EIR with subsequent focused environmental documents for future individual projects. The Master Plan EIR would therefore be the basis for future environmental review of specific proposed facilities under the revised master plan. As the proposed housing site was identified in the revised master plan, this “project-level” analysis of the project provides environmental information in sufficient detail to allow the Board of Trustees to approve schematic plans for the Student Housing North project.

Potential Contested Issues

The following is provided pursuant to the trustees’ request that potential contested issues be noted early in the agenda:

1. Traffic. Several comments indicated concerns about traffic and circulation impacts to local and campus roadways.

CSU Response: The FEIR describes the impact on Highway 1/Highland Drive and Santa Rosa Street/Foothill Boulevard intersections operation as Class I impacts. The DEIR identifies a mitigation measure, which would reduce impacts to a less than significant level; however, the measure identified is not within the jurisdiction of Cal Poly or the CSU system to effect or implement. This position was upheld in the appellate decision in the case of City of Marina et al. v. Board of Trustees of the California State University system in which the court stated that the university is not allowed to mitigate offsite impacts for traffic and circulation because they are not listed in Government Code section 54999.

2. Circulation. Comments have been received as to the selection of Alternative 1, Southerly Crossing, over Alternative 2 as proposed in the Master Plan.

CSU Response: The Master Plan developed an access alternative based on the best information at the time. With the introduction of Alternative 1, traffic analysis was completed for both alternatives and it was found that neither would have a dramatic change in traffic generations. In discussions with those campus groups interested in the biological effects of the project, it was felt that a variation of Alternative 1 was the preferred direction.

Project Background

In keeping with its mission to provide the highest quality "learn by doing" educational experience, Cal Poly has undertaken an extensive program to expand and modernize its campus
facilities. To help guide these ongoing improvements, Cal Poly prepared a comprehensive update of the Cal Poly Master Plan that was adopted by the Board of Trustees in March 2001. The Master Plan provides a blueprint for the expansion and modernization of campus facilities to accommodate academic programs and services though the year 2020.

The updated Cal Poly Master Plan identified the need for additional university-provided housing for students, staff and faculty. Alternative locations for this housing were analyzed in several studies. The proposed site was found to be suitable for a large student housing development that would be close to the campus core and still distant from the surrounding neighborhoods. Cal Poly is proposing to construct this housing in response to increasing costs and demand in the local housing market, which makes it difficult for students to find affordable housing.

Issues Identified through Public Participation

Comments were received in response to the Notice of Preparation/Initial Study and the DEIR for the proposed Student Housing North. The comments included concerns about:

- Aesthetics
- Agriculture
- Air Quality
- Biological Resources
- Land Use and Planning
- Noise
- Public Services

During the 45-day public comment period, 28 letters were received. The following public agencies or special interest groups submitted comments regarding the proposed project:

- City Of San Luis Obispo Utilities Department
- San Luis Obispo Council of Governments
- California Department of Forestry/San Luis County Fire
- Air Pollution Control District
- City of San Luis Obispo Fire Department
- City Of San Luis Obispo Public Works Department
- Zimmer & Marcus, LLP, Representing the Neighbors North Of Foothill
- San Luis Obispo Bicycle Coalition
- ECOSLO
- Adams Broadwell Joseph & Cardoza, Representing the Plumbers and Pipefitters Union Local 409, Southern California Pipe Trades District Council 16, Lawrence Murray and David Coronel.
The comment letters and the responses to the comments are provided as part of the FEIR. The comment letters raised these significant issues:

- **Comment:** Mitigation measures for traffic must reflect the "project's required contribution," must specify what additional improvements will be necessary and states that in-lieu fees must be tied to unit counts.
  
  **Response:** The EIR identifies feasible mitigation measures for impacts to roadways, based on previous study of the intersection, but recognizes limitations on the university's ability to implement such mitigation. The EIR correctly states that impacts are significant and unavoidable, because feasible mitigation (i.e., roadway improvements) is outside the university's jurisdiction. The university is prevented by law from paying fees for services not expressly identified in the Government Code.

- **Comment:** The DEIR fails to provide indication that Caltrans has any subsequent permitting authority for the project and refuses to consider mitigation measures over which another agency may have future permitting authority.
  
  **Response:** The DEIR mentions traffic mitigation measures that are entirely within the jurisdiction of other agencies, and correctly states that impacts are significant and unavoidable due to the university's inability to implement mitigation. Caltrans does not have subsequent permitting authority for the project.

- **Comment:** The project is inconsistent with the Master Plan and therefore may not rely on the programmatic analysis therein.
  
  **Response:** The DEIR does not rely on findings made in the Master Plan EIR. The DEIR incorporates mitigation measures where appropriate, but makes separate analyses and findings for each topic therein, including cumulative impacts.

- **Comment:** The project will increase the percentage of the resident student population above the level contemplated under the Master Plan.
  
  **Response:** The impacts of increased residents on campus are addressed in sections such as Traffic, and Water Supply. The project will not increase enrollment on campus, however, and will therefore result in a number of benefits associated with increased residents (reduced home-school trips, etc.).

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

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

For complete copies of the comments and written responses, please refer to the Responses to Comments Section of the FEIR.

**Amend the 2003/04 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program**

Cal Poly wishes to amend the 2003/04 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program to include $270,982,000 for the design and construction of the Student Housing North project to be financed through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program. This project is being pursued by the campus in lieu of the Student Housing II project (700 bed spaces, 400 parking spaces) approved by the Board of Trustees at the January 2002 meeting.

**Approval of Schematic Plans—Student Housing North Project**

*Project Architect: McLarand Vasquez Emsiek & Partners*

**Scope**

As previously noted, the proposed Student Housing North project will consist of 2,710 beds in apartment residences. The project will also include 1,900 parking spaces, 25,710 square feet of common space for grocery/food service, retail space, administrative space for operations, a recreation/fitness center, and swimming pool. As part of the agreement, the developer Capstone will transfer to the university approximately 1,254 acres about five miles from the campus core that will help mitigate the loss of agricultural lands.

**Timing (Estimated)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guaranteed Maximum Price</td>
<td>September 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Working Drawings</td>
<td>March 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>November 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>September 2006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Basic Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Area</td>
<td>35 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Parking Structure Area</td>
<td>541,500 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Parking Spaces</td>
<td>1,900 spaces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gross Housing Building Area (includes common space) 967,444 square feet
Assignable Building Area  832,053 square feet
Efficiency 86 percent
Bed Spaces  2,710 spaces

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Configuration</th>
<th>No. of Units</th>
<th>No. of Beds</th>
<th>Size (SF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Studio Apartments</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two bedroom/one bath</td>
<td>272</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four bedroom/two bath</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>2,044</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>2,710 beds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019

Housing Building Cost, includes common space ($152 per GSF)  $146,993,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Breakdown (Includes Group I Equipment) (per GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substructure (Foundation) $3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure) $46.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes) $34.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire) $54.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Equipment and Furnishings $13.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parking Structure Costs ($10,056 per space)  $19,107,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Breakdown (per GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substructure (Foundation) $3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure) $22.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes) $.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire) $8.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Demolition and Development (includes landscaping)  20,933,000

Construction Cost  $187,033,000

Fees, Contingency and Services  40,313,000
Relocation of Agriculture Buildings  5,000,000

Total Project Cost ($154 per GSF)  $232,346,000

Group II Equipment  7,436,000
Student Housing II Sunk Costs  1,000,000
Land Acquisition  20,200,000

Guaranteed Maximum Price  $260,982,000
Cost Comparison

This project’s housing building cost of $152 per GSF is comparable to the Pomona University Village Phase III project at $122 per GSF and the San Jose Campus Village Housing, Phase I project at $166 per GSF. Additional cost premiums on this project are associated with hillside construction and Type II steel construction as opposed to Type V wood framed construction on the comparative Pomona housing project. San Jose’s housing was a high rise with attendant higher system costs for foundation, structure, and fire safety, plus a more expensive brick and GFRC exterior. This project’s parking structure cost per space at $10,056 is comparable to parking structures at Northridge ($8,500 per space) and Sacramento ($8,346 per space). Higher construction costs in San Luis Obispo are generally due to a limited local skilled labor pool and rock soil conditions that prevail in the area.

Funding Data

This project was presented to the Housing Proposal Review Committee on July 9, 2003. The project will be self-supporting, financed solely through project revenues including income from tenant rental, food services, parking and retail. The campus will request Board of Trustees’ approval at a future meeting to issue bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program to finance the design and construction of the project.

California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Action

The FEIR was prepared to analyze the potential significant environmental effects of the proposed project in accordance with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. A project level analysis for the Student Housing North project is included in the FEIR presented to the Board of Trustees for review and certification as part of this agenda item. Public comments received specific to the student housing project focused on traffic and parking impacts to the adjacent neighborhood. The potential impacts of each of these issues were studied in detail as part of the EIR analysis and were determined to be less than significant, with the exception of three off-campus intersections both present and cumulative that would be impacted to significant unavoidable levels.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of The California State University, that:
1. The FEIR has been prepared to address the potential significant environmental impacts, mitigation measures, and project alternatives, comments and responses to comments associated with approval of the Student Housing North project, and all discretionary actions related thereto, as identified on page 2-1 of the FEIR.

2. The FEIR (State Clearinghouse No. 2003041077) was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and the state CEQA Guidelines.

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

4. This board hereby adopts the findings of fact and related mitigation measures for Agenda Item 7 of the September 16-17, 2003, trustees’ meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation measures which are hereby incorporated by reference.

5. The board’s findings include specific overriding considerations that outweigh certain remaining significant impacts.

6. Prior to the certification of the FEIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned FEIR. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the Student Housing North project 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 purposes of CEQA, the record of the proceedings for the project comprise the following:

   A. The DEIR for the Student Housing North project;

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

   C. The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at the proceedings; and
D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items A through C above.

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802-4210, and California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Department of Facilities Planning and Capital Projects, Building 70, Room 200, San Luis Obispo, CA, 93407.

7. The board certifies the FEIR for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Student Housing North project.

8. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for Agenda Item 7 of the September 16-17, 2003, trustees’ meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6)

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

10. The 2003/04 Nonstate Funded Capital Outlay Program is amended to include $270,982,000 for preliminary plans, working drawings, construction, equipment, and related contingency allowances for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Student Housing North project.

11. The schematic plans for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Student Housing North project are approved at a total project cost of $270,982,000 at CCCI 4019.
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Approval of Supplement to the Final Environmental Impact Report for the Faculty and Staff Housing H-8 at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary and Background

On March 13, 2002, the Board of Trustees of the California State University certified a Final Environmental Impact Report (Final EIR) for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8. The project is a carefully planned residential community development for Cal Poly faculty and staff. A neighborhood organization challenged the Final EIR adopted by the board. A court ruling upheld the validity of the Final EIR in all but four areas. The Superior Court ordered the Board of Trustees to: (i) set aside the portion of the resolution regarding the Final EIR with respect to the four areas; (ii) prepare and recirculate information and analysis regarding the four areas; and (iii) reconsider the project approvals in light of that information and analysis.

In response, a Supplement to the Final EIR for the Cal Poly Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8 was prepared. That document was distributed for public review on February 14, 2003, as mandated by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA). The public review period ended March 31, 2003. The Supplement is available for public review at the office of Facilities Planning and Capital Projects at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo as well as on the Cal Poly Housing Corporation website at http://www.cphousingcorp.org/. This agenda item’s proposed resolution references the Findings of Fact, Mitigation Measures, the Statements of Overriding Considerations, and a Mitigation Monitoring Plan as required by CEQA and the Court’s decision.

The project site is located at the northwest corner of the intersection of Highway 1 and Highland Drive. The site is adjacent to the City of San Luis Obispo in central San Luis Obispo County. The university (Cal Poly) and the Cal Poly Housing Corporation propose to construct 72 dwelling units on approximately 6 acres of undeveloped, university-owned land. The FEIR and SEIR analyzed a development up to 85 units. For a full project description and the balance of the environmental analysis, please refer to the Final EIR. Hereafter, the proposal will be referred to as the “Project.”

Technical appendices to the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR are in Volume Two and available at the Cal Poly library or on the website at http://www.cphousingcorp.org/.
The adequacy of the Final EIR was challenged in court on numerous grounds. In a statement of decision filed on December 23, 2002, the Court found that the H-8 Final EIR satisfied CEQA in all but four specific areas. In response to that statement of decision and the judicial writ of mandate issued on January 10, 2003, the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR addresses the following four issues:

- **Construction and Cumulative Air Quality.** The Final EIR explained that the previously approved Cal Poly Master Plan EIR found that Class I construction and cumulative air quality impacts would result from implementation of the Master Plan. Consistent with CEQA Guideline Section 15152, the Final EIR described those already disclosed impacts as less than significant and the Board of Trustees did not readopt a Statement of Overriding Considerations when it approved the Project. Subsequent to the certification of the H-8 Final EIR, the *Communities For A Better Environment v. California Resources Agency*, 103 Cal. App. 4th 98 (October 2002), questioned the validity of CEQA Guideline Section 15152. The Court ordered the Board of Trustees to comply with the *Communities For A Better Environment* decision. The Supplement acknowledges that the Project will have Class I impacts regarding construction and cumulative air quality. The Board of Trustees will consider Statements of Overriding Considerations.

- **Public Services (Cumulative Wastewater).** Adequate wastewater capacity exists to service this Project and other Master Plan projects. As disclosed in the Master Plan EIR and the H-8 Final EIR, sufficient capacity does not currently exist to serve all future Master Plan projects at total build-out. The Court concluded that the Board of Trustees had not properly characterized or adopted adequate mitigation for cumulative wastewater impacts. The Supplement modifies the discussion of cumulative wastewater impacts and proposes appropriate mitigation to ensure that adequate wastewater capacity will exist for future long-term build-out of the Cal Poly Master Plan at the maximum enrollment.

- **Traffic.** The Court found that the Final EIR did not clearly demonstrate that the cumulative traffic impact analysis included the impacts of traffic from Cal Poly’s other proposed faculty/staff housing project at Site H-9. The Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR demonstrates that the cumulative traffic analysis includes the traffic from Cal Poly’s proposed faculty/staff housing project at Site H-9 and other required cumulative projects. New traffic counts were also used to ensure that the analysis reflects recent traffic volumes and the subsequent analysis for Student Housing North on affected roadways and the closure of O’Connor Way.

- **Air Quality.** The Court found that the Final EIR did not adequately explain why a Carbon Monoxide “hotspot” analysis was not undertaken for the intersection at Highland Drive and Highway 1. The Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR provides further information regarding Carbon Monoxide “hotspots” analysis, the result of a “hotspots” analysis, and explains that
even with the conservative inputs used in the model, this Project will not now or in the future cause the intersection to violate California air quality standards for CO concentrations.

Other than the matters discussed in the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR, all the remaining contents of the Final EIR certified by the Board of Trustees were determined by the Superior Court to be adequate and are not the subject of this action. Consistent with the writ of mandate, this action allows the Board of Trustees to consider the Project approvals in light of the additional information and analysis contained in the Supplement.

Potential Contested Issues

Comments received on the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR reflected the following potential contested issues. The general CSU response for the items is also noted here.

1. **Public Services.** Comments received questioned whether the added mitigation is enough to ensure future capacity for the build-out of the Cal Poly Master Plan. They also suggest that the Supplement neglected to discuss cumulative wastewater of other city projects.

   **CSU Response:** Sewer capacity is provided by Cal Poly through existing allocations; capacity is sufficient to serve the Project and the H-9 project proposed for a site north of the H-8 Project. During the subsequent build-out of the Cal Poly Master Plan, demand could exceed wastewater capacity; the Master Plan EIR included mitigation to reduce and ameliorate this impact in the long-term. The Supplement identified the fact that cumulative impacts are significant if development under the City’s General Plan and/or Cal Poly’s Master Plan would exceed the City of San Luis Obispo’s wastewater treatment plant capacity, resulting in a need to construct new facilities that would have a significant effect on the environment. This future deficiency has been recognized by the city for over a decade and the city has been working to provide additional capacity when it will be needed. Planning for this additional capacity is underway, including consultation by the city with Cal Poly. Mitigation measures proposed in the Supplement ensure that adequate wastewater capacity will exist when needed.

2. **Mitigation of Traffic Impacts.** Comments received continue to question the feasibility and effectiveness of mitigation proposed for traffic impacts resulting from the Project, including funding, and the technical basis for the analysis. Commenters suggested that the Supplement does not address the concern of the Court.

   **CSU Response:** The Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR clearly demonstrates that the H-9 project is included in the cumulative analysis. The Project’s potential significant traffic impacts could be mitigated with modifications to the intersection of Highland Drive/Highway 1. In addition, Cal Poly will complete the extension of California Boulevard to Highland Drive prior to Project occupancy to further relieve congestion at that intersection. The analysis in the Supplement demonstrates that the proposed mitigation measures are adequate to ensure that the traffic
impacts are less than significant. Furthermore, both San Luis Obispo city transportation staff and Caltrans stated in letters of record that the mitigation proposed for the intersection was adequate to address the Project’s impacts.

3. **Air Quality.** Commenters were concerned that the Supplement did not look at a worst-case scenario.

**CSU Response:** Based upon general air quality conditions in the state, region and the City of San Luis Obispo, the relatively small intersection and vehicle numbers, actual monitoring at Cal Poly’s Grand Avenue parking structure and in the City of San Luis Obispo, the lack of a prompting from the Air Pollution Control District, and the over-prediction of modeling, a CO hotspot analysis was determined not to be necessary. Nevertheless, to resolve any doubts, Cal Poly engaged an air quality specialist to undertake a CO hotspot analysis for the intersection of Highland Drive/Highway 1. The modeling performed by the air quality expert demonstrates that the CO 1-hour standard (20 ppm) would not be exceeded under any of the scenarios modeled. This modeling approach, including the assumptions about future use of better fuels and more fuel-efficient automobiles, was recommended by Cal Poly’s air quality expert and is acceptable to the Air Pollution Control District of San Luis Obispo County.

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

The Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR was prepared pursuant to CEQA and the judicial writ. The public comment period ended on March 31, 2003. Comments were received and responded to in the Supplement. A copy of the previously approved Final EIR and the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR, which together include all written and oral comments is available at the Cal Poly Housing Corporations website at [http://www.cphousingcorp.org/](http://www.cphousingcorp.org/).

**Resolution and Final Environmental Impact Report**

A proposed resolution is presented below with respect to the Board of Trustees’ actions. Consistent with the Court's order, the resolution: (i) sets aside the portion of the Final EIR addressing the four areas of deficiencies; (ii) certifies the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR; (iii) finds that the Board of Trustees has reconsidered the Project in light of the information and analysis in the Supplement, and all other evidence and information before the board; and (iv) finds that, except as otherwise noted, no modifications of the March 13, 2002 Project approval are necessary. Referenced in this resolution are the required CEQA Findings of Fact, Mitigation Measures, the Statements of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

**RESOLVED,** By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that upon consideration of the information provided in the Supplement to the H-8
Final EIR and all other information in the record of these proceedings, the board makes the following findings:

1. In accordance with the judicial writ, the board sets aside those portions of the March 13, 2002 resolution certifying the Final EIR, the CEQA Findings and the Mitigation Monitoring Plan for the H-8 project that address: (1) carbon monoxide hot spots, (2) wastewater treatment capacity, (3) cumulative impacts on air quality and traffic, specifically including the combined impacts of the H-8 and H-9 Projects, and (4) the construction-related and cumulative air quality impacts for which Statements of Overriding Considerations were adopted in the Master Plan EIR but not in the Final EIR.

2. 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 fact supporting each finding).

3. This board has reviewed and considered the additional Findings of Fact and related Mitigation Measures prepared for Agenda Item 8 of the September 16-17, 2003 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds for the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and related mitigation and which are hereby incorporated by reference.

4. This board has reconsidered the March 13, 2002 approval of the project in light of the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR and all other information and analysis specified in the record for this project. This information demonstrates that the nature and severity of the project's impacts have not materially changed. This board will adopt appropriate findings to modify the original resolution approving the project.

5. Prior to certification of the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR, the Board of Trustees has reviewed and considered the above-mentioned Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR and finds that the Supplement reflects the independent judgment of the Board of Trustees. The board hereby certifies the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR for the proposed project as complete and adequate and in conformance with CEQA, the State CEQA Guidelines and the requirements imposed by the writ of mandate issued in San Luis Obispo Superior Court Case No. CV 020325. For the purposes of CEQA and the State CEQA Guidelines, the record of the proceedings for the project includes the following:

- The Cal Poly Master Plan and the previously certified Master Plan EIR;
• The Draft EIR for the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8;
• The Final EIR including all comments received and responses to comments;
• The proceedings before the Board of Trustees relating to the subject project, including testimony and documentary evidence introduced at such proceedings;
• All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents;
• The Peremptory Writ of Mandate issued January 10, 2003 and the Statement of Decision filed on December 23, 2002;
• The Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR for the Cal Poly San Luis Obispo, Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8; including all comments received and responses to comments at http://www.cphousingcorp.org/.

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802, and California Polytechnic State University, Office of Facilities Planning and Capital Projects (Building 70) San Luis Obispo, California 93407.

6. The board adopts the Findings set forth in Agenda Item 8 of the September 16-17, 2003, meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, including the rejection or modification of mitigation measures, the Statements of Overriding Considerations and the other findings. The board specifically finds that the rejected or unmodified mitigation measures were not feasible for the reasons stated in the Final EIR.

7. The board certifies the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8, and directs that the Supplement be considered in any further actions on the project.

8. The Mitigation Measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Plan of Agenda Item 8 of the September 16-17, 2003 meeting of the Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).
9. The board reconsidered the approval of the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8 in light of the Supplement to the H-8 Final EIR and all other information within the record of this proceeding and finds that, except as otherwise provided for in this resolution, no modifications to the March 13, 2002 project approvals are necessary.

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

11. The schematic plans for the California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, Faculty and Staff Housing at Site H-8 project remain unchanged and, in light of the Supplement and the record in this proceeding, no modification of the March 13, 2002 approval of the schematic plans is required.
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Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision at California State University, Fullerton

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

This item requests that the Board of Trustees approve an increase in the master plan enrollment ceiling at CSU Fullerton from 20,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) to 25,000 FTES. The board is also requested to certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and approve a campus master plan revision to support this increase. The proposed master plan provides a framework for implementation of the university’s goals and academic programs by identifying facilities and improvements needed to support the increase in main campus enrollment to 25,000 FTES. The enrollment projection is consistent with recent campus enrollment history and with California Department of Finance (DOF) research reports indicating future demand for access to CSU Fullerton.

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

- Define sites for up to 15 additional campus facilities.
- Close or realign segments of some campus roadways.
- Propose the future realignment or closure of a segment of Nutwood Avenue, a public street adjacent to the campus, to aid in the long-term development of the campus.

Attachment B is the existing campus master plan.

The Board of Trustees must certify that the FEIR is adequate and complete under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in order to approve the campus master plan revision. The FEIR, Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations and the Environmental Mitigation Measures Monitoring and Reporting Program are available for review by the board and the public at http://csuf-eir.fullerton.edu/.

Pursuant to the trustees’ request that potential contested issues be noted early in the agenda item, the following is provided:
1. Off-Site Public Improvements. The City of Fullerton has commented that the university is obligated to pay for the costs of off-site street improvements made necessary by increased vehicular traffic resulting from increased enrollment.

CSU Response: Implementation of off-site improvements on non-university public property is not within the jurisdiction or responsibility of CSU Fullerton or the trustees to fund or construct. This policy position has been upheld recently in a state appellate court decision in the matter of the City of Marina et al. v. Board of Trustees of the California State University. The court stated that the university is not allowed to mitigate off-site impacts from traffic and other related impacts because they are not statutorily authorized to do so under existing law. This principle relies on funding for such improvements by the agency that the Legislature has specifically authorized and provided fiscal resources to do so, within the taxing and revenue scheme previously established by the Legislature.

2. The City of Fullerton has commented that the City of Fullerton, rather than the CSU Board of Trustees should have lead agency status for CEQA matters over land owned by the CSUF Foundation (not owned in fee by the trustees).

CSU Response: The statutory provisions and guidelines implementing CEQA clearly define the Board of Trustees as the lead agency for CEQA matters in the case of land owned by the Foundation, when the trustees are “the public agency with the greatest responsibility for approving the project as a whole” (and) even if the project would be located within the jurisdiction of another public agency.” (Public Resources Code Article 4. sec.15050)

Background

The Board of Trustees approved the original Fullerton campus master plan in 1962, with an enrollment cap of 20,000 FTES. While there have been a number of major master plan revisions since then with the last in 1993, no adjustment in the FTES capacity has been necessary until now. Current enrollment is at the mandated capacity of 20,000 FTES. Enrollment has been increasing in recent years at a consistent rate of four to five percent annually. Looking to the future, DOF estimates show a 38% cumulative increase in Orange County high school graduates by 2011-12, with a total numeric increase of 10,516. Thirty-eight percent (38%) of those graduates will be eligible for CSU enrollment. Combined with students drawn from outside Orange County and other sources, this data indicates a solid demographic basis for the anticipated enrollment demand.

In order for the Fullerton campus to continue to support enrollment demand, the Board of Trustees is requested to approve an increase of enrollment capacity to 25,000 FTES. This is consistent with the trustees’ May 2003 policy encouraging campuses to expand as needed to accommodate enrollment demand. If enrollment growth continues at the current pace, the
increased enrollment cap will accommodate growth through approximately 2010 to 2012. Notwithstanding current budgetary limitations on enrollment growth, a return to a robust growth rate is foreseen.

Rapid and extensive changes in the physical development of the campus are already underway and are expected to continue in pace with enrollment growth. CSU Fullerton has completed a two-year planning effort intended to guide the intensive campus development expected through at least 2010. This planning featured a public consultative process which involved a broad range of students, faculty, staff and the local community. As the campus matures and builds on the last of its developable land, it is determined to make wise land use and campus design decisions that will serve students and faculty well and reflect the quality of the California State University.

Key physical elements of the master plan include:

- Campus green spaces are to be preserved and protected from development.
- The character of the academic core of the campus should be preserved.
- Future development should be accomplished primarily through the re-use of existing surface parking lots, and around the perimeter of the academic core.
- On-campus student housing should increase from 830 existing residents to about 2,420 total residents.
- Provide approximately 250 units of faculty and staff on-campus rental housing.
- Net parking capacity will expand by up to 3,000 spaces with the addition of parking structures to accommodate campus growth and to compensate for surface parking displaced by campus development.
- Closure or realignment of Nutwood Avenue on the campus’ southern boundary is proposed as a long-range goal.
- Provide for up to six future academic buildings totaling approximately 470,000 gross square feet (gsf).
- Close or realign some campus roadways to enlarge the academic core and preserve its pedestrian-only character.
- Redefine the south entrance to the campus in conjunction with the development of the College of Business and Economics Building.

Proposed Revisions – Attachment A

The item number associated with each project described below corresponds to the large circled numbers on the attached master plan map. For the sake of brevity, the most significant, near-term projects are described individually, while others are listed below with minimal description.

Student Recreation Center (Item 2)
The 90,000 gsf student fee-funded Student Recreation Center (#33) will provide a variety of fitness, sports and recreation facilities, including basketball and racquetball courts, weightlifting, cardio-fitness equipment, multi-purpose rooms, a swimming pool and support spaces. This project includes the realignment of approximately 1,000 feet of West Campus Drive to place the recreation center within the campus loop road in a suitable pedestrian environment.

Parking and Transportation/Retail Building (Item 5)

This building (#58) will provide a combination of administrative support space and retail tenant space in a strategic location between a parking structure and the Performing Arts Addition, both currently under construction. This project is expected to be funded by the Foundation.

Academic Buildings A, B, and C (Items 7, 10 and 12)

These three proposed building sites (#46, 47, 51) are reserved for potential future expansion after the College of Business and Economics. With a total potential area of up to approximately 228,000 gsf, these three buildings would provide more than sufficient expansion to support enrollment increases to 25,000 FTES. Building C (#51) is shown adjacent to existing facilities of the College of Natural Sciences and Mathematics, and would support its potential expansion needs. Building A (#46) is shown adjacent to the existing College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and would support its potential expansion needs. Building B (#47) would likewise support the College of Human Development and Community Service. Enrollment growth is currently balanced among the three Colleges, so that the priority among these three buildings will depend on enrollment trends yet to emerge.

College of Business and Economics Building (Item 8)

The College of Business and Economics (COBE) (#38) is a 193,000 gsf building proposed for state funding in 2004-05. This project will support the rapid enrollment growth of the COBE, and consolidate all its facilities currently scattered among various campus buildings. The project will include space for classrooms, faculty offices, administrative support space. Because of its selected site, the project will displace the existing main entrance road to the east side of the campus. Realignment of the road and relocation of the campus’ south entrance will be included in the COBE project scope.

College Park Housing/Parking Structure 3 (Item 9)

These projects (#0302, 0303, 0304) combine faculty/staff rental housing, student housing, and a parking structure and related office/retail space. The housing component will include 250 units of faculty/staff housing and student housing for 390 residents. The 1,200 space parking structure is connected to and between the two housing elements. The parking structure will be large enough to accommodate all the residents of the housing development, as well as replacing all the
existing surface parking spaces on the site, which will be displaced by the project. This project is expected to be funded by the Foundation. Existing building #0301 is a 200,000 gsf building owned by the CSUF Foundation, housing academic and administrative space. This building and its ten acre site are being added to the campus master plan.

Parking Structure 4 (Item 11)

This 2,000 space parking structure (#59) is proposed to support the long-range parking needs of the campus. Two other parking structure sites already approved by the trustees are expected to be sufficient to support campus enrollment increases for up to eight years. This proposed structure would support expanded parking needs after that time should continued expansion be necessary.

Meeting and Dining Facility (Item 14)

The student union building is on the west side of the campus leaving the east side underserved particularly as campus population grows. This 25,000 gsf facility (#57) will provide dining services to the campus’ east side population at large, and particularly to the expanding student housing complex. Some future student housing will not have kitchens; a nearby dining facility will be required.

Student Housing Phases 3 and 4 and related Parking Structures (Item 16)

Existing student housing (#24, 25) supports approximately 830 residents. Demand for student housing remains much more than is available. Student Housing Phases 3 and 4 (#53, 55) will provide housing for approximately 1,200 additional residents. Because the construction of such housing will displace existing surface parking, both phases of housing expansion will include parking structures (#54, 56) of a capacity approximately equal to the surface parking displaced.

Other master plan projects:

- **Bookstore Expansion (Item 3) #60** - up to 20,000 gsf on the north side of the existing building (#6)
- **Expanded Central Utilities Complex (Item 6) #63** - future cooling towers, substation, cogeneration
- **Visitor Information Centers (Item 4) #45** - replace existing facility at two new locations (#40A and 40B)
- **Corporation Yard Replacement Buildings (Item 1) #34** - replaces eight temporary buildings with 22,000 gsf of new facilities.
- **Ruby Gerontology Center Addition (Item 15) #61** – a 20,000 gsf addition to the existing center (#37).
College of Engineering and Computer Science Expansion (Item 13) #49 – a 51,000 gsf addition to the existing college complex (#10).

Fiscal Impact

Implementation of the proposed master plan revision up to 25,000 FTES adds state funded projects at an estimated cost of $120 million and nonstate funded projects at an estimated cost of $339 million in current dollars.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

A comprehensive FEIR has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR identifies unavoidable significant impacts, specifically increased vehicular traffic and its associated air pollution emissions. Resolution of these requires a Statement of Overriding Considerations which is provided for in the proposed resolution. The Draft EIR also identified potentially significant impacts for which mitigation measures are included that reduce impacts below the level of significance. A complete description and discussion of project impacts and mitigation measures are included in the FEIR as part of this agenda item. In addition, the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program describe the procedures that will be used to implement the mitigation measures.

The FEIR is a Program Level EIR, intended to encompass a range of future development over an extended period of time, defined broadly rather than explicitly. Certification of this FEIR will allow the proposed near term projects listed above to proceed without separate EIRs to accompany each project as it develops over time. As each project is implemented, it will be analyzed to determine its consistency with the FEIR, and additional CEQA documentation will be prepared if warranted. Please note that while the Nutwood Avenue realignment concept is reflected in the master plan revision as a long-term goal, it is excluded from approval under the FEIR. If and when the university and the City of Fullerton move closer to an agreement on the Nutwood Avenue realignment, and funding becomes possible, separate CEQA approval will be sought.

Issues Identified Through Public Participation

The Draft EIR addressed potential impacts associated with the CSU Fullerton campus master plan revision. The campus held a public hearing on June 30, 2003 to obtain public input and comments. The 45-day public review period for the Draft EIR began on June 16, 2003 and ended July 30, 2003. The following public agencies submitted comments:

- County of Orange, Planning and Development Services Department
- Caltrans
• Orange County Transportation Authority
• City of Fullerton, Development Services Department
• Southern California Association of Governments
• California Department of Toxic Substances Control

The comment letters and the responses to these comments are provided in section 6.0 of the FEIR. The comment letters raised these significant issues:

- **Comment**: Addition of campus-generated vehicular traffic resulting in a decline in the level of service at five signalized and one unsignalized intersections, off-site of the university campus, will require university funding to mitigate.
  - **Response**: Funding of improvements in public roadways is specifically within the authority and responsibility of the respective public agencies, not the Board of Trustees of the California State University. CSU and statewide policy exempts CSU Fullerton from responsibility for providing funds for this purpose.

- **Comment**: The City of Fullerton has asserted lead agency status for CEQA matters over future development, which may occur on the CSUF Foundation-owned property called College Park, on the theory that the property is not state-owned. The result would be that planning and zoning controls, and CEQA authority would reside with the city rather than the trustees.
  - **Response**: The CSUF Foundation is a function of the educational mission of CSU Fullerton. The proposed development on the College Park property is part of that mission. For all practical purposes, College Park is under the authority of the trustees, and at an appropriate future time, it will be legally deeded to the trustees. The trustees should be the lead agency for the College Park property, just as for the remainder of the campus. The controlling statutes for CEQA implementation clearly define the authority of the trustees to act in the lead agency capacity where the trustees have the primary control over the property, even though the property may be within the jurisdiction of another public agency and not owned in fee by the trustees.

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

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

**Alternatives**

Section 4.0 of the FEIR analyzed the following four alternative development programs in accordance with CEQA and state CEQA Guidelines. The ability of each alternative to reduce impacts was also identified. The preferred alternative is CSU Fullerton’s proposed master plan revision dated September 2003.

*Alternative 1:* No project – Continuation of the 1993 Master Plan  
*Alternative 2:* Smaller Facility Development  
*Alternative 3:* Master Plan with Increased Emphasis on Student Housing

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

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The FEIR for the CSU Fullerton master plan revision was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures, and project alternatives associated with the approval and implementation of the proposed master plan revision, including increased enrollment, and all discretionary actions relating to it, including component construction projects as identified in Section 1.0 Project Description of the FEIR.

2. The FEIR was prepared pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act, the CEQA Guidelines, and CSU CEQA procedures.

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

4. This board hereby adopts the Findings of Fact and related mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program for Agenda Item 9 of the September 16-17, 2003, meeting of the trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the
proposed project and related mitigation measures which are hereby incorporated by reference.

5. The board’s adopted Findings include specific overriding considerations that outweigh certain remaining significant impacts.

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

A. The Draft EIR for the CSU Fullerton master plan revision;

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

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

D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (A) through (C) above.

The above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore, Long Beach, California 90802-4210, and California State University, Fullerton, Department of Facilities Management, 800 North State College Avenue, Fullerton, California 92834.

7. The board hereby certifies the FEIR for the CSU Fullerton master plan revision, including the component construction projects identified in the FEIR.

8. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring Program are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring Program for Agenda Item 9 of the September 16-17, 2003 meeting of the trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and
Grounds, which meets the requirements of the CEQA (Public Resources Code, Section 21081.6).

9. The CSU Fullerton master plan revision dated September 2003 is approved at a master plan enrollment ceiling of 25,000 FTES.

10. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the CSU Fullerton master plan revision.
**CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON**  
**CAMPUS MASTER PLAN—25,000 FTES**

| 1. Corporation Yard       | 32. Orange Co. Sanitation District Pumping Station |
| 2. McCarthy Hall & Science Lab Center | 33. Student Recreation Center |
| 3. Performing Arts        | 33A Recreation Center Outdoor Sports Annex |
| 4. Physical Education     | 34. Physical Services Complex Improvements |
| 4A Kinesiology and Health Sciences A | 35. Marriott Hotel |
| 4B Kinesiology and Health Sciences B | 36. Sports Complex |
| 4C Kinesiology and Health Sciences C | 37. Ruby Gerontology Center |
| 5. Paulina June & George Pollak Library | 38. College of Business and Economics |
| 6. Titan Bookstore        | 39. Weight Training Facility |
| 7. Humanities & Social Sciences Building | 40. Visitors’ Information Center East/West (40A/40B) |
| 8. Visual Arts Center     | 41. Faculty Terrace-South (temporary) |
| 9. Langsdorf Hall         | 42. Children’s Center (temporary) |
| 10. Engineering & Computer Science | 43. Visitors’ Information Center (temporary) |
| 11. Student Health Center | 44. Academic Building A |
| 12. Education Classroom Building | 45. Academic Building B |
| 13. Arboretum Visitors’ Center | 46. University Police |
| 14. Titan Student Union   | 47. Engineering & Computer Science Addition |
| 15. University Hall       | 48. Golleher Alumni House |
| 17. Cooling Towers & Electrical Substation | 50. Children’s Center |
| 18. Parking Structure 1 (2,500 spaces) | 51. Student Housing Phase 3 |
| 19. Perform. Arts Ctr.-Aud./Fine Arts Instruct. Fac. | 52. Student Housing Ph. 3 Parking Structure (300 spaces) |
| 20. Carl’s Jr. Restaurant | 53. Student Housing Phase 4 |
| 21. Plant Growth Facility | 54. Meeting and Dining Facility |
| 22. Jewel Plummer Cobb Residence Halls | 55. Parking and Transportation/Retail |
| 23. Student Housing Phase 2 | 56. Parking Structure 4 (2,000 spaces) |
| 24. Parking Structure 2 (1,400 spaces) | 57. Titan Bookstore Addition |
| 25. Titan House           | 58. Ruby Gerontology Addition |
| 26. Extended Education/Administration | 59. Central Utilities Plant Improvements |
| 30. Health Center Addition | 60. Cogeneration Plant |

**LEGEND: EXISTING FACILITY/Proposed Facility**

Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Database (SFDB)
CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
CAMPUS MASTER PLAN—20,000 FTES

| 1. Corporation Yard                  | 25. Student Housing Complex   |
| 3. Performing Arts Center           | 27. Titan House               |
| 4. Physical Education Building      | 28. *Cafeteria Addition*      |
| 5. Paulina June & George Pollak Library| 29. Extended Education/Parking/EH&S |
| 7. Humanities & Social Sciences Bldg.| 31. Arboretum/Heritage House |
| 8. Visual Arts Center               | 32. Pumping Station           |
| 9. Langsdorf Hall                   | 33. *Faculty Housing*         |
| 10. Engineering/Comp. Science Complex| 34. *Physical Service Complex*|
| 11. Student Health Center           | 35. Marriott Hotel            |
| 12. Education Classroom Building    | 36. Sports Complex            |
| 13. *Environmental Science Education*| 37. Ruby Gerontology Center  |
| 14. Titan Student Union             | 38. *Business Administration Addition* |
| 15. University Hall                 | 39. Weight Training Facility  |
| 17. Cooling Towers & Electrical Sub.| 41. Faculty Terrace-South     |
| 18. *Parking Structure “A”*        | 42. Children’s Center         |
| 19. *Auditorium/Fine Arts Instruction Fac.*| 43. Visitors Information Center |
| 20. Carl’s Jr. Food Services        | 44. Golleher Alumni House     |
| 21. Plant Growth Faculty & Utilities| 45. *Proposed Children’s Center*|
| 22. Jewel Plummer Cobb Residence Halls||

**LEGEND:** EXISTING FACILITY/Proposed Facility
Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Database (SFDB)
COMMITTEE ON CAMPUS PLANNING, BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Certify the Final Environmental Impact Report and Approve the Initial Campus Master Plan for the San Diego State University, Imperial Valley Off-Campus Center, Brawley and the Campus Master Plan Revision for the Imperial Valley Off-Campus Center, Calexico

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

San Diego State University requests the following actions by the Board of Trustees:

- Certify a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR)
- Approve the Initial Campus Master Plan for Imperial Valley Off-Campus Center in Brawley (IVC Brawley) at a Master Plan Enrollment Ceiling of 850 FTES
- Approve the Campus Master Plan Revision for Imperial Valley Off-Campus Center in Calexico (IVC Calexico)
- Approve Increasing the IVC Calexico Enrollment Ceiling from 400 FTES to 850 FTES

The Board of Trustees must certify that the FEIR is adequate and complete under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) in order to approve the IVC Brawley initial campus master plan and the IVC Calexico master plan revision. The FEIR, Findings of Fact and Statements of Overriding Considerations and the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are available for review by the board and the public at http://bfa.sdsu.edu/fpm/brawley.htm.

The following attachments are included in the item:

- Attachment A illustrates the IVC Brawley proposed 850 FTES initial campus master plan.
- Attachment B illustrates the IVC Calexico proposed 850 FTES campus master plan.
- Attachment C illustrates the IVC Calexico existing 400 FTES campus master plan.

Background

IVC Calexico is in the southern portion of Imperial County and is the only higher education campus in the county. In July 2001, the CSU Chancellor’s Office, Division of Academic Affairs, Office of Analytic Studies, undertook an Enrollment Needs Study for Imperial County. The
study evaluated current and historical population trends in the Imperial Valley, recognized the physical constraints to additional enrollment at IVC Calexico beyond 850 FTES and supported the need for additional higher education facilities in the Imperial Valley. The study also recognized the need for additional facilities in the northern portion of the county citing distance as a barrier to providing higher education in the more populated northern portion of the county. A private developer offered a gift of 200 acres east of the City of Brawley to enhance higher education opportunities in northern Imperial County. In September 2001, the Board of Trustees recognized that IVC Calexico had reached its enrollment ceiling and that there was a growing need for additional CSU educational services in Imperial County. The trustees authorized the chancellor to accept the gift of real property for IVC Brawley and entered into a Memorandum of Understanding with the donor. The gift of property was subject to compliance with the trustees’ policy on public/private real estate projects. Pursuant to the board policy, SDSU has completed due diligence proceedings for the subject property. The due diligence process included development of Phase I and II Environmental Assessments, Title Assessments, including an ALTA Survey, an Appraisal Report and an Improvement Assessment. Conceptual Land Use and Phase Development Plans were developed. For development purposes, the 200-acre parcel has been divided into a 5-acre nonstate owned parcel and a 195-acre state owned parcel.

5-Acre Nonstate Parcel: In an effort to expedite the provision of much needed higher education facilities to this portion of Imperial County, a proposal by the private developer to sub-divide a 5-acre parcel from the 200 acres was negotiated. The 5-acre nonstate parcel is being independently developed with a Phase I Initial Facility. It is envisioned that the Phase I Initial Facility will be a self-contained, operational satellite of SDSU as part of the existing IVC Calexico campus and would not encumber the development and operation of a future campus on the remaining property. The County of Imperial became the lead agency for the purposes of preparing the EIR for the nonstate Phase I Initial Facility. The public review period for the EIR was complete on March 17, 2003 and the Imperial County Board of Supervisor’s certified the project on May 6, 2003. Aztec Shops, Ltd., an SDSU Auxiliary, accepted title to the 5-acre parcel in June 2003, and will develop the Phase I Initial Facility for SDSU IVC Brawley. The facility will consist of an approximately 10,000 GSF (6,400 ASF) classroom and office building with a 150-car parking lot and other support facilities as required. Construction started in August 2003 and occupancy is planned for January 2004. The 5-acres was appraised at a total value of $155,000.

195-Acre State Owned Parcel: SDSU has received title to the 195-acre gift of real property. The land will be held for future development with student enrollment growth determining the ultimate development schedule.

Initial Campus Master Plan for IVC Brawley—Attachment A
Consistent with the mission established for IVC Calexico, the IVC Brawley site is proposed to provide permanent educational facilities similar to those established at the Calexico site. The proposed initial campus master plan for IVC Brawley includes a long-range Land-Use Development Plan for the 200-acre Brawley site. Development proposed for the site includes facilities to support academic functions as well as research institute uses. Future campus facilities may include classrooms and teaching labs, faculty and administrative offices, research buildings for programs such as those related to agriculture and energy, a library, computer building, student center/food service facilities, an auditorium or multi-purpose facility, student housing, recreation fields, a physical plant building, surface parking and other support facilities. As previously noted, development of the 200 acres has been divided into a 5-acre nonstate parcel and a 195-acre state parcel. The initial development includes the Initial Facility (Attachment A, #1) on the 5-acre nonstate parcel, followed by the state funded Academic Buildings II and III (Attachment A, #2 and #3) as required to accommodate student enrollment growth to a master planned enrollment ceiling of 850 FTES.

**Fiscal Impact**

Implementation of the IVC Brawley initial campus master plan adds state funded projects at an estimated cost of $69 million and nonstate funded projects at an estimated cost of $74 million in current dollars.

**Master Plan Revision for IVC Calexico—Attachment B**

The proposed campus master plan revision for IVC Calexico removes temporary facilities currently housing student services and classroom facilities and proposes the addition of two classroom facilities to accommodate student enrollment growth to a master planned enrollment ceiling of 850 FTES.

Attachment B identifies the proposed revisions with a hexagon numbering system as indicated below:

- **Hexagon 1:** Classroom Building East
- **Hexagon 2:** Classroom Building South

**Fiscal Impact**

Implementation of the IVC Calexico proposed master plan revision adds state funded projects at an estimated cost of $16 million in current dollars.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**
A comprehensive FEIR was prepared pursuant to the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines. The FEIR is presented to the Board of Trustees for certification as part of this agenda item. San Diego State University, as representative of the Lead Agency, prepared the Draft EIR and Initial Study for the SDSU Imperial Valley Center Master Plan, SCH. NO. 200251010 in April 2003. The IVC Master Plan includes both the Calexico and Brawley sites. The EIR was undertaken to address and evaluate the need to improve and enhance higher education facilities in the Imperial Valley. The EIR addressed the addition of facilities at the existing IVC Calexico campus and raising the enrollment ceiling to 850 FTES. The EIR also addressed the provision of facilities for up to 850 FTES at IVC Brawley.

The Draft EIR was distributed on April 9, 2003 for a 45-day public review period, which ended on May 23, 2003. Comments to the Draft EIR were received from the Department of Toxic Substances Control and the Department of Conservation.

1. Hazardous Material. The State Department of Toxic Substances Control commented that agricultural lands may contain residue of toxic materials.

CSU Response: San Diego State University has conducted exhaustive Phase I and II Environmental Assessment on the property, and no excessive concentrations of hazardous or toxic substances have been identified.

2. Loss of Agricultural Land. The State Department of Conservation has identified loss of farmland as a potentially significant impact.

CSU Response: Although this project will ultimately convert existing farmland to urban university uses, the immediate and cumulative impact is negligible. Responsibility for basic land use determination on a regional basis lies with the County of Imperial and other regional government agencies.

Analyses of resource issues in the Draft EIR addressed the following issues:

- Land Use
- Geotechnical and Seismic
- Hazardous Materials
- Biological Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Public Services
- Hydrology
- Agricultural Lands
- Water Quality
- Cumulative Transportation and Traffic
The FEIR is a Program Level EIR, intended to encompass a range of future development over an extended period of time, defined broadly rather than explicitly. Certification of this FEIR will allow the proposed near term projects listed above to proceed without separate EIRs to accompany each project as it develops over time. As each project is implemented, it will be analyzed to determine its consistency with the FEIR, and additional CEQA documentation will be prepared if warranted.

With the exception of Cumulative Transportation and Traffic, it was determined that implementation of the mitigation measures set forth in the FEIR would assure the project would not result in any significant adverse environmental impacts. The FEIR determined the Cumulative Transportation and Traffic would have significant unavoidable cumulative environmental impacts for which a Statement of Overriding Considerations is presented to the Board of Trustees for certification as part of this agenda item. A copy of the FEIR, including all written comments, the project Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Plan, the Findings and the Statements of Overriding Considerations have been made available to the Board of Trustees for certification as part of this agenda item.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The FEIR for the SDSU Imperial Valley Center (IVC) Master Plan was prepared to address the environmental effects, mitigation measures and project alternatives associated with approval of the SDSU IVC Master Plans for Calexico and Brawley sites and the respective enrollment ceiling determinations, and all discretionary actions relating thereto.

2. The FEIR for the SDSU IVC Master Plan (State Clearinghouse No. 200251010) was prepared pursuant to CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines.

3. 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.

4. This board hereby adopts the Findings of Fact and related mitigation measures for Agenda Item 10 of the September 16-17, 2003, meeting of the trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which identify specific impacts of the proposed project and which are incorporated by reference.
5. The findings in the Statement of Overriding Considerations for the SDSU IVC Master Plan are incorporated by reference and adopted by this board, and those findings include specific overriding considerations, which outweigh certain remaining significant impacts.

6. 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 SDSU IVC Master Plan as complete and adequate in that the FEIR addresses all environmental impacts of the proposed project and fully complies with the requirements of CEQA and the state CEQA Guidelines:

A. The DEIR for the SDSU IVC Master Plan;

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

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

D. All attachments, documents incorporated, and references made in the documents as specified in items (A) through (C) above.

All of the above information is on file with the California State University, Office of the Chancellor, Capital Planning, Design and Construction, 401 Golden Shore Avenue, Long Beach, CA. 90802-4210 and San Diego State University, Office of Facilities Planning and Management, Administration Building, Room 130, 5500 Campanile Drive, San Diego, CA. 92182-1624.

7. The board certifies the FEIR for the SDSU IVC Master Plan as complete and adequate, consistent with the requirements of CEQA and CSU Board of Trustees policies.

8. The board finds that the FEIR has sufficiently analyzed the environmental impacts and mitigation measures identified in the Project Description and that the board shall consider the FEIR in connection with any future approvals for the construction of the component projects identified in the FEIR.

9. The board adopts the findings set forth in this resolution including the identification of other specific agencies, which are the proper agencies responsible for specified off-site traffic mitigation measures.
10. The mitigation measures identified in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan are hereby adopted and shall be monitored and reported in accordance with the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan for Agenda Item 10 of the September 16-17, 2003, meeting of the trustees’ Committee on Campus Planning, Buildings and Grounds, which meets the requirements of CEQA (Public Resources Code Section 21081.6).

11. The chancellor or his designee is requested under the Delegation of Authority granted by the Board of Trustees to file the Notice of Determination for the SDSU IVC Master Plan.

12. The board approves the SDSU IVC Brawley initial campus master plan dated September 2003 at a master plan enrollment ceiling of 850 FTES.

13. The board approves the SDSU IVC Calexico campus master plan revision dated September 2003 at a master plan enrollment ceiling of 850 FTES.
SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY, IMPERIAL VALLEY CAMPUS BRAWLEY
MASTER PLAN ENROLLMENT: 850 FTE
PROPOSED DATE: SEPTEMBER 2003

1. Initial Facility
2. Academic Building II
3. Academic Building III
4. Library
5. Computer Building
6. Classroom Building
7. Auditorium
8. Administration
9. Student Center
10. Energy Museum
11. Faculty Office
12. Agricultural Research

---

LEGEND
EXISTING FACILITY / Initial Facility
Note: Building numbers correspond with building numbers in the Space and Facilities Data Base (SFDDB)
San Diego State University

Imperial Valley Campus
Calipso
Campus Master Plan
Master Plan Enrollment: 400 FTE
Approval Date: January 1995
Campus Acreage: 8.38

FACILITY LEGEND
1  NORTH CLASSROOM BUILDING
2  ADMINISTRATION BUILDING
2A  ART GALLERY
3  AUDITORIUM / CLASSROOMS
4  CLASSROOMS BUILDING
5  LIBRARY
5A  LIBRARY ADDITION
6  PHYSICAL PLANT
7  COMPUTER BUILDING
8  STUDENT AFFAIRS BUILDING
9  FACULTY OFFICES BUILDING EAST
10  FACULTY OFFICES BUILDING WEST
20  STUDENT CENTER
21  CLASSROOM BUILDING

BUILDINGS

1  NORTH CLASSROOM BUILDING
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Approval of Schematic Plans

Presentation By

J. Patrick Drohan
Assistant Vice Chancellor
Capital Planning, Design and Construction

Summary

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

1. CSU Dominguez Hills—Loker Student Union Addition/Remodel
   *Project Architect: Cannon Design*

Background and Scope

The CSU Dominguez Hills, Loker Student Union addition will be located on the north side of the existing union. The two-story addition includes an interior courtyard adjoining the existing student union building. The exterior skin will have a two-story glass curtain wall at the principle entry, and stucco walls to harmonize with the existing student union. The proposed project will also remodel the existing building and provide additional space for large meeting rooms, offices and expansion space for the bookstore, food court and retail sales areas.

Timing (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Preliminary Plans</td>
<td>October 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of Working Drawings</td>
<td>May 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Start</td>
<td>July 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupancy</td>
<td>June 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Building Area</td>
<td>57,450 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignable Building Area</td>
<td>41,360 square feet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td>72 percent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Renovation
Gross Building Area 56,650 square feet
Assignable Building Area 40,490 square feet
Efficiency 71 percent

Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019

New Building Cost ($224 per GSF) $12,876,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Breakdown</th>
<th>($ per GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substructure (Foundation)</td>
<td>$13.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure)</td>
<td>$73.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)</td>
<td>$27.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)</td>
<td>$84.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Equipment and Furnishings</td>
<td>$25.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Renovated Building Cost ($120 per GSF) 6,801,000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systems Breakdown</th>
<th>($ per GSF)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Substructure (Foundation)</td>
<td>$ 2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Shell (Substructure and Enclosure)</td>
<td>$31.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes)</td>
<td>$24.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire)</td>
<td>$50.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Equipment and Furnishings</td>
<td>$ 6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Special Construction (Demolition)</td>
<td>$ 4.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Development (includes landscaping) 1,074,000

Construction Cost $20,751,000
Fees, Contingency and Services 8,178,000

Total Project Cost ($254 per GSF) $28,929,000
Group II Equipment 1,500,000

Grand Total $30,429,000

Cost Comparison

The CSU does not have a building cost standard for Student Unions due to the varying programmatic differences of campus projects. However, based on three recent CSU Student
Union buildings at Los Angeles ($200/GSF), San Bernardino ($235/GSF) and Northridge ($248/GSF), this project’s cost is reasonable for the proposed program.

**Funding Data**

Funding for the project will be provided through a $4 million donation from Katherine Loker, and through Student Union fees. The campus will request Board of Trustees’ approval at a future meeting to issue bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program to finance the remaining funds necessary for the construction of the project.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the project and was filed with the State Clearinghouse in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Dominguez Hills, Loker Student Union Addition/Remodel project has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have a significant adverse impact on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.

3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Dominguez Hills, Loker Student Union Addition/Remodel project are approved at a project cost of $30,429,000 at CCCI 4019.

2. **CSU Hayward—Pioneer Heights Phase II Student Housing**

   **Project Architect: The Steinberg Group**

**Background and Scope**

The existing CSU Hayward Pioneer Heights student housing has 404 beds and was built in 1987. The proposed Phase II student housing project will add 76 units to provide a total of 416 new beds. A new administration and commons building will support both the existing and proposed housing and is designed to serve as the new front door to the housing community. The main pedestrian spine leading from the academic core feeds into the entry plaza to the commons.
There will be 32 units consisting of double-occupancy rooms in 8 three-room suites and 24 four-room suites for freshmen, totaling 240 beds, and 44 units consisting of 4 single-occupancy rooms intended for upperclassmen, totaling 176 beds. The housing will be in three buildings designed in a combination of 3 and 4-story structures of 121,277 GSF, organized around a large common open space. The building exterior is designed to complement the existing phase I complex and will be constructed of cement fiber exterior walls and energy efficient glazing. All units will have balconies overlooking the central open space and dedicated study/meeting rooms on every floor to foster a learning environment within the housing community. The new administration and commons building of 7,500 GSF will provide offices, conference rooms, a mailroom, computer facilities, a large multi-purpose space and a fitness/exercise room. Also included is a free standing mechanical service building of 1,590 GSF, to serve both the existing and new housing. The project also includes the renovation and reconfiguration of the existing El Dorado Hall to expand laundry facilities to serve both Phases I and II residents.

**Timing (Estimated)**

- Completion of Preliminary Plans: November 2003
- Completion of Working Drawings: January 2004
- Construction Start: May 2004
- Occupancy: September 2005

**Basic Statistics**

**New Construction**

- Gross Building Area: 130,367 square feet
- Assignable Building Area: 104,294 square feet
- Efficiency: 80 percent

**Renovation**

- Gross Building Area: 5,720 square feet
- Assignable Building Area: 4,576 square feet
- Efficiency: 80 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019**

New Building Cost ($140 per GSF): $18,240,000

*Systems Breakdown*  
- a. Substructure (Foundation): $6.01  
- b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure): $49.80
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes) $28.43

d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire) $49.87

e. Equipment and Furnishings $  5.80

Renovation Building Cost ($88 per GSF) 503,000

Systems Breakdown ($ per GSF)

a. Substructure (Foundation) $  0.00
b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure) $  4.15
c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes) $25.73
d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire) $39.95
e. Equipment and Furnishings $10.73
f. Special Construction (Demolition) $  7.44

Site Development (includes landscaping) 3,713,000

Construction Cost $22,456,000
Fees, Contingency and Services  5,032,000

Total Project Cost ($202 per GSF) $27,488,000
Group II Equipment 1,100,000
Grand Total $28,588,000

Cost Comparison

The new building’s $140 per square foot cost is comparable to the recent cost range of northern housing projects at Sonoma ($114), and San Luis Obispo ($137). Hayward has greater costs under the building services category than Sonoma, which is attributed to greater costs for vertical transportation (elevators) in addition to providing air conditioning to limited areas. Site development costs to accommodate the new electrical load are somewhat higher than comparable projects due to the longer distance to the point of connection.

Funding Data

The project was presented to the Housing Proposal Review Committee on July 9, 2003. Project funding is from three sources: a campus request for Board of Trustees’ approval at a future meeting to issue bonds through the Systemwide Revenue Bond program to be serviced with housing rental revenue, $1.5 million from parking fines and forfeiture funds, and $2 million from Pioneer Heights Phase I Capital Development reserves.
California Environmental Quality Act Action

An initial study was prepared and a Negative Declaration was filed with the State Clearinghouse on July 15, 2003, in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act. The 30-day public comment period ended August 14, 2003. There were no adverse comments received. A copy of the Negative Declaration will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Negative Declaration for the California State University, Hayward, Pioneer Heights Phase II Student Housing has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have the potential for significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.

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

4. The schematic plans for the California State University, Hayward, Pioneer Heights Phase II Student Housing are approved at a project cost of $28,588,000 at CCCI 4019.

3. CSU Long Beach—Parking Office Building

*Project Architect: Robbins Jorgensen Christopher, Inc.*

Background and Scope

The CSU Long Beach, Parking Office Building will provide replacement offices for the Parking, Transportation and Event Services; and Sports, Athletic, and Recreation programs. The new 19,500 GSF building will be located south of the Pyramid and east of Parking Structure 1, in an area used for athletic track and field activities. The project will replace, in part, existing offices located in temporary trailers so that the trailers can be removed to accommodate the construction of Parking Structures 2 and 3. The two-story structure will be of steel frame, metal stud construction with exterior finishes of brick veneer, exterior plaster, glass and metal sunscreen materials consistent with campus architectural standards. The Sports, Athletic, and Recreation offices will be located on the first floor, with administrative functions of Parking, Transportation
and Event Services located on the second floor. The site costs include revising the field activity area.

**Timing (Estimated)**

Completion of Preliminary Plans  
Completion of Working Drawings  
Construction Start  
Occupancy

**Basic Statistics**

- Gross Building Area: 19,500 square feet  
- Assignable Building Area: 11,800 square feet  
- Efficiency: 61 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019**

- Building Cost ($162 per GSF): $3,162,000
- Site Development (includes landscaping): 584,000
- Construction Cost: $3,746,000
- Fees, Contingency and Services: 1,108,000
- Total Project Cost ($249 per GSF): $4,854,000
- Group II Equipment: 100,000
- Grand Total: $4,954,000

**Cost Comparison**
This project’s $162 per GSF building cost is below the CSU construction cost guidelines ($180) for faculty offices.

Funding Data

The project funding is from parking program reserves. The faculty office space for the Sports, Athletics and Recreation department will be leased from the Parking Program by the General Fund.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

Development of this new support facility was analyzed as part of the CSU Long Beach, campus master plan revision (Northeast Campus Improvements Project), which was the subject of a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) certified by the board at the July 15-16, 2003, Board of Trustees’ meeting. No adverse comments were received. A copy of the FEIR that includes all written and oral comments received by CSU Long Beach on the Draft EIR is available at http://www.ppfm.csulb.edu.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

RESOLVED, By the Board of Trustees of the California State University, that upon consideration of the information provided in the previously approved FEIR prepared for the California State University, Long Beach, campus master plan revision (Northeast Campus Improvements Project), the board finds that:

1. The FEIR was prepared to specifically include the Parking Office Building and has been previously approved by the Board of Trustees on July 15-16, 2003, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. Based on the information contained in the previously approved FEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted, the proposed project will not have a significant effect on the environment.

3. The project does not propose substantial changes, which would require revision of the previously certified FEIR.

4. The project does not involve any substantial changes in the circumstances under which the previously certified campus master plan revision (Northeast Campus Improvements Project) FEIR was certified.
5. No substantial new information has been identified, which shows that the project would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous FEIR.

6. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

7. The mitigation measures and implementation of the recommended improvements specified in the FEIR for the campus master plan revision (Northeast Campus Improvements Project) are hereby adopted as part of this approval of the California State University, Long Beach, Parking Office Building.

8. The project will benefit the California State University.

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

10. The schematic plans for the California State University, Long Beach, Parking Office Building are approved at a project cost of $4,954,000 at CCCI 4019.

4. CSU Los Angeles—Physical Science Replacement Building, Wing A

*Project Architect: A.C. Martin Partners*

**Background and Scope**

The new CSU Los Angeles, Physical Science Replacement Building, Wing A will provide a modern laboratory building for the science disciplines. The building will be sited and configured to accommodate the future construction of Wing B, with a shared courtyard and utility area, and a bridge connecting the two wings. The existing tennis courts and basketball courts will be relocated to the eastern part of campus as part of this project to make room for the new building. The structure will be a three story steel frame with braced frames to resist horizontal loads. The layout of columns, walls, and service spaces will allow flexibility for future changes in occupancy. Exterior wall finishes will be designed for durability and ease of maintenance and will blend in with the campus environment. The internal racetrack circulation around the support spaces will allow laboratory spaces and offices to be located at the perimeter to take advantage of natural light. The building will be fully air conditioned, and exhaust systems will be provided at laboratory fume hoods. Chilled water and other utilities will be taken from existing campus distribution systems. An emergency generator will provide power for certain critical functions. The project includes laboratories, support spaces, and faculty offices for Biological Sciences,
Chemistry and Biochemistry, Geological Sciences, Health and Human Services and College spaces (including animal facilities), and some computer laboratories.

**Timing (Estimated)**

- Completion of Preliminary Drawings: December 2003
- Completion of Working Drawings: July 2004
- Construction Start: October 2004
- Occupancy: June 2006

**Basic Statistics**

- Gross Building Area: 105,815 square feet
- Assignable Building Area: 65,981 square feet
- Efficiency: 62 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019**

Building Cost ($272 per GSF): $28,772,000

- Systems Breakdown ($ per GSF)
  - a. Substructure: $7.05
  - b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure): $63.81
  - c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes): $31.90
  - d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire): $122.07
  - e. Equipment (includes Group I): $47.07

Site Development (includes landscaping): $2,064,000

Construction Cost: $30,836,000

Fees, Contingency and Services: $7,272,000

Total Project Cost ($360 per GSF): $38,108,000

Group II Equipment: $4,487,000

Grand Total: $42,595,000

**Cost Comparison**
This project’s cost of $272 per GSF is comparable with science projects at Stanislaus ($261 per GSF) and Long Beach ($275 per GSF) when adjusted to CCCI 4019.

**Funding Data**

Project funding (Public Works Board Lease Revenue Bond funds) was approved as part of the Governor’s Economic Stimulus Package (AB 16) and provided for design and construction.

**California Environmental Quality Act Action**

A Categorical Exemption has been completed for the project and was filed with the State Clearinghouse in accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Categorical Exemption for the California State University, Los Angeles, Physical Science Replacement Building, Wing A has been prepared pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The proposed project will not have significant adverse impacts on the environment, and the project will benefit the California State University.

3. The schematic plans for the California State University, Los Angeles, Physical Science Replacement Building, Wing A are approved at a project cost of $42,595,000 at CCCI 4019.

5. **Sonoma State University—Student Housing, Phase II**

   *Project Architect: Fisher-Friedman*

**Background and Scope**

Sonoma State University currently has design capacity of 2,455 student beds. With anticipated growth of 1,000 full-time equivalent students (FTES) by Fall 2006, the university will have a projected enrollment of 8,250 FTES. Sonoma State University commissioned an independent market research firm to explore the demand for additional housing on campus. The study identified a current market unmet demand for 1,897 beds in Fall 2003 and 2,739 beds in Fall 2006. This schematic approval is for the second phase of a proposed housing complex in the southeast corner of the campus on an approved campus master plan site. The completed
complex will accommodate 1,350 students. Phase I accommodated 655 students. The proposed Phase II facility will provide 695 beds consisting of 171 four-bed apartments of approximately 1,150 square feet with private baths, full kitchens, dining and living rooms, one two-bedroom apartment for the resident assistant and ten studio apartments. The project will include two (2) laundry facilities, eight (8) multi-use student gathering spaces, as well as a 12,000 square foot multi-purpose meeting facility (Tuscany Hall), which will be part of the University Center Complex. This project also includes 350 parking spaces and road modifications to the southeastern campus entrance. The apartments will be three-story wood frame buildings with exterior staircases, plaster exteriors, clay tile roofing, radiant heat flooring, upgraded interior finishes and fire sprinkler protection.

**Timing (Estimated)**

- Completion of Preliminary Drawings: October 2003
- Completion of Working Drawings: January 2004
- Construction Start: April 2004
- Occupancy: August 2006

**Basic Statistics**

- Gross Building Area: 253,984 square feet
- Assignable Building Area: 221,096 square feet
- Efficiency: 87 percent

**Cost Estimate—California Construction Cost Index 4019**

- Building Cost ($114 per GSF): $28,832,000
- Systems Breakdown ($ per GSF):
  - a. Substructure (Foundation): $9.27
  - b. Shell (Structure and Enclosure): $38.14
  - c. Interiors (Partitions and Finishes): $28.64
  - d. Services (HVAC, Plumbing, Electrical, Fire): $31.94
  - e. Equipment and furnishings: $5.53

- Site Development (includes landscaping): $4,333,000
- Construction Cost: $33,165,000
- Fees, Contingency and Services: $4,701,000
Total Project Cost ($149 per GSF) $37,866,000  
Group II Equipment 2,677,000  
Grand Total $40,543,000

Cost Comparison

The project’s building cost of $114 per GSF is comparable to Pomona’s University Village at $122 per GSF with similar massing and construction materials, but lower estimated costs under the building Services (HVAC) category.

Funding Data

The project was presented to the Housing Proposal Review Committee on July 9, 2003. The campus plans to request Board of Trustees’ approval to issues bonds through the CSU Systemwide Revenue Bond program at the March 2004 meeting.

California Environmental Quality Act Action

An Addendum has been prepared to the FEIR originally prepared for the Sonoma State University, campus master plan revision, to address technical changes and potential impacts of the proposed Student Housing, Phase II project. The board approved the original FEIR in May 2000 and as a result of the analysis done for the Addendum, no new significant impacts or mitigation measures related to the proposed Student Housing, Phase II project have been identified. A copy of the FEIR with the Addendum will be available at the meeting.

The following resolution is presented for approval:

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

1. The board finds that the Addendum to the previously certified FEIR for the Sonoma State University, campus master plan revision, was prepared to include the Student Housing, Phase II project pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.

2. The FEIR was prepared to specifically include this project and has been previously approved by the Board of Trustees on May 9-10, 2000, pursuant to the requirements of the California Environmental Quality Act.
3. Based on the information contained in the previously certified FEIR and the mitigation measures identified therein and previously adopted and the Addendum to the FEIR prepared specifically for the Student Housing, Phase II project, the proposed project will not have new significant effects on the environment.

4. The project does not propose substantial changes, which would require revision of the previously certified FEIR.

5. The project does not involve any substantial changes in the circumstances under which the previously certified May 2002 campus master plan revision FEIR analyzed the potential impacts of the Student Housing, Phases I and II projects, and which was then certified.

6. No substantial new information has been identified, which shows that the project would have one or more significant effects not discussed in the previous FEIR.

7. No additional mitigation measures are necessary.

8. The mitigation measures and implementation of the recommended improvements specified in the May 2002 campus master plan revision FEIR, which included the Student Housing, Phases I and II projects are hereby adopted as part of this approval of the Sonoma State University, Student Housing, Phase II project.

9. The project will benefit the California State University.

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

11. The schematic plans for the Sonoma State University, Student Housing, Phase II project are approved at a project cost of $40,543,000 at CCCI 4019.